

Item 9:

Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs

DISCUSSION AND ACTION

SUMMARY: This item provides the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) an opportunity to discuss and propose amendments to 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs. Chapter 229 establishes the performance standards and procedures for educator preparation program (EPP) accountability. The proposed amendments would provide for adjustments to the 2020–2021 *Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) Manual* due to the ongoing public health situation; implement House Bill (HB) 159, 87th Texas Legislature, 2021, to add students with disabilities to the student achievement ASEP performance indicator regarding student performance; provide additional clarity for certificate category calculations; and provide updates to the *ASEP Manual*.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY: The statutory authority for 19 TAC Chapter 229 is the Texas Education Code (TEC), §§21.041(a), (b)(1), and (d); 21.043(b) and (c), 21.0441(c) and (d); 21.0443; 21.045, as amended by HB 159, 87th Texas Legislature, 2021; 21.0451; and 21.0452.

TEC, §21.041(a), allows the SBEC to adopt rules as necessary for its own procedures.

TEC, §21.041(b)(1), requires the SBEC to propose rules that provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of TEC, Chapter 21, Subchapter B, in a manner consistent with TEC, Chapter 21, Subchapter B.

TEC, §21.041(d), states that the SBEC may adopt a fee for the approval and renewal of approval of an educator preparation program, for the addition of a certificate or field of certification, and to provide for the administrative cost of appropriately ensuring the accountability of EPPs.

TEC, §21.043(b) and (c), require SBEC to provide EPPs with data, as determined in coordination with stakeholders, based on information reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) that enables an EPP to assess the impact of the program and revise the program as needed to improve.

TEC, §21.0441(c) and (d), require the SBEC to adopt rules setting certain admission requirements for EPPs.

TEC, §21.0443, states that the SBEC shall propose rules to establish standards to govern the approval or renewal of approval of EPPs and certification fields authorized to be offered by an EPP. To be eligible for approval or renewal of approval, an EPP must adequately prepare candidates for educator certification and meet the standards and requirements of the SBEC. The SBEC shall require that each EPP be reviewed for renewal of approval at least every five

years. The SBEC shall adopt an evaluation process to be used in reviewing an EPP for renewal of approval.

TEC, §21.045, as amended by HB 159, 87th Texas Legislature, 2021, states that the SBEC shall propose rules establishing standards to govern the approval and continuing accountability of all EPPs.

TEC, §21.0451, states that the SBEC shall propose rules for the sanction of EPPs that do not meet accountability standards and shall annually review the accreditation status of each EPP. The costs of technical assistance required under TEC, §21.0451(a)(2)(A), or the costs associated with the appointment of a monitor under TEC, §21.0451(a)(2)(C), shall be paid by the sponsor of the EPP.

TEC, §21.0452, states that to assist persons interested in obtaining teaching certification in selecting an EPP and to assist school districts in making staffing decisions, the SBEC shall make certain specified information regarding EPPs in this state available to the public through the SBEC's Internet website.

EFFECTIVE DATE: If approved for filing as proposed in July 2021, and if adopted, subject to State Board of Education (SBOE) review, at the October 1, 2021 SBEC meeting, the proposed effective date of the proposal would be December 26, 2021 (20 days after filing as adopted with the *Texas Register*). The proposed effective date is based on the SBEC and SBOE meeting schedules.

PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION: The SBEC last amended §229.1 and §229.4 effective December 27, 2020. The SBEC last amended §229.5 effective December 22, 2019.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION: EPPs are entrusted to prepare educators for success in the classroom. The TEC, §21.0443, requires EPPs to adequately prepare candidates for certification. Similarly, TEC, §21.031, requires the SBEC to ensure candidates for certification demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the performance of the diverse student population of this state. TEC, §21.045, also requires the SBEC to establish standards to govern the continuing accountability of all EPPs. The SBEC rules in 19 TAC Chapter 229 establish the process used for issuing annual accreditation ratings for all EPPs to comply with these provisions of the TEC and to ensure the highest level of educator preparation, which is codified in the SBEC Mission Statement.

At the April 2021 meeting, Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff presented draft rule text and received direction from the SBEC related to potential rule changes in Chapter 229. The SBEC directed staff to receive additional feedback on certificate category pass rates. Staff hosted a meeting with the Educator Preparation Advisory Committee (EPAC) on May 21, 2021, to receive feedback on the proposed text.

Following is a description of the topics for the SBEC's consideration for proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229. The proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229 are presented in Attachment II. The updated Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c), which is the *ASEP Manual*, is presented in Attachment III. A detailed description is included below.

§229.1. General Provisions and Purpose of Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs.

Update of *ASEP Manual*:

The proposed amendment to Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) would update the *ASEP Manual* to do four things:

Updates to Chapter 3 would include language to exclude candidates issued a probationary certificate under the condition of the waiver issued by the governor. These candidates are removed from the calculation per 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(D), therefore, this update clarifies this removal in the *ASEP Manual*. Chapter 3 would also be updated to align with the pass rate approach for the 2020–2021 academic year (AY), per 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(B). This update aligns the *ASEP Manual* with existing rule language. Chapter 3 would further be updated with clarification about the Core Subjects Adjustment, which is no longer needed due to changes in how data is reported to TEA but is still used for historic data. A new section, Disaggregation at the Certification or Category Level, would be added to the *ASEP Manual*, providing clarity on the calculations for proposed new 19 TAC §229.5(c). These changes were prompted by feedback from the SBEC and stakeholders, as noted in the description of changes to 19 TAC §229.5(c) below. The old section, The Disaggregation at the Test Level, would be removed. Finally, updates to the worked examples would be made, removing old examples and providing new ones, to align with the text updates. The updates include a new example pertaining to 19 TAC §229.5(c).

Updates to Chapter 5 would implement HB 159, 87th Texas Legislature, 2021, to clarify that all students, including students with disabilities, would be used in the calculation of the standard.

Updates to Chapter 8 would provide the new focus area for the Innovative EPP commendation. This focus area was approved by the EPP commendation committee at its meeting on April 29, 2021.

Updates to Chapter 9 would remove the date reference to streamline the text.

Updates throughout the *ASEP Manual* would correct date references and correct minor technical errors as well as provide transparency to the field as to the calculations used to determine accreditation statuses.

§229.4. Determination of Accreditation Status.

The proposed amendment in §229.4(a) would prescribe that due to the governor's ongoing disaster declaration, the 2020–2021 AY data for the performance indicators would be reported to EPPs but not be used for accountability purposes. Given that the governor declared a disaster during which many campuses, facilities, and services were closed, impacting the ability of EPPs to meet these accountability measures, this amendment would prevent EPPs from receiving accountability ratings based on data that are partial or incomplete.

Determination of Accreditation Status:

The proposed amendment to §229.4(b), (b)(1), and (b)(2) would delay the implementation of the previously adopted index system. This would continue to provide a year in which the recommended accreditation status would be the more favorable outcome of the index system described in the §229.4(b)(1)(A)–(D) or the existing system in §229.4(b)(2)(A)–(D) for each EPP. This would align with the previous approach to the implementation timeline as being the year immediately following the end of the *Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster* accreditation status.

The proposed amendment to §229.4(b)(4) would extend the accreditation status of *Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster* to the 2020–2021 reporting year for all EPPs. This status is based on the governor’s declaration of disaster on March 13, 2020, due to COVID-19. This status would limit the continued impact of test center closures and local education agency (LEA) closures on EPP accreditation statuses. The proposed amendment to §229.4(b)(4) would prescribe that the ASEP status that each EPP was assigned by the SBEC for the 2018–2019 reporting year would be the operative accreditation status for purposes prescribed in 19 TAC Chapter 228, Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs, for 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 AYs.

Proposed new §229.4(b)(4)(D) would prescribe that EPPs that were not assigned an ASEP status of *Accredited* for the 2018–2019 AY and meet the requirements to be assigned an ASEP status of *Accredited* for the 2020–2021 AY, as described in §229.4(b)(1)(A) or (2)(A), would provide for a break in consecutively measured years or next most recent years as prescribed in §229.4(b)(1)–(3), and would allow an EPP to be eligible for commendations as described in §229.1(d). Proposed new §229.4(b)(4)(D) would allow an EPP that has made program improvements during the pandemic that would have resulted in an *Accredited* status if ASEP was not paused to break from the 2018–2019 ASEP status for purposes of determining future ASEP accreditation status based on consecutive years of poor performance and be eligible for a commendation.

A technical edit would be made to a cross reference in §229.4(a)(3) to apply Texas Register style requirements.

§229.5. Accreditation Sanctions and Procedures.

The proposed amendment to §229.5(c) would clarify that the determination of pass rates evaluated at the level of a certification class or category is calculated at the exam level, and that all exams required for certification, as listed in Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e), are included. This amendment would require EPPs to meet the performance standard for all non-PPR exams required for certification within a certification class or category. This aligns with the requirements for candidates to be certified.

At the May 21, 2021 meeting of the EPAC, there was discussion about the update to §229.5(c). Stakeholders noted the importance of using all tests available and ensuring specifically that results from the Science of Teaching Reading (STR) exam were able to be used. The group discussed a number of options, including combining pass rates and having each pass rate count separately. Stakeholders also noted that candidates are required to pass all exams for certification and that expectations for EPPs should be aligned. Proposed amendments in §229.5(c) and Chapter 3 of the *ASEP Manual* would provide for this alignment.

Proposed new §229.5(c)(3) would prescribe that EPPs that failed to meet the performance standard in subsection (c) regarding performance on a certification examination in the 2018–2019 academic year and would meet the requirements for the 2020–2021 AY will provide a break in consecutively measured years for that class or category for the purposes of determining future consecutive years of poor performance. This would allow an EPP that has made program improvements in a certificate class or category that would have resulted in a reset if the calculation was not paused to break from the 2018–2019 consecutively measured years.

The proposed amendment in §229.5(c) would provide technical edits to renumber and reletter subsections (d) and (e) to paragraphs (1) and (2) and subsections (f) and (g) to subsections (d) and (e).

FISCAL IMPACT: The TEA staff has determined that there is no additional fiscal impact on state or local governments and that there are no additional costs to entities required to comply with the proposal.

LOCAL EMPLOYMENT IMPACT: The proposal has no effect on local economy; therefore, no local employment impact statement is required under Texas Government Code (TGC), §2001.002.

SMALL BUSINESS, MICROBUSINESS, AND RURAL COMMUNITY IMPACT: The proposal has no direct adverse economic impact for small businesses, microbusinesses, or rural communities; therefore, no regulatory flexibility analysis, specified in TGC, §2006.002, is required.

COST INCREASE TO REGULATED PERSONS: The proposal does not impose a cost on regulated persons, another state agency, a special district, or a local government and, therefore, is not subject to TGC, §2001.0045.

TAKINGS IMPACT ASSESSMENT: The proposal does not impose a burden on private real property and, therefore, does not constitute a taking under TGC, §2007.043.

GOVERNMENT GROWTH IMPACT: The TEA staff prepared a Government Growth Impact Statement assessment for this proposed rulemaking. During the first five years the proposed rulemaking would be in effect, it would limit an existing regulation by removing accountability requirements for EPPs for the 2020–2021 academic year due to the ongoing disaster declaration. EPPs will not be held accountable for performance metrics during this time as outlined in this proposed rule.

The proposed rulemaking would not create or eliminate a government program; would not require the creation of new employee positions or elimination of existing employee positions; would not require an increase or decrease in future legislative appropriations to the agency; would not require an increase or decrease in fees paid to the agency; would not create a new regulation; would not expand or repeal an existing regulation; would not increase or decrease the number of individuals subject to its applicability; and would not positively or adversely affect the state's economy.

PUBLIC BENEFIT AND COST TO PERSONS: The public benefit anticipated as a result of the proposal would be an accountability system that informs the public of the quality of educator

preparation provided by each SBEC-approved EPP. There is no anticipated cost to persons who are required to comply with the proposal.

DATA AND REPORTING IMPACT: The proposal would have no new data and reporting impact.

PRINCIPAL AND CLASSROOM TEACHER PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS: The TEA staff has determined that the proposal would not require a written report or other paperwork to be completed by a principal or classroom teacher.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: The public comment period on the proposal begins August 20, 2021, and ends September 20, 2021. The SBEC will take registered oral and written comments on this item at the October 1, 2021 meeting in accordance with the SBEC board operating policies and procedures.

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs, to be published as proposed in the *Texas Register*.

Staff Members Responsible:

Mark Olofson, Director, Educator Data, Research, and Strategy
Christie Pogue, Director, SBEC Policy Development and Support

Attachments:

- I. Statutory Citations
- II. Text of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs
- III. Text of Proposed Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c)

ATTACHMENT I**Statutory Citations Relating to Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229,
Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs****Texas Education Code, §21.041, Rules; Fees (excerpts):**

- (a) The board may adopt rules as necessary for its own procedures.
- (b) The board shall propose rules that:
 - (1) provide for the regulation of educators and the general administration of this subchapter in a manner consistent with this subchapter;
- (d) The board may propose a rule adopting a fee for the approval or renewal of approval of an educator preparation program, or for the addition of a certificate or field of certification to the scope of a program's approval. A fee imposed under this subsection may not exceed the amount necessary, as determined by the board, to provide for the administrative cost of approving, renewing the approval of, and appropriately ensuring the accountability of educator preparation programs under this subchapter.

Texas Education Code, §21.043, Access to PEIMS Data (excerpts):

- (b) The agency shall provide educator preparation programs with data based on information reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) that enables an educator preparation program to:
 - (1) assess the impact of the program; and
 - (2) revise the program as needed to improve the design and effectiveness of the program.
- (c) The agency in coordination with the board shall solicit input from educator preparation programs to determine the data to be provided to educator preparation programs.

Texas Education Code, §21.0441, Admission Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs (excerpts):

- (c) The overall grade point average of each incoming class admitted by an educator preparation program, including an alternative educator preparation program, may not be less than 3.00 on a four-point scale or the equivalent or a higher overall grade point average prescribed by the board. In computing the overall grade point average of an incoming class for purposes of this subsection, a program may:
 - (1) include the grade point average of each person in the incoming class based on all course work previously attempted by the person at a public or private institution of higher education; or
 - (2) include the grade point average of each person in the incoming class based only on the last 60 semester credit hours attempted by the person at a public or private institution of higher education.
- (d) A person seeking career and technology education certification is not included in determining the overall grade point average of an incoming class under Subsection (c).

Texas Education Code, §21.0443, Educator Preparation Program Approval and Renewal:

- (a) The board shall propose rules to establish standards to govern the approval or renewal of approval of:
 - (1) educator preparation programs; and
 - (2) certification fields authorized to be offered by an educator preparation program.
- (b) To be eligible for approval or renewal of approval, an educator preparation program must adequately prepare candidates for educator certification and meet the standards and requirements of the board.
- (c) The board shall require that each educator preparation program be reviewed for renewal of approval at least every five years. The board shall adopt an evaluation process to be used in reviewing an educator preparation program for renewal of approval.

Texas Education Code, §21.045, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs, as amended by House Bill 159, 87th Texas Legislature, 2021:

- (a) The board shall propose rules necessary to establish standards to govern the continuing accountability of all educator preparation programs based on the following information that is disaggregated with respect to race, sex, and ethnicity:
 - (1) results of the certification examinations prescribed under Section 21.048(a);
 - (2) performance based on the appraisal system for beginning teachers adopted by the board;
 - (3) achievement, including improvement in achievement, of all students, including students with disabilities, taught by beginning teachers for the first three years following certification, to the extent practicable;
 - (4) compliance with board requirements regarding the frequency, duration, and quality of structural guidance and ongoing support provided by field supervisors to candidates completing student teaching, clinical teaching, or an internship; and
 - (5) results from a teacher satisfaction survey, developed by the board with stakeholder input, of new teachers performed at the end of the teacher's first year of teaching.
- (b) Each educator preparation program shall submit data elements as required by the board for an annual performance report to ensure access and equity. At a minimum, the annual report must contain:
 - (1) the performance data from Subsection (a), other than the data required for purposes of Subsection (a)(3);
 - (2) data related to the program's compliance with requirements for field supervision of candidates during their clinical teaching and internship experiences;
 - (3) the following information, disaggregated by race, sex, and ethnicity:
 - (A) the number of candidates who apply;
 - (B) the number of candidates admitted;
 - (C) the number of candidates retained;
 - (D) the number of candidates completing the program;

- (E) the number of candidates employed as beginning teachers under standard teaching certificates by not later than the first anniversary of completing the program;
 - (F) the amount of time required by candidates employed as beginning teachers under probationary teaching certificates to be issued standard teaching certificates;
 - (G) the number of candidates retained in the profession; and
 - (H) any other information required by federal law;
- (4) the ratio of field supervisors to candidates completing student teaching, clinical teaching, or an internship; and
 - (5) any other information necessary to enable the board to assess the effectiveness of the program on the basis of teacher retention and success criteria adopted by the board.
- (c) The board shall propose rules necessary to establish performance standards for the Accountability System for Educator Preparation for accrediting educator preparation programs. At a minimum, performance standards must be based on Subsection (a).
 - (d) To assist an educator preparation program in improving the design and effectiveness of the program in preparing educators for the classroom, the agency shall provide to each program data that is compiled and analyzed by the agency based on information reported through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) relating to the program.

Texas Education Code, §21.0451, Sanctions Under Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs:

- (a) The board shall propose rules necessary for the sanction of educator preparation programs that do not meet accountability standards or comply with state law or rules and shall at least annually review the accreditation status of each educator preparation program. The rules:
 - (1) shall provide for the assignment of the following accreditation statuses:
 - (A) not rated;
 - (B) accredited;
 - (C) accredited—warned;
 - (D) accredited—probation; and
 - (E) not accredited—revoked;
 - (2) may provide for the agency to take any necessary action, including one or more of the following actions:
 - (A) requiring the program to obtain technical assistance approved by the agency or board;
 - (B) requiring the program to obtain professional services under contract with another person;
 - (C) appointing a monitor to participate in and report to the board on the activities of the program; and

- (D) if a program has been rated as accredited—probation under the Accountability System for Educator Preparation for a period of at least one year, revoking the approval of the program and ordering the program to be closed, provided that the board or agency has provided the opportunity for a contested case hearing;
- (3) shall provide for the agency to revoke the approval of the program and order the program to be closed if the program has been rated as accredited—probation under the Accountability System for Educator Preparation for three consecutive years, provided that the board or agency has provided the opportunity for a contested case hearing; and
- (4) shall provide the board procedure for changing the accreditation status of a program that:
 - (A) does not meet the accreditation standards established under Section 21.045(a); or
 - (B) violates a board or agency regulation.
- (b) Any action authorized or required to be taken against an educator preparation program under Subsection (a) may also be taken with regard to a particular field of certification authorized to be offered by an educator preparation program.
- (c) A revocation must be effective for a period of at least two years. After two years, the program may seek renewed approval to prepare educators for state certification.
- (d) The costs of technical assistance required under Subsection (a)(2)(A) or the costs associated with the appointment of a monitor under Subsection (a)(2)(C) shall be paid by the educator preparation program.

Texas Education Code, §21.0452, Consumer Information Regarding Educator Preparation Programs:

- (a) To assist persons interested in obtaining teaching certification in selecting an educator preparation program and assist school districts in making staffing decisions, the board shall make information regarding educator programs in this state available to the public through the board's Internet website.
- (b) The board shall make available at least the following information regarding each educator preparation program:
 - (1) the information specified in Sections 21.045(a) and (b);
 - (2) in addition to any other appropriate information indicating the quality of persons admitted to the program, the average academic qualifications possessed by persons admitted to the program, including:
 - (A) average overall grade point average and average grade point average in specific subject areas; and
 - (B) average scores on the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT), the American College Test (ACT), or the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), as applicable;
 - (3) the degree to which persons who complete the program are successful in obtaining teaching positions;

-
- (4) the extent to which the program prepares teachers, including general education teachers and special education teachers, to effectively teach:
 - (A) students with disabilities; and
 - (B) students of limited English proficiency, as defined by Section 29.052;
 - (5) the activities offered by the program that are designed to prepare teachers to:
 - (A) integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction, including activities consistent with the principles of universal design for learning; and
 - (B) use technology effectively to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of increasing student academic achievement;
 - (6) for each semester, the average ratio of field supervisors to candidates completing student teaching, clinical teaching, or an internship in an educator preparation program;
 - (7) the percentage of teachers employed under a standard teaching certificate within one year of completing the program;
 - (8) the perseverance of beginning teachers in the profession, as determined on the basis of the number of beginning teachers who maintain status as active contributing members in the Teacher Retirement System of Texas for at least three years after certification in comparison to similar programs;
 - (9) the results of exit surveys given to program participants on completion of the program that involve evaluation of the program's effectiveness in preparing participants to succeed in the classroom;
 - (10) the results of surveys given to school principals that involve evaluation of the program's effectiveness in preparing participants to succeed in the classroom, based on experience with employed program participants; and
 - (11) the results of teacher satisfaction surveys developed under Section 21.045 and given to program participants at the end of the first year of teaching.
- (c) For purposes of Subsection (b)(9), the board shall require an educator preparation program to distribute an exit survey that a program participant must complete before the participant is eligible to receive a certificate under this subchapter.
 - (d) For purposes of Subsections (b)(9) and (10), the board shall develop surveys for distribution to program participants and school principals.
 - (e) The board may develop procedures under which each educator preparation program receives a designation or ranking based on the information required to be made available under Subsection (b). If the board develops procedures under this subsection, the designation or ranking received by each program must be included in the information made available under this section.
 - (f) In addition to other information required to be made available under this section, the board shall provide information identifying employment opportunities for teachers in the various regions of this state. The board shall specifically identify each region of this state in which a shortage of qualified teachers exists.

- (g) The board may require any person to provide information to the board for purposes of this section.

ATTACHMENT II
Text of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC

Chapter 229. Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs

§229.1. General Provisions and Purpose of Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs.

- (a) The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) is responsible for establishing standards to govern the continuing accountability of all educator preparation programs (EPPs). The rules adopted by the SBEC in this chapter govern the accreditation of each EPP that prepares individuals for educator certification. No candidate shall be recommended for any Texas educator certification class or category except by an EPP that has been approved by the SBEC pursuant to Chapter 228 of this title (relating to Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs) and is accredited as required by this chapter.
- (b) The purpose of the accountability system for educator preparation is to assure that each EPP is held accountable for the readiness for certification of candidates completing the programs.
- (c) The relevant criteria, formulas, calculations, and performance standards relevant to subsection (d) of this section and §229.4 of this title (relating to Determination of Accreditation Status) are prescribed in the *Texas Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) Manual* provided as a figure in this subsection.

Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) [~~Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(e)~~]

- (d) An accredited EPP that is not under an active SBEC order or otherwise sanctioned by the SBEC may receive commendations for success in the following four dimensions identified by the SBEC and prescribed in the figure in subsection (c) of this section:
 - (1) Rigorous and Robust Preparation;
 - (2) Preparing the Educators Texas Needs;
 - (3) Preparing Educators for Long-Term Success; and
 - (4) Innovative Educator Preparation.

§229.4. Determination of Accreditation Status.

- (a) Accountability performance indicators. The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) shall determine the accreditation status of an educator preparation program (EPP) at least annually, based on the following accountability performance indicators, disaggregated by demographic group and other requirements of this chapter and determined with the formulas and calculations included in the figure provided in §229.1(c) of this title (relating to General Provisions and Purpose of Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs). Data will be used only if the following indicators were included in the accountability system for that academic year. Except for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 academic years [~~year~~], when the data described in paragraphs (1)-(5) of this subsection will be reported to EPPs and will not be used to determine accreditation statuses, EPP accreditation statuses shall be based on:
 - (1) the EPP candidates' performance on examinations of pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) and non-PPR standard certification examinations. The EPP candidates' performance on PPR and non-PPR examinations shall provide separate accountability performance indicators for EPPs.
 - (A) For both PPR and non-PPR examinations, the performance standard shall be calculated based on the percentage of individuals admitted after December 26, 2016, who passed an examination within the first two attempts. For purposes of determining the pass rate, an individual shall not be excluded because the individual has not been recommended for a standard certificate. The pass rate is based solely on the examinations approved by the EPP and required to obtain initial certification in the class or category for which the individual serves his or her internship, clinical teaching, or practicum. Examinations not required for certification in that class or category, whether taken before or after admission

- to an EPP, are not included in the rate. The formula for calculation of pass rate is the number of individuals who have passed an examination on their first or second attempt, including any attempts after the candidate completed the EPP, divided by the number of individuals who passed an examination on their first attempt plus those who passed or failed on their second attempt.
- (B) For the 2020-2021 academic year and following, the performance standard shall be the percent of individuals admitted after December 26, 2016, who passed an examination within the first two attempts, including those examinations attempted after the individual has completed the EPP or when the EPP has not recommended the individual for a standard certificate. The pass rate is based solely on the examinations approved by the EPP. Examinations taken before admission to the EPP or specific examinations taken for pilot purposes are not included in the pass rate. Completers who have been issued a probationary certificate under a waiver issued by the governor pursuant to the declaration of disaster on March 13, 2020, are not included in the pass rate for the 2020-2021 academic year.
- (C) For examinations of PPR, the pass rate will be calculated as described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 academic years and subparagraph (B) of this paragraph beginning with the 2020-2021 academic year. The performance standard shall be a pass rate of 85%.
- (D) For non-PPR examinations, the pass rate will be calculated as described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 academic years and subparagraph (B) of this paragraph beginning with the 2020-2021 academic year. The performance standard shall be a pass rate of 75%.
- (2) the results of appraisals of first-year teachers by administrators, based on a survey in a form to be approved by the SBEC. The performance standard shall be 70% of first-year teachers from the EPP who are appraised as "sufficiently prepared" or "well prepared."
- (3) the growth of students taught by beginning teachers as indicated by the STAAR Progress Measure, determined at the student level as described in Figure: 19 TAC §97.1001(b) of Part II of this title (relating to Accountability Rating System), and aggregated at the teacher level as described in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) of this title [~~relating to General Provisions and Purpose of Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs~~]. The performance standard shall be 70% of beginning teachers from the EPP reaching the individual performance threshold. The first two academic years for which the Texas Education Agency (TEA) has data necessary to calculate this performance standard following the 2019-2020 academic year will be reporting years only and will not be used to determine accreditation status;
- (4) the results of data collections establishing EPP compliance with SBEC requirements specified in §228.35(g) of this title (relating to Preparation Program Coursework and/or Training), regarding the frequency, duration, and quality of field supervision to candidates completing clinical teaching or an internship. The frequency and duration of field supervision shall provide one accountability performance indicator, and the quality of field supervision shall provide a separate accountability performance indicator.
- (A) The performance standard as to the frequency, duration, and required documentation of field supervision shall be that the EPP meets the requirements of documentation of §228.35(g) of this title for 95% of the EPP's candidates.
- (B) The performance standard for quality shall be 90% of candidates rating the field supervision as "frequently" or "always or almost always" providing the components of structural guidance and ongoing support; and
- (5) the results from a teacher satisfaction survey, in a form approved by the SBEC, of new teachers administered at the end of the first year of teaching under a standard certificate. The performance standard shall be 70% of teachers responding that they were "sufficiently prepared" or "well prepared" by their EPP.

- (b) Accreditation status assignment. For the 2021-2022 [~~2020-2021~~] academic year, the assigned accreditation status shall be the better result for the EPP from the system described in paragraph (1) of this subsection and paragraph (2) of this subsection.
- (1) Beginning in the 2021-2022 [~~2020-2021~~] academic year, all approved EPPs may be assigned an accreditation status based on their performance in the Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP) Index system, as described in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) of this title.
- (A) Accredited status. An EPP shall be assigned an Accredited status if the EPP has met the standard of 85% of the possible points in the ASEP Index system as described in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) of this title and has been approved by the SBEC to prepare, train, and recommend candidates for certification.
- (B) Accredited-Not Rated status. An EPP shall be assigned Accredited-Not Rated status upon initial approval to offer educator preparation, until the EPP can be assigned a status based on the ASEP Index system as described in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) of this title. An EPP is fully accredited and may recommend candidates for certification while it is in Accredited-Not Rated status.
- (C) Accredited-Warned status.
- (i) An EPP shall be assigned Accredited-Warned status if the EPP accumulates 80% or greater but less than 85% of the possible points in the ASEP Index system as described in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) of this title.
- (ii) An EPP may be assigned Accredited-Warned status if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules, orders, and/or Texas Education Code (TEC), Chapter 21.
- (D) Accredited-Probation status.
- (i) An EPP shall be assigned Accredited-Probation status if the EPP accumulates less than 80% of the possible points in the ASEP Index system as described in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c) of this title.
- (ii) An EPP may be assigned Accredited-Probation status if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules, orders, and/or TEC, Chapter 21.
- (2) Through the 2021-2022 [~~2020-2021~~] academic year, all approved EPPs may be assigned an accreditation status as follows.
- (A) Accredited status. An EPP shall be assigned an Accredited status if the EPP has met the accountability performance standards described in subsection (a) of this section and has been approved by the SBEC to prepare, train, and recommend candidates for certification.
- (B) Accredited-Not Rated status. An EPP shall be assigned Accredited-Not Rated status upon initial approval to offer educator preparation, until the EPP can be assigned a status based on the performance standards described in subsection (a) of this section. An EPP is fully accredited and may recommend candidates for certification while it is in Accredited-Not Rated status.
- (C) Accredited-Warned Status.
- (i) An EPP shall be assigned Accredited-Warned status if the EPP:
- (I) fails to meet the performance standards set by the SBEC for the overall performance of all its candidates on any of the indicators set forth in subsection (a) of this section in any one year;
- (II) fails to meet the performance standards in two demographic groups on an indicator set forth in subsection (a) of this section in any one year; or

- (III) fails to meet the performance standards for a demographic group on any of the indicators set forth in subsection (a) of this section for two consecutively measured years, regardless of whether the deficiency is in the same demographic group or standard.
 - (ii) An EPP may be assigned Accredited-Warned status if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules, orders, and/or TEC, Chapter 21.
- (D) Accredited-Probation status.
 - (i) An EPP shall be assigned Accredited-Probation status if the EPP:
 - (I) fails to meet the performance standards set by the SBEC for the overall performance of all its candidates on any of the indicators set forth in subsection (a) of this section for two consecutively measured years;
 - (II) fails to meet the performance standards in three demographic groups on an indicator set forth in subsection (a) of this section in any one year; or
 - (III) fails to meet the performance standards for a demographic group on any of the indicators set forth in subsection (a) of this section for three consecutively measured years, regardless of whether the deficiency is in the same demographic group or standard.
 - (ii) An EPP may be assigned Accredited-Probation status if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules, orders, and/or TEC, Chapter 21.
- (3) Not Accredited-Revoked status.
 - (A) An EPP shall be assigned Not Accredited-Revoked status and its approval to recommend candidates for educator certification revoked if it is assigned Accredited-Probation status for three consecutively measured years.
 - (B) An EPP may be assigned Not Accredited-Revoked status if the EPP has been on Accredited-Probation status for one year, and the SBEC determines that revoking the EPP's approval is reasonably necessary to achieve the purposes of the TEC, §21.045 and §21.0451.
 - (C) An EPP may be assigned Not Accredited-Revoked status if the EPP fails to pay the required ASEP technology fee by the deadline set by TEA as prescribed in §229.9(7) of this title (relating to Fees for Educator Preparation Program Approval and Accountability).
 - (D) An assignment of Not Accredited-Revoked status and revocation of EPP approval to recommend candidates for educator certification is subject to the requirements of notice, record review, and appeal as described in this chapter.
 - (E) A revocation of an EPP approval shall be effective for a period of two years, after which a program may reapply for approval as a new EPP pursuant to Chapter 228 of this title (relating to Requirements for Educator Preparation Programs).
 - (F) Upon revocation of EPP approval, the EPP may not admit new candidates for educator certification but may complete the training of candidates already admitted by the EPP and recommend them for certification. If necessary, TEA staff and other EPPs shall cooperate to assist the previously admitted candidates of the revoked EPP to complete their training.
- (4) Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster status.
 - (A) Due to the governor's declaration of disaster on March 13, 2020 in accordance with Texas Government Code, §418.014, all EPPs shall be assigned a status of Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 academic years [~~year~~].
 - (B) The assignment of Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster shall not interrupt consecutively measured years or next most recent prior years as prescribed in this chapter. The

assignment of Not Rated: Declared State of Disaster shall not be included in any count of years prescribed in this chapter.

- (C) For the purposes of §228.10 of this title (relating to Approval Process), §228.17(c) of this title (relating to Change of Ownership and Name Change), and §228.20 of this title (relating to Governance of Educator Preparation Programs), the status the SBEC assigned an EPP for the 2018-2019 academic year shall be the operative accreditation status.
- (D) For EPPs with an assigned status other than Accredited for the 2018-2019 academic year that meet the requirements for a status of Accredited as described in subsection (b)(1)(A) or (b)(2)(A) of this section based on their 2020-2021 data:
 - (i) the 2020-2021 academic year shall represent a break in consecutively measured years or next most recent prior years as prescribed in subsection (b)(1)-(3) of this section; and
 - (ii) the EPP shall be eligible for commendations as described in §229.1(d) of this title for the 2020-2021 academic year.

(c) Small group exception.

- (1) For purposes of accreditation status determination, the performance of an EPP candidate group, aggregated or disaggregated by demographic group, shall be measured against performance standards described in this chapter in any one year in which the number of individuals in the group exceeds 10. The small group exception does not apply to compliance with the frequency and duration of field supervisor observations.
- (2) For an EPP candidate group, aggregated or disaggregated by demographic group, where the group contains 10 or fewer individuals, the group's performance shall not be counted for purposes of accreditation status determination for that academic year based on only that year's group performance.
- (3) If the current year's EPP candidate group, aggregated or disaggregated by demographic group, contained between one and 10 individuals, that group performance shall be combined with the next most recent prior year's group performance for which there was at least one individual, and if the two-year cumulated group contains more than 10 individuals, then the two-year cumulated group performance must be measured against the standards in the current year.
- (4) If the two-year cumulated EPP candidate group, aggregated or disaggregated by demographic group, contains between one and 10 individuals, then the two-year cumulated group performance shall be combined with the next most recent group performance for which there was at least one individual. The three-year cumulated group performance must be measured against the standards in the current year, regardless of how small the cumulated number of group members may be.
- (5) In any reporting year in which the EPP candidate group, aggregated or disaggregated by demographic group, does not meet the necessary number of individuals needed to measure against performance standards for that year, for all indicators, the accreditation status will continue from the prior year. Any sanction assigned as a result of an accredited-warned or accredited-probation status in a prior year will continue if that candidate group has not met performance standards since being assigned accredited-warned or accredited-probation status. The SBEC may modify the sanction as the SBEC deems necessary based on subsequent performance, even though that performance is not measured against performance standards for a rating.

§229.5. Accreditation Sanctions and Procedures.

- (a) The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) may assign an educator preparation program (EPP) Accredited-Warned or Accredited-Probation status if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules and/or Texas Education Code, Chapter 21.
- (b) If an EPP has been assigned Accredited-Warned or Accredited-Probation status, or if the SBEC determines that additional action is a necessary condition for the continuing approval of an EPP to recommend

candidates for educator certification, the SBEC may take any one or more of the following actions, which shall be reviewed by the SBEC at least annually:

- (1) require the EPP to obtain technical assistance approved by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) or SBEC;
 - (2) require the EPP to obtain professional services approved by the TEA or SBEC;
 - (3) appoint a monitor to participate in the activities of the EPP and report the activities to the TEA or SBEC; and/or
 - (4) require the EPP to develop an action plan addressing the deficiencies and describing the steps the program will take to improve the performance of its candidates. TEA staff may prescribe the information that must be included in the action plan. The action plan must be sent to TEA staff no later than 45 calendar days following notification to the EPP that SBEC has ordered the action plan.
- (c) Notwithstanding the accreditation status of an EPP, if the performance of candidates on an examination required for certification (as listed in Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e) of this title (relating to Educator Assessment)) in an individual certification class or category offered by an EPP fails to meet the performance standard on the non-PPR examinations as described in §229.4(a)(1)(D) of this title (relating to Determination of Accreditation Status) for three consecutive years, the approval to offer that certification class or category shall be revoked. Any candidates already admitted for preparation in that class or category may continue in the EPP and be recommended for certification after program completion, but no new candidates shall be admitted for preparation in that class or category unless and until the SBEC reinstates approval for the EPP to offer that certification class or category.
- (1) ~~(d)~~ For purposes of determining compliance with subsection (c) of this section, candidate performance in individual certification classes or categories in only the 2016-2017 academic year and subsequent academic years will be considered.
 - (2) ~~(e)~~ Performance indicators by demographic group shall not be counted for purposes of subsection (c) of this section pertaining to performance standards for individual certification classes or categories. If the aggregated number of individuals counted for a certification class or category is 10 or fewer, the performance on the standard shall be cumulated and counted in the same manner as provided in §229.4(c) of this title.
 - (3) For EPPs that failed to meet the standard described in subsection (c) of this section for a certification class or category in the 2018-2019 academic year that meet the requirements based on their 2020-2021 data, the 2020-2021 academic year shall represent a break in consecutively measured years for the purpose of subsection (c) of this section.
- (d) ~~(f)~~ An EPP shall be notified in writing regarding any action proposed to be taken pursuant to this section, or proposed assignment of an accreditation status of Accredited-Warned, Accredited-Probation, or Not Accredited-Revoked. The notice shall state the basis on which the proposed action is to be taken or the proposed assignment of the accreditation status is to be made.
- (e) ~~(g)~~ All costs associated with providing or requiring technical assistance, professional services, or the appointment of a monitor pursuant to this section shall be paid by the EPP to which the services are provided or required, or its sponsor.

ATTACHMENT III

19 TAC Figure §229.1(c)

Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c)

**Texas Accountability System for Educator
Preparation (ASEP) Manual
2020–2021 [~~2019–2020~~]**

Contents

Chapter	Page
Chapter 1 – Accountability Overview	21
Chapter 2 – Methodological Considerations	23
Chapter 3 – Certification Exam Pass Rate	25
Chapter 4 – Appraisal of First-year Teachers by Administrators	37
Chapter 5 – Improvement in Student Achievement of students taught by beginning teachers.....	41
Chapter 6 – Frequency, Duration, and Quality of Field Supervision.....	45
Chapter 7 – New Teacher Satisfaction	52
Chapter 8 – Educator Preparation Program Commendations	5656
Chapter 9 – Determination of ASEP Index Score.....	59

Chapter 1 – Accountability Overview

The Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP) was the result of state legislation¹ that implemented an accountability framework for educator preparation programs (EPPs) and provided information for EPPs, policymakers, and the public. ASEP provides information about the performance of EPPs and establishes accountability measures related to EPP processes and outcomes. Within this legislation, The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) was charged with establishing rules² governing ASEP. Key provisions of the governing legislation and rules include:

- Establishing minimum standards for initial and continuing approval of EPPs
- Establishing sanctions for EPPs that do not meet standards
- Requiring annual reporting of performance data for each EPP
- Providing publicly available consumer information to support individuals in selection of EPPs and school districts in making recruitment and staffing decisions

About This Manual

This manual provides descriptions and examples of the analyses and calculations used in calculating the values for the ASEP indicators for accreditation. These analytical approaches will be used to compute ASEP values based on 2020–2021 [~~2019–2020~~] data. This manual is designed to be adopted into rule by the SBEC. To this end, it has been condensed from prior iterations to focus solely on those indicators and calculations for the ASEP accreditation indicators.

This manual begins with an overview of ASEP and accreditation, followed by methodological considerations that apply across the system (Chapter 2). Chapters 3–7 elaborate on each individual ASEP indicator and include an explanation of the analysis along with an example. Chapter 8 presents information about the recognition of high-performing EPPs. Chapter 9 describes the determination of accreditation statuses using the ASEP Index.

ASEP Accountability Indicators

ASEP accountability indicators are used to determine accreditation status of EPPs. These indicators are described in Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.045 and enacted in rule in Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 229. TEC statute identifies five measures, which TAC rule further delineates into seven separate indicators:

- ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) exams
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a: Frequency and duration of field observations

¹ Texas Education Code (TEC) §§21.045, 21.0451, and 20.0452.

² [Texas Administrative Code \(TAC\) \[§\] Chapter 229](#)

- ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b: Quality of field supervision
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 5: Satisfaction of new teachers

These indicators are further explained in the following chapters, including the performance standards and methods for calculations.

Chapter 2 – Methodological Considerations


This ASEP chapter discusses methodological and reporting considerations that are relevant to ASEP accountability indicators.

Small Group Aggregation

Per 19 TAC §229.4(c), selected ASEP accountability indicators are subject to a small group consideration and aggregation. These indicators are used for accountability if groups include more than 10 individuals in an individual year or contain 10 individuals when combined with the next-most prior year for which there are data, or when combined with the two next-most prior years for which there are data.

Illustration 1 summarizes the procedure for the small group aggregation. If 10 or fewer individuals are present in a reporting group in a year, data are combined with data for the next most prior year for which there are data. If the combined (Year 1 and Year 2) group size is more than 10, then the combined group data are reported. If the combined group size is 10 or fewer, then data from the next most prior year for which there are data are combined (Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3) and the performance for the combined group is reported regardless of sample size.

Illustration 1: Overview of Small Group Aggregation Procedure



As illustrated above, use of the small group exception may result in nonreported data for ASEP for some years. Because determination of accreditation status may be based on performance across multiple years, the small group procedure allows for accreditation determinations to be based on data from nonconsecutive years, including only those years in which enough data are available.

Demographic Group Conventions

As prescribed by 19 TAC §229.4(a), ASEP accountability indicators are to be reported with disaggregation in respect to gender, race, and ethnicity. For these categories, TEA uses the race, ethnicity, and gender designations defined in 19 TAC §229.2(13).

As of this publication, Educator Certification Online System (ECOS) allows for self-identified gender designations of male and female, which are the disaggregated gender categories reported for ASEP. If no selection is made, the individual is excluded from the disaggregated performance metric calculations. However, the individual is still included in the aggregated performance metric calculations.

Per 19 TAC §229.2(13) ASEP uses these four categories for the race and ethnicity demographic group: African American, Hispanic, White, and Other. If no selection for race and ethnicity is made, the individual is excluded from the disaggregated performance metric calculations. However, the individual is still included in the aggregated performance metric calculations.

Rounding Conventions

Unless otherwise noted, to compute ASEP accountability indicators, conventional rounding rules are applied. For example, when rounding to a whole number, numbers that end with a decimal value of .4999 or less are rounded down; those that end with a decimal value of .5000 or more are rounded up. When rounding to a one-place decimal, numbers that end with .9499 round to .9, and those that end with .9500 round to 1.0.

Chapter 3 – Certification Exam Pass Rate

Overview

ASEP Indicator 1 is the pass rate on certification exams approved by the EPP. The SBEC has separated this indicator into two measures: the pass rate on PPR exams (1a) and the pass rate on non-PPR exams (1b). This chapter presents the individuals included, the assessments included, special methodological considerations, and a worked example of computing these two similar indicators.

Individuals Included

For the ~~2020–2021~~ ~~[2019–2020]~~ academic year (AY), all individuals who are enrolled in an EPP and complete an examination required for licensure are eligible for inclusion. Individuals admitted to the EPP prior to December 27, 2016, who have not exited the program and subsequently re-entered the EPP following December 26, 2016, are excluded from this calculation. Individuals who were issued a probationary certificate under a waiver issued by the governor pursuant to the declaration of disaster on March 13, 2020, are not included. For the purposes of determining the pass rate, individuals shall not be excluded because the individual has not been recommended for a standard certificate.

Assessments Included

For the ~~2020–2021~~ ~~[2019–2020]~~ AY, certification examinations approved by the EPP ~~[and required for certification in the category(ies) in which the candidate is pursuing certification]~~ are eligible for inclusion. ~~[The TEA identifies these examinations by comparing the examinations completed by the individual to the category being pursued, specified by the EPP on the finisher records list in ECOS with the category(ies) of the certificate associated with the internship active at the time of the examination, should such an internship exist.]~~

The examination must be the first or second attempt for the particular examination³ approved by the EPP for the individual. Examinations approved by the EPP and completed prior to the reporting year are used in determining the attempt-count for an individual. Results from examinations taken during the reporting year are used in the calculation of the pass rate. Examinations approved by the EPP but completed after the individual has finished the EPP are included. Examinations that are part of an exam pilot program as of the date they are approved by the EPP are excluded, both from the pass rate and from the determination of which examinations are the first two attempts.

Calculation

ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a:

Divide the number of passed PPR certification examinations on the first or second attempt by the total number of passed PPR certification examinations on the first attempt plus the number of PPR certification examinations passed or failed on their second attempt. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

³ Examinations are uniquely identified by test number and test type

ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b:

Divide the number of passed non-PPR certification examinations on the first or second attempt by the total number of passed non-PPR certification examinations on the first attempt plus the number of non-PPR certification examinations passed or failed on their second attempt. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

Special Methodological Considerations**Core Subjects Adjustment**

Due to an update in how data is reported to TEA from the test vendor, the Core Subjects adjustment is no longer needed for scores reported January 2020 and following. As the adjustment is still used in years which may be included as part of a small group aggregation, the procedure is described below.

The Core Subjects examinations (i.e., 291 Core Subjects EC–6 TExES and 211 Core Subjects 4–8 TExES) allow for candidates to re-take individual subject areas if they fail the examination on their first attempt. The way in which the test vendor reports this data back to TEA necessitates a post-hoc adjustment to the pass rates related to these exams. The core subjects adjustment treats individual subject retakes as second attempts only once a) all subject areas have been passed or b) a particular subject area has been failed the second time. If all subject areas are passed without a subject area being failed the second time, TEA identifies this as a second attempt pass. If the candidate fails an individual subject area a second time, TEA identifies this as a second attempt fail.

It should be noted that if individuals take the individual subject matter exams, each attempt counts towards their 5-time test limit for the overall (i.e., 291 Core Subjects EC–6 TExES and 211 Core Subjects 4–8 TExES) exam.

[Disaggregation at the Test Level]

[EPP results are disaggregated at the individual certification exam level. The same approach to candidate and assessment identification is used in this reporting. Additionally, the TEA uses the small group aggregation procedure described in Chapter 2 for the individual exam level. Per 19 TAC §229.5(e), results within individual certification areas are not disaggregated by race, gender, or ethnicity.]

Disaggregation at the Certification Class or Category Level

As described in 19 TAC §229.5(c) the performance of candidates in individual certification classes and categories are also calculated following the same procedure used for Indicator 1b. TEA uses the small group aggregation procedure described in Chapter 2 for the individual exam level. Per 19 TAC §229.5(e), results within individual certification areas are not disaggregated by race, gender, or ethnicity.

The Science of Teaching Reading examination (STR, TExES 293) and the Bilingual Supplemental exam (BIL, TExES 164) are used for certification in multiple certification categories (see Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e)). As guided by 19 TAC §229.5(c), the following approach is used to identify candidates with results for these exams with the applicable certification category.

For candidates who have attempted 293 or 164, identify the category the candidate is pursuing certification that requires 293 or 164. TEA associates candidates with categories by reviewing the certification category

being pursued, specified by the EPP on the finisher records list in ECOS and with the category(ies) of the certificate associated with the internship, should such an internship exist. In cases of discrepancies between the finisher records list and the internship, the certification category associated with the internship is used. If the candidate with a result for 293 or 164 cannot be associated with a certification category that requires the 293 or 164, the results for the candidate are not used in the calculation of pass rates for the purposes of 19 TAC §229.5(c).

For certification categories with multiple non-PPR exams, the pass rates are calculated independently using the procedure described in the Calculation section of this chapter. Both pass rates are evaluated against the standard in 19 TAC §229.4(a)(2). As noted in 19 TAC §229.5(c), failure to meet the performance standard for an exam required for a certification class or category results in the EPP being identified as not meeting the standard for the certification class or category. If an EPP fails to meet the standard for a certification class or category for three consecutive years, the approval to offer that certification class or category is revoked.

Small Group Aggregation and Enrollment Date

As described in Chapter 2, if individual demographic groups contain ten or fewer test individuals, the TEA adds results from the prior year for which there is data. For use in ASEP Accountability Indicators 1a and 1b, these prior-year groups continue to exclude individuals who were admitted prior to December 27, 2016. This means that the earliest available year for aggregation is AY 2016–2017.

Worked Examples

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing PPR Certification Examinations (ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a)

Step 1: Using the test approval list in ECOS, identify all individuals admitted to the EPP after December 26, 2016.

Step 2: Identify which tests to include in calculations. PPR examinations recommended by the EPP are included [~~which are necessary for the category(ies) necessary for the certificate(s) under which an individual is serving an internship and tests necessary for the category(ies) identified by the EPP on the finisher records list in ECOS are included~~]. Tests which were part of a pilot program when they were approved by the EPP and completed by the candidate are excluded.

Step 3: Retrieve PPR exam results for candidates identified in Step 1 for the examinations [~~their category(ies)~~] identified in Step 2.

Step 4: Counting chronologically, identify the attempt number associated with each exam for each candidate in each category at each EPP.

Step 5: Identify which test scores to include in calculations. For the purpose of calculating pass rate, only passes on first attempts, passes on second attempts, or failures on second attempts are included. Only first attempt passes, second attempt passes, and second attempt fails completed in the academic year are included.

ASEP Indicator 1a Example

<u>Name</u>	<u>Admission Date</u> <u>Test Date</u> <u>Test</u> <u>Attempt</u>	<u>Certificate Description</u> <u>Test Number / Name</u>	<u>Test Result</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>1/15/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6</u>	
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>April 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>6/15/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Betty</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>April 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Carlos</u>	<u>1/1/2018</u>	<u>LOTE EC-12 Spanish</u>	
<u>Carlos</u>	<u>February 2018</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Dana</u>	<u>12/15/2018</u>	<u>Physical Ed EC-12</u>	
<u>Dana</u>	<u>April 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>7/15/2017</u>	<u>Social Studies 8-12 & ESL</u> <u>Supplemental</u>	
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>6/6/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6</u>	
<u>Faye</u>	<u>December 2017</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>March 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>August 2019</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Hector</u>	<u>3/15/2018</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>George</u>	<u>8/1/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6</u>	
<u>George</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>8/12/2018</u>	<u>Social Studies 7-12</u>	
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>270: PPR Trade and</u> <u>Industrial Education 6-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>9/1/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Ken</u>	<u>6/1/2019</u>	<u>Math 7-12</u>	
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>9/12/2018</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8 &</u> <u>Bilingual Supplemental-</u> <u>Spanish</u>	
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Mel</u>	<u>6/22/2017</u>	<u>Social Studies 78-12</u>	
<u>Mel</u>	<u>Sept. 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Nancy</u>	<u>12/29/2016</u>	<u>Physical Ed EC-12</u>	
<u>Nancy</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>2/11/2017</u>	<u>LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>1/12/2018</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6 &</u> <u>Bilingual Supplemental-</u> <u>Arabic</u>	
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>June 2019</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>6/15/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6 &</u> <u>Bilingual Supplemental-</u> <u>Spanish</u>	

[Exclusion example:
All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual did not make a second attempt during the reporting AY or already attempted the exam twice.]

[Exclusion example:
Test 270: PPR Trade and Industrial Education for Imogen is excluded because it is not required for the candidates' certification category.]

<u>Name</u>	<u>Admission Date</u> <u>Test Date</u> <u>Test</u> <u>Attempt</u>	<u>Certificate Description</u> <u>Test Number / Name</u>	<u>Test Result</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>June 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>October 2019</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>7/1/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>February 2018</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>April 2019</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Sally</u>	<u>6/15/2018</u>	<u>LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	
<u>Sally</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>

All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual has not yet made a second attempt or already attempted the exam twice.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Test Attempt</u>	<u>Test Number / Name</u>	<u>Test Result</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Carlos</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Dana</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>George</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2110 edTPA:</u> <u>Elementary Education:</u> <u>Literacy with Mathematics</u> <u>Task 4</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160: PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Mel</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Nancy</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Sally</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>160 PPR EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>

Inclusion Notes:

The results for Dana, George, Lawrence, Mel, and Nancy are not included because they failed their first attempt and have not yet completed a second attempt.

The result for Imogen is not included because edTPA is a pilot exam in the 2020–2021 reporting year.

Step 6: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation. If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list. See Chapter 2 of this manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation.

Step 7: Calculate the pass rate by dividing the number of eligible passed examinations on the first or second attempt (9) by the total number of eligible examinations passed on the first added to the total number of eligible examinations that were passed or failed on the second attempt (11). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

Example Pass Rate Calculation

$$= \frac{\text{Number of tests passed on first or second attempt}}{\text{Number of tests passed on first or second attempt or failed on second attempt}} \times 100$$

$$=$$

$$\frac{9}{11} \times 100 =$$

$$0.81818 \times 100 =$$

$$82\%$$

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Non-PPR Certification Examinations (ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b)

Step 1: Using the test approval list in ECOS, identify all individuals admitted to the EPP after December 26, 2016.

Step 2: Identify which tests to include in calculations. Non-PPR exams recommended by the EPP are included. Tests which were part of a pilot program when they were approved by the EPP and completed by the candidate are excluded. ~~[which are necessary for the category(ies) necessary for the certificate(s) under which an individual is serving an internship and tests necessary for the category(ies) identified by the EPP on the finisher records list are included.]~~

Step 3: Retrieve non-PPR exam results for candidates identified in Step 1 for the examinations ~~[their category(ies)]~~ identified in Step 2.

Step 4: Counting chronologically, identify the attempt number associated with each exam for each candidate in each field at each EPP.

Step 5: Identify which test scores to include in calculations. For the purpose of calculating pass rate, only passes on first attempts, passes on second attempts, or failures on second attempts are included. Only first attempt passes, second attempt passes, and second attempt fails completed in the academic year are included.

ASEP Indicator 1b Example

<u>Name</u>	<u>Admission Date</u> <u>Test Date</u>	<u>Certificate Description</u> <u>Test Number / Name</u>	<u>Test Result</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>1/15/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6</u>	
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>April 2019</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>6/15/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Betty</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Carlos</u>	<u>1/1/2018</u>	<u>LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	
<u>Carlos</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>613 LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Dana</u>	<u>12/15/2018</u>	<u>Physical Ed EC-12</u>	
<u>Dana</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>158 Physical Education EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Dana</u>	<u>April 2019</u>	<u>158 Physical Education EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>7/15/2017</u>	<u>Social Studies 7-12 & ESL</u> <u>Supplemental</u>	
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>January 2019</u>	<u>154 English as a Second Language</u> <u>Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>6/6/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6</u>	
<u>Faye</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>March 2019</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>September 2019</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>George</u>	<u>8/1/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6</u>	
<u>George</u>	<u>September 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Hector</u>	<u>3/15/2018</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Hector</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>8/12/2018</u>	<u>Social Studies 7-12</u>	
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>233 History 7-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>9/1/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>068 Principal</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Ken</u>	<u>6/1/2019</u>	<u>Math 7-12</u>	
<u>Ken</u>	<u>June 2019</u>	<u>235 Math 7-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>9/12/2018</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8 & Bilingual</u> <u>Supplemental-Spanish</u>	
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>June 2019</u>	<u>164 Bilingual Education</u> <u>Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Mel</u>	<u>6/22/2017</u>	<u>Social Studies 7-12</u>	
<u>Mel</u>	<u>June 2019</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Nancy</u>	<u>12/29/2016</u>	<u>Physical Ed EC-12</u>	
<u>Nancy</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>158: Physical Ed EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>2/11/2017</u>	<u>LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>613: LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>

[Exclusion example:
All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual did not make a second attempt during the reporting AY or already attempted the exam twice.]

<u>Name</u>	<u>Admission Date Test Date</u>	<u>Certificate Description Test Number / Name</u>	<u>Test Result</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>1/12/2018</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6 & Bilingual Supplemental- Arabic</u>	
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>June 2019</u>	<u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>February 2019</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>6/15/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects EC-6 & Bilingual Supplemental- Spanish</u>	
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>June 2019</u>	<u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>4/1/2017</u>	<u>Core Subjects 4-8</u>	
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>June 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>October 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Sally</u>	<u>6/15/2018</u>	<u>LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	
<u>Sally</u>	<u>December 2018</u>	<u>613 LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>

All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual has not yet made a second attempt or already attempted the exam twice.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Test Attempt</u>	<u>Test Number / Name</u>	<u>Test Result</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Andrea</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Betty</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Carlos</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>613 LOTE Spanish EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Dana</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>158 Physical Education EC-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Dana</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>158 Physical Education EC-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Eduardo</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>154 English as a Second Language Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Faye</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>George</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Hector</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Imogen</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>233 History 7-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Jermaine</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Ken</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>235 Math 7-12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Lawrence</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u>	<u>P</u>

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number / Name	Test Result
<u>Mel</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>232 Social Studies 7–12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Nancy</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>158: Physical Ed EC–12</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Oscar</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>613: LOTE Spanish EC–12</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC–6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC–6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Patrice</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC–6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Quinn</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC–6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4–8</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4–8</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Roberto</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>211 Core Subjects 4–8</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Sally</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>613 LOTE Spanish EC–12</u>	<u>F</u>

Inclusion Notes:

The results for Mel, Nancy, Quinn, and Sally are not included because they failed their first attempt and have not yet completed a second attempt.

Step 6: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation. If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list. See Chapter 2 for further explanation of the small group aggregation.

Step 7: Calculate the pass rate by dividing the number of examinations passed on their first or second attempt (14) by the total number examinations passed on the first and second attempt plus the number of failed examinations on the second attempt (19). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

Example Pass Rate Calculation

$$= \frac{\text{Number of tests passed}}{\text{Number of tests completed}} \times 100$$

=

$$\frac{14}{19} \times 100 =$$

$$0.736 \times 100 =$$

73.6%, which rounds to 74%

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Non-PPR Certification Examinations within a Certification Category (19 TAC §229.5(c))

Step 1: Using the test approval list in ECOS, identify all individuals admitted to the EPP after December 26, 2016.

Step 2: Identify which tests to include in calculations. For certificate categories that do not require the Science of Teaching Reading exam (STR) or the Bilingual Supplemental exam (BIL), Non-PPR exams recommended by the EPP are included. For certificate categories that require STR or BIL, exams are associated with candidates and categories as described in the Disaggregation at the Certification Class or Category Level section of this chapter.

Step 3: Retrieve non-PPR exam results for candidates identified in Step 1 for their category(ies) and examinations identified in Step 2.

Step 4: Counting chronologically, identify the attempt number associated with each exam for each candidate in each field at each EPP.

Step 5: Identify which test scores to include in calculations. For the purpose of calculating pass rate, only passes on first attempts, passes on second attempts, or failures on second attempts are included. Only first attempt passes, second attempt passes, and second attempt fails completed in the academic year are included.

STR Certificate Category (Core Subjects with STR: EC-6) Example

All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual has not yet made a second attempt or already attempted the exam twice.

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number / Name	Cert Category Pursued by Candidate	Test Result
Andrea	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Andrea	2	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Andrea	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Betty	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Carlos	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Dana	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Dana	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Eduardo	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Eduardo	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Faye	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Faye	2	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Faye	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
George	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Hector	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Imogen	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Imogen	2	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Imogen	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Josefina	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Josefina	2	291 Core Subjects EC-6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number / Name	Cert Category Pursued by Candidate	Test Result
<u>Josefina</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Kim</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Lance</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Manuel</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Manuel</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Nadia</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Naida</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Olga</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Olga</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Olga</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Pent</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Quentin</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Ramon</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>Ramon</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Ramon</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Sienna</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Todd</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Early Childhood: EC-3</u>	<u>P</u>
<u>Uma</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>293 Science of Teaching Reading</u>	<u>Core Subjects with STR: EC-6</u>	<u>P</u>

Inclusion Notes:

The 291 results for Dana and Olga and the 293 results for Imogen are not included because they failed their first attempt and have not yet completed a second attempt.

The 293 result for Todd is not included because he is not pursuing a different certificate category. His result would be used in the calculation for the Early Childhood: EC-3 category pass rate.

Step 6: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation. If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1-5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list. See Chapter 2 for further explanation of the small group aggregation.

Step 7: Calculate the pass rate for each exam by dividing the number of examinations passed on their first or second attempt (291: 16; 293: 11) by the total number examinations passed on the first and second attempt plus the number of failed examinations on the second attempt (291: 12; 293: 11). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

Example Pass Rate Calculation

$$= \frac{\text{Number of tests passed}}{\text{Number of tests completed}} \times 100$$

=

$$\frac{12}{16} \times 100 =$$

$$0.75 \times 100 =$$

$$75\% \text{ for } 291$$

$$\frac{11}{11} \times 100 =$$

$$1 \times 100 =$$

$$100\% \text{ for } 293$$

Chapter 4 – Appraisal of First-Year Teachers by Administrators

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 2 is the percent of first-year teachers who are designated as *sufficiently prepared* or *well-prepared* based on survey ratings by their principals.

The principal survey is administered between early April and mid-June at the end of the relevant academic year. The survey is delivered through the ECOS. The roster of first-year teachers is determined using certification data and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data. This roster is loaded into ECOS and district-level human resources staff perform roster verification, certifying that the individual is employed in the district, was employed for at least five months in the reporting period, and works at the school designated in the system.

Principals log in to ECOS to complete the survey. Within the survey, the principal verifies that the individual is teaching in the area(s) for which he or she was prepared by the EPP and that the individual was employed for at least five months in the reporting period. If the principal does not verify these two statements, the survey is not collected.

The survey application requires the completion of all questions in the four required sections of the survey. These sections are Planning, Instruction, Learning Environment, and Professional Practices & Responsibilities. Additionally, if the principal indicates that the individual worked with students with disabilities or students who are English language learners, these additional survey sections are displayed and required to be completed.

Following the end of the principal survey data collection period, the data is retrieved from ECOS, cleaned, processed, de-identified, and posted online. Additionally, EPP-specific reports are generated and delivered to EPPs and the public. The aggregated and disaggregated results are used as ASEP Accountability Indicator 2.

Individuals Included

All first-year teachers of record currently enrolled in an EPP or who finished an EPP program within the five years prior to the reporting period and taught in the Texas public school system for a minimum of five months during the reporting period are included.⁴ Teachers on standard, intern, and probationary certificates are included. Teachers who are teaching under an emergency permit are excluded.

Assessments Included

All complete surveys with valid data for teachers who meet the conditions above are included. Surveys that lack valid data on any of the four required survey sections are excluded. Data from optional sections (i.e., Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners) are included when available.

⁴ See TAC §229.2(18) for the definition of a first-year teacher

Calculation

Count the number of principal surveys for the EPP that met standard. Divide this number by the total number of completed principal surveys for the EPP. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

Scoring Approach

The scoring approach weights all individual categories equally. Each item is weighted by the inverse of the number of items in the subscale. Operationally, this means that the average for each subscale is calculated, and then the average of these subscale values is calculated for the final individual-level score. The individual must average a score of 2 or better, corresponding with *sufficiently prepared*.

The individual subscales and their constituent items are presented in the table below.

Individual Subscales and Constituent Items

Subscale	Number of Items	Items in ECOS Survey
Planning	12	Q4 – Q15
Instruction	13	Q16 – Q28
Learning Environment	7	Q29 – Q35
Professional Practices & Responsibilities	6	Q36 – Q41
Students with Disabilities	6	Q43 – Q48
English Language Learners	4	Q50 – Q53

Special Methodological Considerations

Optional Sections and Missing Data

As noted above, the Students with Disabilities section and English Language Learners section are only displayed if the principal indicates that the teacher worked with either or both of these populations. If the survey sections are not displayed on the survey, no data are recorded for these sections. The determination of whether or not the individual survey met standard is based only on the sections of the survey with complete data.

The survey tool does not allow for individuals completing the survey to leave questions blank. Consequentially, each individual survey will have either four, five, or six complete survey sections.

Small Group Aggregation

Per 19 TAC §229.4(c), the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is conducted for ASEP Accountability Indicator 2. Only data from years in which ASEP Accountability Indicator 2 has been a consequential indicator are used in this aggregation. The small group aggregation procedure uses results calculated using the survey and scoring approach effective for the particular administration of the survey.

Worked Example

Example Calculation: Principal Appraisal of First-Year Teachers (ASEP Accountability Indicator 2)

Step 1: Retrieve principal survey data in ECOS.

Step 2: Average the item scores in each subsection.

Step 3: Average the subsection values.

Step 4: Identify which surveys have the minimum acceptable score or higher.

Example Survey Data and Calculation

Name ⁵	Points by Survey Section ⁶						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	ELL	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	ELL		
<i>Number of Questions</i>	12	13	7	6	6	4	12	13	7	6	6	4		
Kurt	27	28	16	16		12	2.25	2.15	2.29	2.67		3.00	2.47	Y
Salvador	26	28	18	15	14		2.17	2.15	2.57	2.50	2.33		2.35	Y
Regina	25	31	19	17	18	9	2.08	2.38	2.71	2.83	3.00	2.25	2.54	Y
Silvia	22	26	16	15	13	12	1.83	2.00	2.29	2.50	2.17	3.00	2.30	Y
Rachael	30	36	20	17	18	7	2.50	2.77	2.86	2.83	3.00	1.75	2.62	Y
Myra	29	32	19	16			2.42	2.46	2.71	2.67			2.56	Y
Darla	26	29	18	14	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	2.00	2.30	Y
Guadalupe	32	33	19	14	16	11	2.67	2.54	2.71	2.33	2.67	2.75	2.61	Y
George	21	24	16	13	12	6	1.75	1.85	2.29	2.17	2.00	1.50	1.92	N
Jessie	31	35	21	17	16	9	2.58	2.69	3.00	2.83	2.67	2.25	2.67	Y
Lewis	24	25	12	7	11	8	2.00	1.92	1.71	1.17	1.83	2.00	1.77	N
Ruby	26	25	16	15	16	5	2.17	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.13	Y
Josefina	33	35	20	16	17		2.75	2.69	2.86	2.67	2.83		2.76	Y
Susan	34	33	20	15	15	11	2.83	2.54	2.86	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.66	Y
Molly	28	29	18	14	15	5	2.33	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	1.25	2.20	Y
Sam	20	25	16	15	17	11	1.67	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.83	2.75	2.33	Y
Lucy	26	29	19	17	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.71	2.83	2.50	2.00	2.41	Y
Kevin	28	33	20	13	14		2.33	2.54	2.86	2.17	2.33		2.45	Y
Robin	29	35	19	11	13	5	2.42	2.69	2.71	1.83	2.17	1.25	2.18	Y
Mercedes	33	37	20	15	16	5	2.75	2.85	2.86	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.48	Y

Step 5: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation. If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform Steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list. See Chapter 2 of the ASEP Manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation.

⁵ Public data sets do not include names.

⁶ PL = Planning; INS = Instruction; LE = Learning Environment; PPR = Professional Practices & Responsibilities; SWD = students with disabilities; ELL = English language learners. Empty cells denote missing data.

Step 6: Count the number of first-year teachers who met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently-prepared* or *well-prepared* (18).

Step 7: Divide the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently-prepared* or *well-prepared* (18) by the total number of surveys with valid scores (20). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

$$\frac{\text{Number of surveys meeting standard}}{\text{Total number of valid surveys}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{18}{20} \times 100 =$$

90%

Chapter 5 – Improvement in Student Achievement of Students Taught by Beginning Teachers

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 3 is the improvement of student achievement of students in the classrooms of beginning teachers. This indicator uses student data from the STAAR progress measure generated as part of the Accountability Rating System of districts, campuses, and charter schools and aggregates it to the EPP by linking the students to the beginning teachers whom have completed the EPP. Once values are determined for the beginning teachers, the value for the EPP is calculated and compared to the performance standard.

Individuals

All beginner teachers of record currently employed within a Texas public school. Beginner teachers are defined as teachers of record with three (3) or fewer consecutive years of teaching. These teachers are verified through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) and through validation by local education agencies. Teachers on standard, intern, and probationary certificates are included. Teachers who are teaching under an emergency permit are excluded. Teachers who received initial teacher certification through a route other than preparation by a Texas EPP are excluded. Teachers of students with STAAR progress measures are included. Students' STAAR progress measures are associated with the corresponding teacher as contained in the assessment data.

Assessments Included

The model utilizes the STAAR progress measure for individual students, calculated as described in 19 TAC Figure: §97.1001(b). The STAAR progress measure indicates the amount of improvement or growth a student has made from year to year. For STAAR assessments (with or without accommodations), progress is measured as a student's gain score—the difference between the scaled score a student achieved in the prior year and the scaled score a student achieved in the current year. Individual student progress is then categorized as Limited, Expected, or Accelerated. If a student's STAAR progress measure is Expected, he or she met growth expectations. If the student's STAAR progress measure is Accelerated, he or she exceeded growth expectations. Currently, STAAR results for grades 4–8, English II, and Algebra I end-of-course (EOC), are utilized. Available data from all students, including students with disabilities, are used in the calculation of this measure.

Scoring Approach

The scoring approach first determines a value associated with the teacher based on the associated student STAAR progress measures. TEA then compares the teacher score to the individual standard. The individual teacher performances are then aggregated at the EPP level, and the EPP performance is determined. This EPP value is then compared with the performance standard.

Teacher level aggregation

The value for the individual teacher is generated by first taking the average of the students' progress measures for each STAAR subject area taught by that teacher and multiplied by 100. Next, we find the average of all the subject-level progress measures associated with the teacher. This value is compared to a value of 50, which corresponds with neutral student growth. If the value is 50 or greater, the individual teacher is considered to have met the individual standard.

EPP Score Determination

Following the determination of the performance standard for the individual teachers, the value for the EPP is determined. The number of teachers associated with the EPP who met the individual standard is then divided by the total number of teachers associated with the EPP in the sample and multiplied by 100 to get a percent. This is the EPP value for Indicator 3, which is compared with the performance standard.

Special Methodological Considerations

Small Group Aggregation

Per 19 TAC §229.4(c), the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is conducted for ASEP Accountability Indicator 3. Only data from years in which ASEP Accountability Indicator 3 has been a consequential indicator are used in this aggregation. The small group aggregation procedure uses results calculated using the scoring approach effective for the year in which the values were calculated.

Worked Example

Example Calculation: Student growth of Beginning Teachers (ASEP Accountability Indicator 3)

Step 1: Identify teachers in their first three years serving as a teacher of record who were prepared for initial certification by a Texas EPP.

Step 2: Retrieve student data from Performance Reporting for students associated with the beginning teacher roster.

Step 3: Average the student progress measures for each unique combination of teacher and STAAR area

EPP Code (E)	Teacher (T)	Average Student Growth Scores (GSs)	Course (C)
123456	111	75	Math
123456	112	65	Math
123456	112	70	ELAR
123456	113	50	ELAR

Step 4: Average the values by individual teacher

Step 5: Compare individual teacher values to the individual standard score

Teacher	Teacher Growth Score	Individual Standard	Met Standard?
111	75	50	Yes
112	67.5	50	Yes
113	50	50	No
778	60	50	Yes
892	35	50	No
952	69	50	Yes
1155	73.5	50	Yes
1357	82	50	Yes
1544	58	50	Yes
1656	90	50	Yes
1959	88	50	Yes
2083	100	50	Yes
2257	51	50	Yes
2492	60	50	Yes
2926	84	50	Yes
3011	42.5	50	No
3271	69	50	Yes
3461	40	50	No
3753	71.5	50	Yes
4045	82	50	Yes
4214	64	50	Yes
4226	55	50	Yes
4267	91	50	Yes
4358	67	50	Yes
4464	26	50	No
4779	70	50	Yes
5421	58.5	50	Yes
5973	88.5	50	Yes
6404	64	50	Yes
6542	51	50	Yes
6772	50	50	No
7279	87.5	50	Yes
7849	41	50	No
7881	41	50	No
7925	81	50	Yes
8106	75	50	Yes
8341	90	50	Yes
9297	44	50	No

Step 6: Count the total number of beginning teachers with growth scores associated with the EPP (38).

Step 7: Count the total number of beginning teachers associated with the EPP who met the standard (29).

Step 8: Divide the number in Step 7 by the number in Step 6 and multiply by 100. This is the value for the EPP.

$$\frac{\text{Number of teachers meeting individual standard}}{\text{Total number of teachers with growth scores}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{29}{38} \times 100 =$$

$$76\%$$

Chapter 6 – Frequency, Duration, and Quality of Field Supervision

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4 is the frequency, duration, and quality of field observations. The SBEC has separated this indicator into two measures: the frequency and duration of field observations (ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a) and the quality of field observations (ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b). ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a is based on data reported by EPPs into ECOS for each individual observation. ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b is based on an exit survey of teacher candidates which is administered at the time the candidates apply for their standard certificate. This section presents the individuals included, the data included, special methodological considerations, and a worked example of computing these two aligned indicators.

Individuals Included

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a, all individuals who completed an internship or clinical teaching appointment during the reporting period are included. In the cases where an internship or clinical teaching appointment overlaps two reporting years, the field experience is reported in the reporting year in which it ended. Individuals serving an internship are identified for the data set if they have an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate which expires in the reporting year. Individuals completing a clinical teaching appointment are identified as being marked as a completer by the program without having held an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate.

Individuals who have their internship certificate deactivated prior to the expiration of the certificate are removed from the data set. These deactivations must be communicated to the TEA by the EPP. Additionally, individuals who do not complete their field experience, due to extenuating circumstances or the issuance of a standard certificate prior to the conclusion of their field experience, are removed from the data set. EPPs communicate these exceptions via official letters to the TEA during the ASEP reporting period.

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b, all individuals who apply for an initial standard teaching license during the academic year are asked to submit surveys, which are completed in ECOS.

Data Included

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a

All observations reported to the TEA through ECOS are used in the calculation for ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a. Observations must be reported in ECOS in the academic year during which they occurred. EPPs report the

candidate name, candidate TEA ID, field supervisor name, field supervisor TEA ID, assignment begin date, assignment end date, observation date, observation duration, assignment type, notes, and any other field required by ECOS for each observation.

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b

All exit surveys with complete data that are submitted in the reporting year are included in the data set.

Calculation

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a:

Divide the number of individuals who completed an internship or clinical teaching appointment in the reporting year who had the minimum number of required observations (as specified in 19 TAC §228.35(g)) by the number of individuals who completed an internship or clinical teaching appointment in the reporting year. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b:

Count the number of surveys for the EPP that met standard. Divide this number by the total number of completed exit surveys for the EPP. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

Special Methodological Considerations

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a, results are disaggregated by race, gender, and ethnicity categories. Per 19 TAC §229.4(c)(1), the small group aggregation procedure does not apply to indicator 4a.

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b, the data collection mechanism does not capture race, gender, or ethnicity data. Consequentially, this indicator is reported only at the aggregated level. The small group aggregation procedure does apply to ASEP Indicator 4b.

Worked Examples

Example Calculation: Frequency and Duration of Internship and Clinical Teaching Field Observations (ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a)

Step 1: Identify all individuals completing an internship between September 1 and August 31 of the reporting year. These individuals are those who have an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate which expired in the reporting year.

Step 2: Identify all individuals completing clinical teaching between September 1 and August 31 of the reporting year. These individuals are those who were marked as a completer by the program without having held an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate.

Step 3: Combine the individuals from Steps 1 and 2. Remove any accepted exceptions reported to the TEA during the annual reporting period using the supplied form.

Step 4: Retrieve all field observations reported to the TEA which occurred during the internships or clinical teaching experiences in the data set resulting from Step 3.

Step 5: Count the number of observations of at least the duration specified in 19 TAC §228.35(g), for each candidate.

Example Observation Data

Name	Certificate / Assignment Type	Visit_Hours ⁷
Carmen Adams	Intern	0:56
Carmen Adams	Intern	1:02
Carmen Adams	Intern	0:45
Carmen Adams	Intern	1:12
Carmen Adams	Intern	0:46
Christina Boyd	Intern	0:57
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	0:50
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:14
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:09
Dora Cain	Intern	0:47
Dora Cain	Intern	0:51
Dora Cain	Intern	0:40
Dora Cain	Intern	1:00
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	1:13
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	0:38
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	0:53
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	0:47
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	1:01
Billie Daniels	Probationary	1:15
Billie Daniels	Probationary	0:58
Billie Daniels	Probationary	0:54
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	1:10
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Jaime Fowler	Intern	0:59
Jaime Fowler	Intern	1:07
Jaime Fowler	Intern	1:01
Jaime Fowler	Intern	1:00
Jaime Fowler	Intern	0:49
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	1:11
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	1:25
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	0:58
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	0:50
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	1:00

Exclusion example:
The observation of Dora Cain and Dianne Cannon are not counted because these observations were less than the requirement in 19 TAC §228.35(g).

⁷ This column indicates the duration of the observation.

Name	Certificate / Assignment Type	Visit_Hours ⁷
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	0:59
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	0:52
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Doris Hunter	Probationary	1:03
Doris Hunter	Probationary	1:19
Doris Hunter	Probationary	0:45
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	0:53
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	1:01
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	1:20
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:58
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:50
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:59
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:57
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	1:47
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	0:51
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	1:05
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	1:15
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	1:01
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	0:55
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:58
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:52
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:47
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:58
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:45
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:53
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:52
Charlie Schultz	Intern	1:23
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	1:17
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:53
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:48
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Penny Sutton	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	0:49
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	0:45
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	0:57
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	1:25
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	1:15
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	1:25

Step 6: Identify candidates and interns who meet the minimum requirement of the number of observations required in 19 TAC §228.35(g).

Example Data Summary

Name	Pre-Certification Teaching Experience	Number of 45-Minute Field Observations	Meet Minimum Requirement?
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	3	N
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	4	N
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	3	N
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	3	N
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	6	Y
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching	6	Y
Penny Sutton	Clinical Teaching	1	N
Carmen Adams	Intern	5	Y
Cristina Boyd	Intern	1	N
Dora Cain	Intern	3	N
Billie Daniels	Probationary	3	Y
Jaime Fowler	Intern	5	Y
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	4	Y
Doris Hunter	Probationary	3	Y
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	5	Y
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	3	Y
Charlie Schultz	Intern	5	Y

Calculation Rule:
Penny only had one qualifying observation. She is identified as a candidate for whom the minimum requirement was not met.

Calculation Rule:
Cristina had only one qualifying observation. She is identified as a candidate for whom the minimum requirement was not met.

Step 7: Divide the number of candidates who received at least the minimum field observations required by 19 TAC §228.35(g) (14) by the total number of candidates who completed clinical teaching (21).

$$\frac{\text{Number of candidates who met minimum requirement}}{\text{Number of candidates with field experiences}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{14}{21} \times 100 = 66.67\%, \text{ which rounds to } 67\%$$

Example Calculation: Quality of Field Supervision (ASEP Indicator 4b)

Step 1: Access the Exit Survey results completed by candidates between September 1 and August 31 of the academic year. These results are recorded without personally identifiable information.

Step 2: Identify which candidate scores were within acceptable values for their field supervision rating. Candidates rate their field experience on 11 survey items (items 39–45, 47–50) on the Exit Survey using a 4-point scale where 4 = *Rarely*; 3 = *Occasionally*; 2 = *Frequently*; and 1 = *Always/Almost Always*. To meet the standard of *frequently* or *always/almost always* providing the components of structural guidance and ongoing support provision of high-quality field supervision (see 19 TAC §229.4(a)(4)(B)), responses to the applicable items must sum to equal or less than 22 points ($11 \times 2 = 22$), corresponding with an average score of 2 or less across survey items.

Example Data

Name	Total Points	Within Acceptable Values
Candidate 1	21	Y
Candidate 2	20	Y
Candidate 3	23	N
Candidate 4	19	Y
Candidate 5	18	Y
Candidate 6	18	Y
Candidate 7	17	Y
Candidate 8	14	Y
Candidate 9	19	Y
Candidate 10	25	N
Candidate 11	23	N
Candidate 12	18	Y
Candidate 13	14	Y
Candidate 14	14	Y
Candidate 15	28	N
Candidate 16	19	Y
Candidate 17	26	N
Candidate 18	13	Y
Candidate 19	19	Y
Candidate 20	13	Y
Candidate 21	16	Y
Candidate 22	18	Y
Candidate 23	21	Y
Candidate 24	20	Y
Candidate 25	33	N
Candidate 26	40	N
Candidate 27	26	N
Candidate 28	17	Y
Candidate 29	17	Y
Candidate 30	19	Y

Step 3: Count the number of candidate scores that were within acceptable criteria (22).

Step 4: Divide the number of candidates whose scores were within the acceptable criteria (22) by the total number of candidates with scores (30). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

$$\frac{\text{Number of candidates' scores that were within acceptable values}}{\text{Total number of survey responses}} =$$

$$\frac{22}{30} \times 100 =$$

73.33%, which rounds to 73%

Chapter 7 – New Teacher Satisfaction

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 5 is the percent of new teachers who indicate that they were *sufficiently-prepared or well-prepared* by their EPP, as measured on the teacher satisfaction survey.

The teacher survey is administered between the beginning of April and mid-June at the end of the relevant academic year. The survey is delivered using the Qualtrics survey platform. The sample of new teachers is determined using certification data and PEIMS data. This roster is loaded into Qualtrics and an email containing a link to the survey is sent to the teacher. New teachers verify that they are completing their first year of teaching while holding a standard teaching certificate.

Teachers are required to complete all questions in the four required sections of the survey. Additionally, if the teacher indicates that he or she worked with students with disabilities or students who are English language learners, those additional sections are displayed and are required to be completed by the teacher.

Following the close of the teacher survey data collection period, the data is retrieved from Qualtrics, cleaned, processed, de-identified, and posted online. The aggregated and disaggregated results are used as ASEP Accountability Indicator 5.

Individuals Included

All new teachers who finished an EPP program within the five years prior to the reporting period and are completing their first year of teaching while holding a standard certificate are included.⁸ Teachers must have taught in the Texas public school system for a minimum of five months during the reporting period as evidenced by their presence in the PEIMS employment data gathered in October of the reporting year. Only teachers with standard certificates as of the October snapshot date are included. Teachers who are teaching under an emergency permit or who were not listed as employed in the PEIMS data in the reporting period are excluded.

Assessments Included

All complete surveys with valid data for teachers who meet the conditions above are included. Surveys that lack valid data on one or more of the four required survey sections are excluded. Data from additional sections (i.e., Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners) are included when available.

Calculation

Count the number of teacher surveys for the EPP that met standard. Divide this number by the total number of completed teacher surveys for the EPP. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

⁸ See TAC §229.2(25) for the definition of a new teacher

Scoring Approach

The scoring approach aligns with the scoring approach for the principal survey. Each item is weighted by the inverse of the number of items in the subscale. Operationally, this means that the average for each subscale is calculated, and then the average of these subscale values is calculated for the final individual-level score. The individual must average a score of 2 or better, corresponding with *sufficiently prepared*.

The individual subscales and their constituent items are presented in the table below.

Individual Subscales and Constituent Items

Subscale	Number of Items	Items in Survey (Question #)
Planning	12	Q4 – Q15
Instruction	13	Q16 – Q28
Learning Environment	7	Q29 – Q35
Professional Practices & Responsibilities	6	Q36 – Q41
Students with Disabilities	6	Q43 – Q48
English Language Learners	4	Q50 – Q53

Special Methodological Considerations

Optional Sections and Missing Data

As noted above, Students with Disabilities section and English Language Learners section are only displayed if the teacher indicates that he or she worked with either or both of these populations. If the survey sections are not displayed on the survey, no data are recorded for these sections. The determination of whether or not the individual survey met standard is based only on the sections of the survey with complete data.

The survey tool does not allow for individuals completing the survey to leave questions blank. Consequentially, each individual survey will have either 4, 5, or 6 complete survey sections.

Small Group Aggregation

Per 19 TAC §229.4(c), the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is conducted for ASEP Accountability Indicator 5. Only data from years in which ASEP Accountability Indicator 5 has been a consequential indicator are used in this aggregation. The small group aggregation procedure uses results calculated using the survey and scoring approach effective for the particular administration of the survey.

Worked Example

Example Calculation: New Teacher Satisfaction (ASEP Accountability Indicator 5)

Step 1: Access teacher satisfaction survey results.

Step 2: Average the item scores in each subsection.

Step 3: Average the subsection values.

Step 4: Identify which surveys have the minimum acceptable score or higher.

Example Survey Data and Calculation

Name ⁹	Points by Survey Section ¹⁰						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
	PL	INS	LE	PL	INS	LE	PL	INS	LE	PL	INS	LE		
<i>Number of Questions</i>	12	13			13	7	12	13	7	12	13	7		
Kurt	27	28	16	16		12	2.25	2.15	2.29	2.67		3.00	2.47	Y
Salvador	26	28	18	15	14		2.17	2.15	2.57	2.50	2.33		2.35	Y
Regina	25	31	19	17	18	9	2.08	2.38	2.71	2.83	3.00	2.25	2.54	Y
Silvia	22	26	16	15	13	12	1.83	2.00	2.29	2.50	2.17	3.00	2.30	Y
Rachael	30	36	20	17	18	7	2.50	2.77	2.86	2.83	3.00	1.75	2.62	Y
Myra	29	32	19	16			2.42	2.46	2.71	2.67			2.56	Y
Darla	26	29	18	14	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	2.00	2.30	N
Guadalupe	32	33	19	14	16	11	2.67	2.54	2.71	2.33	2.67	2.75	2.61	Y
George	21	24	16	13	12	6	1.75	1.85	2.29	2.17	2.00	1.50	1.92	Y
Jessie	31	35	21	17	16	9	2.58	2.69	3.00	2.83	2.67	2.25	2.67	N
Lewis	24	25	12	7	11	8	2.00	1.92	1.71	1.17	1.83	2.00	1.77	Y
Ruby	26	25	16	15	16	5	2.17	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.13	Y
Josefina	33	35	20	16	17		2.75	2.69	2.86	2.67	2.83		2.76	Y
Susan	34	33	20	15	15	11	2.83	2.54	2.86	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.66	Y
Molly	28	29	18	14	15	5	2.33	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	1.25	2.20	Y
Sam	20	25	16	15	17	11	1.67	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.83	2.75	2.33	Y
Lucy	26	29	19	17	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.71	2.83	2.50	2.00	2.41	Y
Kevin	28	33	20	13	14		2.33	2.54	2.86	2.17	2.33		2.45	Y
Robin	29	35	19	11	13	5	2.42	2.69	2.71	1.83	2.17	1.25	2.18	Y
Mercedes	33	37	20	15	16	5	2.75	2.85	2.86	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.48	Y

Step 5: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation. If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform Steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list. See ASEP Manual Chapter 2 for further explanation of the small group aggregation.

Step 6: Count the number of surveys that met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently-prepared* or *well-prepared* (18).

⁹ Public data sets do not include names.

¹⁰ PL = Planning; INS = Instruction; LE = Learning Environment; PPR = Professional Practices & Responsibilities; SWD = students with disabilities; ELL = English language learners. Empty cells denote missing data.

Step 7: Divide the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently-prepared* or *well-prepared* (18) by the total number of surveys with valid scores (20). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

$$\frac{\text{Number of surveys meeting standard}}{\text{Total number of valid surveys}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{18}{20} \times 100 =$$

$$90\%$$

Chapter 8 – Educator Preparation Program Commendations

Per 19 TAC §229.1(c), an accredited EPP not under a board order or otherwise sanctioned by the SBEC may receive commendations for success in areas identified by the SBEC. The TEA worked with the SBEC and the EPP stakeholder advisory groups in 2018 to identify and refine a framework for recognition and issues related to EPP eligibility and calculations. In 2019, the SBEC established a four-part framework for recognizing high-performing EPPs. This ASEP chapter presents that framework, related performance standards or metrics, sources of data, and descriptions of relevant calculations.

High-Performing EPP Framework

The framework consists of four parts. The framework was developed to allow for the recognition of EPPs that are high-achieving in both established and emerging measurements and priorities. Dimensions consist of multiple measures. The dimensions for recognition include:

- Rigorous and Robust Preparation
- Preparing the Educators Texas Needs
- Preparing Educators for Long-Term Success
- Innovative Educator Preparation

The measures within each dimension are presented in the table below. These measures are calculated annually to reflect EPP performance in the prior academic year. The TEA conducts these calculations in conjunction with the ASEP accountability calculations and presents both sets of the results to the SBEC for approval on similar schedules. In all cases, the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is applied to these measurements. However, if the small group aggregation is used, only programs with more than 10 individuals over the three years necessary for the calculation are eligible to receive a commendation related to the measure.

High Performing EPP Framework

Dimension	High-Performing EPP Measures	Standard
Rigorous and Robust Preparation	First test pass rate ¹¹	95% or greater
	First Test Pass rate in teacher shortage areas	95% or greater
	Principal Survey % of candidates Met Standard	95% or greater
Preparing the Educators Texas Needs	Preparing teachers in shortage areas	Top 5 EPPs
	Preparing Educators of Color	Top 5 EPPs
	Preparing Teachers for Rural Schools	Top 5 EPPs
Preparing Educators for Long-Term Success	Teacher Retention as a Texas public school teacher for 5 years	95% or greater
	Educator Retention as a Texas public school professional for 5 years	95% or greater
	Principal Employment in Principal or Assistant Principal Role within 3 years	75% or greater
Innovative Educator Preparation	Approved by the SBEC per EPP petition	

¹¹ EPPs are only eligible for this commendation if the differences between pass rates of different demographic groups are less than 10 percentage points

Rigorous and Robust Preparation

This dimension of high-performance uses the same data as the ASEP accountability indicators. The first measure is the overall pass rate for a candidate's first attempt on exams. All exams, including PPR and non-PPR exams, are pooled for this measure. Following ASEP Indicator Accountability 1, only tests necessary for the certificate(s) under which an individual is serving an internship and tests necessary for the category(ies) identified by the EPP on the finisher records list in ECOS are included. The standard is set at 95% or greater. Additionally, EPPs are only eligible for this recognition if the differences in the pass rates disaggregated by race and ethnicity are 10 percentage points or smaller for all groups meeting the minimum size criterion, following small group aggregation. Groups are only included in this analysis only if they contain more than 10 candidates following the small group aggregation.

The second measure in this dimension is the first test pass rate in Texas-identified, federally designated teacher shortage subject areas. These shortage areas are identified annually and reported to the United States Department of Education. For this measure, only those subject-area exams necessary for certification in the specified categories are included. The standard is set at 95% or greater.

The third indicator in this category is EPP performance on the principal survey. Following the procedure in ASEP Manual Chapter 4, results on the principal survey are computed at the EPP level. The standard is set at 95% or more individuals being rated as "met standard."

Preparing the Educators Texas Needs

This dimension of high-performance identifies EPPs that prepare high percentages of educators identified by the SBEC and TEA as targeted for growth. For measures in this category, the top five programs, as a percentage of their completers, are recognized. As with all high-performing recognitions, only EPPs with an accreditation status of "Accredited" are eligible for recognition. This means that fewer than five EPPs may be recognized in any of these categories. Additionally, although the small group aggregation procedure is applied, only those programs which prepare more than 10 educators in any of the specified categories or groups once three years of data are aggregated are eligible for these commendations.

The first measure in this dimension is preparation of educators in teacher shortage subject areas. This indicator identifies EPPs that specialize in the preparation of educators for Texas-identified, federally-recognized teacher shortage areas. The top five EPPs in each identified certification category are eligible to be recognized.

The second measure in this dimension recognizes EPPs that prepare the highest percentage of educators who identify as African American and Hispanic. The top five EPPs with respect to each demographic group are eligible to be recognized.

The third measure is preparation of teachers for rural schools. Using first-year employment data available in the PEIMS database and the district-level geographic designations, the TEA identifies a) completers who are employed and b) completers who are employed in a rural district. The percentage of educators working in a rural district is then calculated. The EPPs with the five highest percentages are eligible to be recognized.

Preparing Educators for Long-term Success

This dimension of high-performance identifies EPPs that prepare educators who continue working in Texas public schools for at least five years. The first measure identifies the percentage of teachers who are recommended for certification by an EPP who are working as classroom teachers five years after their standard

certification becomes effective. To calculate this measure, the TEA first identifies that subset of educators from an EPP who are working as classroom teachers in the year following their completion with the EPP and determines which of those teachers are employed as classroom teachers five years later. Using these numbers, the TEA computes a percentage. The standard for recognition on this measure is set at 95% or higher.

The second measure in the dimension is continued employment in any role in the Texas public education system. The calculation for this measure is similar to the prior measure; however, this measure reports the percentage of classroom teachers still employed in any role after five years. The eligible population is educators from all certification classes prepared by the EPP. The standard for recognition on this measure is 95% or higher.

The third measure in this dimension is the employment of newly prepared principals. The calculation for this standard is the percentage of newly prepared principals working in a public school in Texas in an educational leadership role (principal, assistant principal, instructional leader, etc.) within three years of obtaining principal certification. The standard for recognition on this measure is 75%.

Innovative Educator Preparation

The final dimension of recognition gives the SBEC the opportunity to designate EPPs that have implemented innovative approaches to educator preparation. Specific topic areas ~~(calls)~~ for innovation are updated ~~[annually]~~ using input from the SBEC ~~[, the TEA, and advisory committees]~~. EPPs ~~[shall]~~ respond to a call for applications in a format and a timeline determined by TEA and the SBEC. ~~[these calls by July 1 of the reporting year with]~~ EPPs must submit a complete set of materials to be eligible for recognition. The TEA reviews applications for topic alignment and completeness. Appropriate applications are reviewed by an SBEC subcommittee and approved by the full SBEC. Recognition is awarded at the discretion of the committee and the SBEC.

~~[For 2019–2020, the SBEC seeks to recognize EPPs with innovative practices related to authentic, practice-based educator preparation. Strong partnerships between EPPs, local education agencies (LEAs), and campuses can foster teacher preparation that benefits teachers, schools, and students in ways that traditional internships or clinical teaching appointments may not. Practice-based preparation may include, for example, residency models or multi-semester clinical teaching appointments. Programmatic requirements must be well above the SBEC-mandated minimums to be considered.]~~

~~[Applications for recognition will include an executive summary, a description of the program's innovative practices in authentic, practice based educator preparation, a demonstration of success including measurable outcomes, an explanation of related programmatic values and goals, a description of the implementation of current practices as part of a continuous improvement effort, supporting information from candidates and EPP partners, and peer reviewed research identifying the EPP practices as best practices in the field.]~~

For 2020-2021, the SBEC seeks to recognize EPPs that engage in comprehensive partnerships with LEAs to support district-specific needs, in one or more of the following areas: supporting districts and mentor teachers through the pandemic, accelerating learning in response to COVID-related learning loss, addressing staffing challenges, and implementing best practices that emerged from EPP and/or district responses to the COVID pandemic. Such practices must be well above SBEC-mandate minimums to be considered.

Chapter 9 – Determination of ASEP Index Score

Overview

Per 19 TAC §229.4(b), ~~[starting in the 2020–2021 academic year]~~, the ASEP Index Score may be used for accreditation status determination. This scoring system uses data from the seven ASEP Indicators along with differential weights to determine the total number of points possible for an EPP based on the data present, and the total number of points achieved. This section presents a description of the calculation, the weighting approach, special longitudinal considerations, and a worked example.

Calculation

The ASEP indicators consist of seven separate performance measures. Per TEC, §21.045(a), disaggregated categories with respect to gender, race, and ethnicity are used in the determination of continuing accountability. For these categories, TEA uses the race, ethnicity, and gender designations defined in 19 TAC §229.2(13). The table below presents a matrix representation of this model.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for PPR exams							
1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams							
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers							
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers							
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations							
4b: Quality of field supervision							
5: Satisfaction of new teachers							

As described in the following section, weights are assigned to the individual measure. Additionally, a weight is assigned to the “All” category, separate from the individual demographic categories.

The total number of points achieved is calculated based on the EPP performance in each measure for each group. Values are assigned for each cell in the matrix based on the current and prior year performance.

Performance	Value
Met Standard	1
Did Not Meet Standard and Met Standard in Prior Year	0
No Data/Small Group Exception	<blank>
Did Not Meet Standard and Did Not Meet Standard in Prior Year	-1

The total number of points achieved is then calculated by multiplying the individual cell by the measure weight and the demographic weight, and then summing all the cells. Blank cells are omitted from the sum.

The total number of points possible is calculated based on the data available. Cells are assigned a value of 1 if there is data available for the current academic year. Each cell is then multiplied by the measure weight and the demographic weight, and the cells are summed.

The percentage of points achieved is found by dividing the total number of points achieved by the total number of points possible and multiplying by 100. This value is then rounded to the nearest whole number.

Weighting

The table below presents the measure weights.

ASEP Measure	Weight
1a: Certification examination results for PPR exams	4
1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams	2
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	3
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	3
5: Satisfaction of new teachers	2

The table below presents the demographic group weights.

Group	Weight
All	6
Female	1
Male	1
African American	1
Hispanic / Latino	1
Other	1
White	1

Worked Example

Example Calculation: ASEP Index

Step 1: Identify the EPP results for all ASEP Indicators for all groups.

Step 2: Populate the results table.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for PPR exams	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)
1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams	Met (1)	Met (1)	Did not meet (0)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	Met (1)	Met (1)	Did not meet (0)	Met (1)	Did not meet (0)	Met (1)	Met (1)
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers ¹²	Report Only	Report Only	Report Only	Report Only	Report Only	Report Only	Report Only
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)
4b: Quality of field supervision	Met (1)	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
5: Satisfaction of new teachers	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Small Group	Did not meet (0)	Small Group	Met (1)

Step 3: Multiply each cell by the corresponding measure weight and demographic weight.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for PPR exams	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams	12	2	0	2	2	2	2
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	6	1	0	1	0	1	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers							
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	18						
5: Satisfaction of new teachers	12	2	2		0		2

Step 4: Sum all the cells to find the total points achieved (152).

Step 5: Populate the data available table.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for PPR exams	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)

¹²Per 19 TAC §229.4(a)(3), Indicator 3 is not consequential for ASEP ratings until TEA has data necessary to calculate this performance standard for two years following the 2019–2020 academic year. [For the 2020–2021 reporting year,]

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
4b: Quality of field supervision	Yes (1)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)
5: Satisfaction of new teachers	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No (0)	Yes (1)	No (0)	Yes (1)

Step 6: Multiply each cell by the corresponding measure weight and demographic weight.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for PPR exams	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
1b: Certification examination results for non-PPR exams	12	2	2	2	2	2	2
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers							
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	18						
5: Satisfaction of new teachers	12	2	2		2		2

Step 7: Sum all the cells to find the total points possible (158).

Step 8: Divide the points achieved by the points possible. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

$\frac{\text{Number of ASEP Points Earned}}{\text{Number of ASEP Points Possible}} =$
$\frac{152}{158} \times 100 =$
<p>96.20%, which rounds to 96%</p>