

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 2021–2022 *Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) Manual*; would implement Senate Bill (SB) 2066, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021; would clarify assessments used for accountability; would update procedures for EPP commendations; would provide the SBEC additional flexibility when sanctioning programs; and would clarify what data is used for the determination of accreditation statuses.

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, as amended by House Bill (HB) 159, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021; 21.045, as amended by HB 159, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021; 21.0451; and 21.0452, as amended by Senate Bill 2066, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021.

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 the TEC, Chapter 21, Subchapter B, in a manner consistent with the 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 EPP, 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 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), requires the SBEC to adopt rules setting certain admission requirements for EPPs.

TEC, §21.0443, as amended by House Bill (HB) 159, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021, 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 incorporate proactive instructional planning techniques throughout coursework and across content areas to provide flexibility in the ways information is presented and students respond and are engaged, to reduce barriers in

instruction, to provide appropriate accommodations, and to maintain high achievement expectations for all students; must integrate inclusive practices for all students and evidence-based instruction and intervention strategies throughout course work, clinical experience, and student teaching; must adequately prepare candidates for educator certification; and must 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, Regular Session, 2021, states that the board shall propose rules establishing standards to govern the 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. It further states that the SBEC has authority to make rules to take any necessary action in sanctioning EPPs, including but not limited to requiring the program to obtain technical assistance or professional services, appointing a monitor to participate in and report to the SBEC on the activities of the 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, as amended by Senate Bill 2066, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021, 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.

The full text of statutory citations can be found in the statutory authority section of this agenda.

EFFECTIVE DATE: If approved for filing as proposed in July 2022, and if adopted, subject to SBOE review, at the September 30, 2022 meeting, the proposed effective date of the proposal would be December 29, 2022 (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 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs, effective December 26, 2021.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION: EPPs are entrusted to prepare educators for success in the classroom. 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 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.

Following is a description of the topics for the SBEC's consideration for proposed amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229. The relevant proposed rule text from 19 TAC Chapter 229 is presented

in Attachment I. The proposed Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c), which is the *ASEP Manual*, is presented in Attachment II. 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 provide the following changes to portions of the *ASEP Manual*.

Updates to the table of contents would simplify technical processes related to rulemaking.

Updates to Chapter 1 would simplify and streamline language. These updates would also update the description of Indicators 1a and 1b to align with proposed updates to 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(C) and (D), which use the defined terms *pedagogy test* and *content pedagogy test*.

Updates to Chapter 3 would align the description of Indicators 1a and 1b with proposed updates to 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(C) and (D). Updates would also clarify the exclusion procedures related to the Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL) per 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(B). Proposed updates would strike the reference to the Core Subjects Adjustment as it is no longer needed, due to the reset of the years of data used for the small group aggregation, in proposed 19 TAC §229.4(c)(6). For the same reason, proposed updates would strike a reference to the earliest available year of data for use in the small group aggregation procedure. Proposed updates to Chapter 3 would also add clarification about the procedure to identify how tests 291 Core Subjects EC-6 and 391 Core Subjects EC-6 are counted in combination to ensure that candidates with results for both are not double counted in the pass rate. This is in response to request for clarification from the field. Finally, the proposed updates would modify the worked examples to provide demonstration of the PASL inclusion and the tests 291 Core Subjects EC-6 and 391 Core Subjects EC-6 procedure. This would provide transparency to the field.

Updates to Chapter 4 would update the term "English language learners" with the term "emergent bilingual students" to implement SB 2066, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021. Proposed updates would also note the procedure for EPPs to complete a review of the roster of included candidates. This would provide transparency of processes to the field. Additionally, updates to the worked example would provide an example of how the rounding rule operates. This would provide clarity to the field.

Updates to Chapter 5 would clarify the teachers included in the calculation. These updates would note that teachers who exit the teacher workforce prior to being employed for three years and then return to the workforce are not included in the calculation for the EPP following their workforce re-entry. This additional clarification was requested by EPP stakeholders. These updates would also create a threshold of 10 or more students for a teacher's subject area to be included. This is based on recommendations from the working group that provided input to TEA during the original construction of the Indicator 3 methodology.

Updates to Chapter 6 would remove the term "field experience" and use the terminology "internship or clinical teaching." This would provide better clarity for EPPs, because "field experience" has a separate meaning in 19 TAC Chapter 228. Updates would also clarify the

exception procedure to provide transparency to the field. Updates would modify the worked example for Indicator 4a to simplify the figure. Finally, updates to the worked example for Indicator 4b would update the question number references to align with the survey currently in use. This would provide clarity for the field.

Updates to Chapter 7 would replace the term "English language learners" with the term "emergent bilingual students" to implement SB 2066, 87th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2021. Proposed updates would also note the procedure for EPPs to complete a review of the roster of included candidates. This would provide transparency of processes to the field.

Updates to Chapter 8 would shift the performance standard for retention as a teacher and for retention in any public-school role from 95% to 85%. Over the past two years no EPPs have met the 95% retention standard, and this change would allow for this commendation to be achievable while still requiring excellence in preparing educators who are retained in the field. Updates to the description of the rigorous and robust preparation section would align language with proposed updates to 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(C) and (D) and align the procedure with proposed 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(A). Updates to this section would also clarify that the calculations are done based on the number of candidates with certificates, rather than the number of certificates. This provides clarity for the field and simplifies the standard to address the percent of teachers with a certain type of certificate. This approach allows for clearer recognition of programs who prepare candidates who earn multiple certificates through their EPP. Additional updates to this section would clarify that the percentage of candidates in teacher shortage areas are calculated separately by shortage area, that the percentage of teachers who identify as African American or Hispanic are calculated separately, and that the commendation is awarded separately for these separate results. This provides clarity to the field and addresses questions surfaced by the SBEC in prior meetings. Proposed updates to the preparing educators for long-term success section would clarify that educators are identified as retained when they are continuously employed. This provides clarity for the field and aligns with the reporting specified in TEC, §21.0452. Updates to the Innovative Educator Preparation section would remove the prior year recognition area and would add the new area of commendation recommended by the EPP Commendation Committee at its meeting on April 28, 2022. The new area of commendation will recognize EPPs that engage in innovative development of EPP faculty and staff, field supervisors, and/or cooperating and mentor teachers, in alignment with current research and best practices.

Proposed updates to Chapter 9 would align language with proposed updates to 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(C) and (D) and would align the procedure with proposed 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(A). Additional updates would modify existing references to prior year performance to specify the most recent prior year for which the EPP has data. This would ensure that only data from actionable years will be included in the ASEP index system calculations.

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

§229.2. Definitions.

The updates to the definitions section would add definitions for *content pedagogy test* and *pedagogy test* and would renumber the terms in this section. This allows for alignment of ASEP Indicators 1a and 1b and the *ASEP Manual* with Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e). This alignment would provide transparency and clarity to the field concerning which exams are used in each calculation.

§229.3. Required Submissions of Information, Surveys, and Other Data.

The proposed updates to Figure: 19 TAC §229.3(f) would update the required collections to add the systematic collection of data related to clinical teaching, internship, and practicum experiences, renumbering the Accountability System Data column. EPPs are already required to create and to retain this data locally; allowing EPPs to report this data to TEA using the Educator Certification Online system would ensure proper record retention, simplifying the continuing review process for EPPs. Additionally, collecting this information would allow TEA to connect this data with campus- and district-level data and to provide summaries and visualizations back to EPPs for their use in program monitoring and continuous improvement of their programs. This collection would allow the TEA staff to address SBEC questions related to clinical teaching and internships to inform policy decisions. Finally, this collection is necessary under TEC, §21.045(b)(2), to allow the SBEC more efficiency in monitoring compliance with the SBEC's requirements for field supervision of candidates during their clinical teaching and internship experiences under 19 TAC §228.35(g). With the addition of data related to clinical teaching, internship, and practicum experiences, the subsequent rows under the Accountability System Data column would be renumbered accordingly.

§229.4. Determination of Accreditation Status.

Update to ASEP Indicator 1:

The proposed amendment to §229.4(a)(1) would introduce the terms *content pedagogy tests* and *pedagogy tests* into the indicator description. This aligns with the updates to 19 TAC §229.2 and would provide a clear connection to Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e) and to this ASEP indicator.

The proposed amendment would strike current §229.4(a)(1)(A) and would reletter current §229.4(a)(1)(B) as §229.4(a)(1)(A).

Updates to new §229.4(a)(1)(A) would introduce the terms *content pedagogy tests* and *pedagogy tests* into the indicator description. Additional updates would strike the outdated language related to completers issued a probationary certificate under a waiver that was in place for the 2020–2021 academic year (AY).

Updates to §229.4(a)(1)(C) and §229.4(a)(1)(D) would introduce the terms *content pedagogy tests* and *pedagogy tests* into the indicator description.

Proposed new §229.4(a)(1)(B) would specify that the PASL would continue to be treated as a content pedagogy test through academic year 2022–2023. This is necessary because the PASL has historically been calculated as a content pedagogy test but is in the pedagogy test column in Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e). The eventual inclusion of PASL into the pedagogy test calculation

brings together all pedagogy tests into the same indicator. This timeline would allow for EPPs to be informed of this change and plan for any necessary adjustments.

Update to Not Accredited-Revoked status

Proposed new §229.4(b)(3)(D) would align with TEC, §21.0451(a)(4), to allow the SBEC to revoke an EPP's accreditation and approval to recommend candidates if the EPP violated SBEC rules, Board orders, or Chapter 21 of the TEC. The rules currently allow the SBEC to change an EPP's accreditation status to "Accredited—Warned" or "Accredited—Probation," but requires that the program remain in "Accredited—Probation" for a year before it can be revoked. The proposed addition would allow the SBEC to seek revocation immediately if an EPP violates an SBEC rule, Board order or statute, so that the SBEC can quickly address severe problems with EPPs and thereby, limit the number of candidates, school districts, and students impacted by the EPP's continuing misconduct. Any EPP recommended for revocation will receive due process through an informal review by TEA staff and a contested case proceeding at the State Office of Administrative Hearings under the existing procedures set out in 19 TAC §§229.5-229.8.

Update to small group exception

Proposed amendments to §229.4(c)(3) and(c)(4) would specify that for the purposes of the small group aggregation procedure, only data from years beginning in 2021–2022 would be used. This reset is aligned with prior approaches to the small group aggregation when indicators are reactivated after being report only. During the 2019–2020 and 2020-2021 AY, all indicators were report only. This update would allow for EPPs that have 10 or fewer candidates in the aggregated or disaggregated groups in 2021-2022 AYs to have that data added to future years of data.

§229.5. Accreditation Sanctions and Procedures.

Update to available sanctions

Proposed new §229.5(b)(3) would renumber this section and would allow the SBEC to order EPPs to provide TEA staff with verification that the EPP is in continued compliance with SBEC rules and the TEC. This will allow the SBEC to tailor EPP sanction orders specifically to the particular program's shortcomings or violations to determine whether an EPP has improved its program to comport with the requirements of SBEC rules and the TEC and will put the program in violation of an SBEC order if it is unable to produce proof of compliance. This will allow the SBEC more options to create sanction orders for EPPs that effectively and enforceably address an EPP's violations, without resorting to the blunt instrument of revocation.

Proposed new §229.5(b)(4) would allow the SBEC to require EPPs with an accreditation status of "Accredited—Warned" or "Accredited—Probation" and EPPs with conditions for continuing approval to post information on their websites to inform the public about the EPP's accreditation status or conditions for continuing approval and to post the documents that support and explain the SBEC's decision to order a particular accreditation status or conditions for continuing approval. This will give current candidates in the program and potential candidates considering whether to enter the program more information and insight regarding the quality of teacher preparation and training the EPP provides and the areas where the program has opportunities for improvement.

Update to certification class or category evaluation

The proposed update to §229.5(c) would introduce the terms "content pedagogy tests" and "pedagogy tests" into the indicator description. This would align with the updates above to 19 TAC §229.2 and would provide a clear connection to Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e).

§229.9. Fees for Educator Preparation Program Approval and Accountability.

The proposed amendment would remove "internships" from the fee definition. This update would provide clarity about the fee because out-of-state internships are not allowed under 19 TAC §228.35(e)(9).

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), §2001.022.

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, the proposed rule in new §229.2(12) would create a new regulation by adding new definitions for *content pedagogy test* as those exams listed in the column labeled "Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)" in Figure 19 TAC §230.21(e).

The proposed rule in new §229.2(27) would create a new regulation by defining *pedagogy test* as those exams listed in the column labeled "Required Pedagogy Test(s)" in Figure 19 TAC §230.21(e).

The proposed rule in §229.3(f) would create a new regulation for EPPs by requiring new data reporting collections of data related to clinical teaching, internship, and practicum placements.

The proposed rule in new §229.4(b)(3)(D) would create a new regulation for EPPs by allowing the SBEC to assign a status of Accredited-Revoked if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules, orders, and/or TEC, Chapter 21.

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 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 a data and reporting impact proposed in §229.3(f)(1). New reporting requirements in 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1) include annual collection of data related to clinical teaching, internship, and practicum placements. This collection is necessary under TEC, §21.045(b)(2), to allow the SBEC more efficiency in monitoring compliance with the SBEC's requirements for field supervision of candidates during their clinical teaching and internship experiences under 19 TAC §228.35(g). EPPs are already required to create and retain this data locally; allowing EPPs to report this data to TEA using the Educator Certification Online System would ensure proper record retention, simplifying the continuing review process for EPPs. Additionally, by collecting this information centrally, TEA would be able to connect this data with campus- and district-level data and provide summaries and visualizations back to EPPs for their use in monitoring and continuous improvement of their programs. Finally, this collection would allow the TEA staff to address Board questions related to clinical teaching and internships to inform policy decisions.

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 19, 2022, and ends September 19, 2022. The SBEC will take registered oral and written comments on the proposal at the September 30, 2022 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 Member Responsible:

Mark Olofson, Director, Educator Data, Research, and Strategy

Attachments:

- I. Text of Proposed Amendments to 19 TAC Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs
- II. Text of Proposed Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c)
- III. Text of Proposed Figure: 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1)

ATTACHMENT I
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.

§229.2. Definitions.

The following words and terms, when used in this chapter, shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

- (1) Academic year--If not referring to the academic year of a particular public, private, or charter school or institution of higher education, September 1 through August 31.
- (2) Accredited institution of higher education--An institution of higher education that, at the time it conferred the degree, was accredited or otherwise approved by an accrediting organization recognized by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.
- (3) ACT®--The college entrance examination from ACT®.
- (4) Administrator--For purposes of the surveys and information required by this chapter, an educator whose certification would entitle him or her to be assigned as a principal or assistant principal in Texas, whether or not he or she is currently working in such an assignment.
- (5) Beginning teacher--For purposes of the Texas Education Code, §21.045(a)(3), and its implementation in this chapter, a classroom teacher with fewer than three years of experience as a classroom teacher.
- (6) Candidate--An individual who has been formally or contingently admitted into an educator preparation program; also referred to as a participant.
- (7) Certification category--A certificate type within a certification class, as described in Chapter 233 of this title (relating to Categories of Classroom Teaching Certificates).

- (8) Certification class--A certificate, as described in §230.33 of this title (relating to Classes of Certificates), that has defined characteristics; may contain one or more certification categories, as described in Chapter 233 of this title.
- (9) Clinical teaching--An assignment, as described in §228.35 of this title (relating to Preparation Program Coursework and/or Training).
- (10) Completer--A person who has met all the requirements of an approved educator preparation program. In applying this definition, the fact that a person has or has not been recommended for a standard certificate or passed a certification examination shall not be used as criteria for determining who is a completer.
- (11) Consecutively measured years--Consecutive years for which a group's performance is measured, excluding years in which the small group exception applies, in accordance with §229.4(c) of this title (relating to Determination of Accreditation Status).
- (12) ~~Content Pedagogy Test--Examination listed in the column labeled "Required Content Pedagogy Test(s)" in Figure 19 TAC §230.21(e).~~
- (13) ~~(12)~~ Cooperating teacher--An individual, as described in §228.2 of this title (relating to Definitions), who guides, assists, and supports a candidate during a candidate's clinical teaching assignment.
- (14) ~~(13)~~ Demographic group--Male and female, as to gender; and African American, Hispanic, White, and Other, as to race and ethnicity.
- (15) ~~(14)~~ Educator preparation program--An entity approved by the State Board for Educator Certification to recommend candidates in one or more educator certification classes or categories.
- (16) ~~(15)~~ Educator preparation program data--Data reported to meet requirements under the Texas Education Code, §21.045(b) and §21.0452.
- (17) ~~(16)~~ Examination--An examination or other test required by statute or any other State Board for Educator Certification rule codified in the Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 7, that governs an individual's admission to an educator preparation program, certification as an educator, continuation as an educator, or advancement as an educator.
- (18) ~~(17)~~ Field supervisor--An individual, as described in §228.2 of this title (relating to Definitions), who is hired by an educator preparation program to observe candidates, monitor their performance, and provide constructive feedback to improve their effectiveness as educators.
- (19) ~~(18)~~ First-year teacher--For purposes of the Texas Education Code, §21.045(a) (2), and its implementation in this chapter, an individual in his or her first year of employment as a classroom teacher.
- (20) ~~(19)~~ GPA--Grade point average.
- (21) ~~(20)~~ GRE®--Graduate Record Examinations®.
- (22) ~~(21)~~ Higher Education Act--Federal legislation consisting of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 United States Code, §1070 et seq.) and its subsequent amendments, which requires reports of educator preparation program performance data.
- (23) ~~(22)~~ Incoming class--Individuals contingently or formally admitted between September 1 and August 31 of each year by an educator preparation program.
- (24) ~~(23)~~ Internship--An assignment, as described in §228.35 of this title (relating to Preparation Program Coursework and/or Training).
- (25) ~~(24)~~ Mentor--An individual, as described in §228.2 of this title (relating to Definitions), who guides, assists, and supports a candidate during a candidate's internship assignment.

- (26) [~~(25)~~] New teacher--For purposes of the Texas Education Code, §21.045(a)(5), and its implementation in this chapter, an individual in his or her first year of employment as a classroom teacher under a standard certificate.
- (27) Pedagogy Test--Examination listed in the column labeled "Pedagogical Requirement(s)" in Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e).
- (28) [~~(26)~~] Practicum--An assignment, as described in §228.35 of this title (relating to Preparation Program Coursework and/or Training).
- (29) [~~(27)~~] SAT@--The college entrance examination from the College Board.
- (30) [~~(28)~~] Site supervisor--An individual, as described in §228.2 of this title (relating to Definitions), who guides, assists, and supports a candidate during a candidate's practicum assignment.
- (31) [~~(29)~~] Texas Education Agency staff--Staff of the Texas Education Agency assigned by the commissioner of education to perform the State Board for Educator Certification's administrative functions and services.

§229.3. Required Submissions of Information, Surveys, and Other Data.

- (a) Educator preparation programs (EPPs), EPP candidates, first-year teachers, new teachers, beginning teachers, field supervisors, administrators, mentors, site supervisors, and cooperating teachers shall provide to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff all data and information required by this chapter, as set forth in subsections (e) and (f) of this section.
- (b) Any individual holding a Texas-issued educator certificate who fails to provide information required by this chapter and the Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.045 and §21.0452, as set forth in subsection (e) of this section, may be subject to sanction of his or her certificate, including the placement of restrictions, inscribed or non-inscribed reprimand, suspension, or revocation.
- (c) Any Texas public school that fails to provide information required by this chapter and the TEC, §21.045 and §21.0452, as set forth in subsection (e) of this section, may be referred to the commissioner of education with a recommendation that sanctions upon its accreditation status be imposed for failure to comply with this section and the TEC, §21.0452.
- (d) Any open-enrollment charter school that fails to provide information required by this chapter and the TEC, §21.045 and §21.0452, as set forth in subsection (e) of this section, may be referred to the commissioner of education with a recommendation that sanctions be imposed for failure to comply with this section and the TEC, §21.0452.
- (e) All required EPP data for an academic year shall be submitted to the TEA staff annually by September 15 following the end of that academic year. All surveys and information required to be submitted pursuant to this chapter by principals shall be submitted by June 15 of any academic year in which an administrator has had experience with a first-year teacher who was a participant in an EPP. All surveys and information required to be submitted pursuant to this chapter by new teachers shall be submitted by June 15 of the first full academic year after the teacher completed the requirements of an EPP. All surveys and information required to be submitted pursuant to this chapter by EPP candidates shall be submitted by August 31 of the academic year in which the candidate completed the requirements of an EPP.
- (f) The following apply to data submissions required by this chapter.
- (1) EPPs shall provide data for all candidates as specified in the figure provided in this paragraph.
Figure: 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1) [~~Figure: 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1)~~]
 - (2) Candidates in an EPP shall complete a survey, in a form approved by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC), evaluating the preparation he or she received in the EPP. Completion and submission to the TEA of the survey is a requirement for completion of an EPP.

- (3) Administrators in Texas public schools and open-enrollment charter schools shall complete individual teacher performance surveys, in a form to be approved by the SBEC, for each beginning teacher.
- (4) Administrators in Texas public schools and open-enrollment charter schools shall complete surveys, in a form to be approved by the SBEC, evaluating the effectiveness of preparation for classroom success based on experience with first-year teachers who were participants in an EPP.
- (5) New teachers in a Texas public school, including an open-enrollment charter school, shall complete surveys, in a form to be approved by the SBEC, evaluating the effectiveness of preparation for classroom success.

§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, 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 pedagogy tests [examinations of pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR)] and content pedagogy tests [non-PPR standard certification examinations]. The EPP candidates' performance on pedagogy tests [PPR] and content pedagogy tests [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.]~~

 - (A) ~~[(B)]~~ For both pedagogy tests and content pedagogy tests, [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.]
 - (B) For the 2021-2022 and 2022-2023 academic years, the Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL) shall be treated as a content pedagogy test.
 - (C) For pedagogy tests [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 ~~content pedagogy tests [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 2 [H] 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. 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 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 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-Warning 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 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 EPP may be assigned Not Accredited-Revoked status if the SBEC determines that the EPP has violated SBEC rules, orders, and/or TEC, Chapter 21.
 - (E) ~~(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.
 - (F) ~~(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).
 - (G) ~~(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.
 - (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 from the next most recent prior year subsequent to the 2020-2021 academic year 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. The two-year cumulated group shall not include group performance from years prior to the 2021-2022 academic year.
 - (4) If the two-year cumulated EPP candidate group described in subsection (c)(3), 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 subsequent to the 2020-2021 academic year 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. The three-year cumulated group performance shall not include group performance from years prior to the 2021-2022 academic year.
 - (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 (TEC), 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) require the EPP to provide TEA staff with verification of the EPP's compliance with SBEC rules and/or the TEC;

- (4) require the EPP to post on its website:
- (A) accreditation status;
- (B) notice that the SBEC has instated conditions on the EPP's continuing approval;
- (C) TEA's continuing approval review report; and/or
- (D) official notification of recommended status;
- (5) ~~(3)~~ appoint a monitor to participate in the activities of the EPP and report the activities to the TEA or SBEC; and/or
- (6) ~~(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 content pedagogy tests ~~[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) 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) 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) 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-Warning, 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) 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.

§229.9. Fees for Educator Preparation Program Approval and Accountability.

An educator preparation program requesting approval and continuation of accreditation status shall pay the applicable fee from the following list.

- (1) New educator preparation program application and approval (nonrefundable)--\$9,000.
- (2) Five-year continuing approval review visit pursuant to §228.10(b) of this title (relating to Approval Process)--\$4,500.

- (3) Discretionary continuing approval review visit pursuant to §228.10(b) of this title--\$4,500.
- (4) Addition of new certification category or addition of clinical teaching--\$500.
- (5) Addition of each new class of certificate--\$1,000.
- (6) Applications for out-of-state and out-of-country school sites for field-based experiences, clinical teaching, ~~internships,~~ and practicums--\$500.
- (7) Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs technology fee--\$35 per admitted candidate.

ATTACHMENT II

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

Texas Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) Manual 2021-2022 [2020–2021]

Contents

| Chapter | [Page] |
|--|--------|
| Chapter 1 – Accountability Overview[.....] | 2 |
| Chapter 2 – Methodological Considerations[.....] | 4 |
| Chapter 3 – Certification Exam Pass Rate[.....] | 6 |
| Chapter 4 – Appraisal of First-year Teachers by Administrators[.....] | 15 |
| Chapter 5 – Improvement in Student Achievement of students taught by beginning teachers[.....] | 19 |
| Chapter 6 – Frequency, Duration, and Quality of Field Supervision[.....] | 23 |
| Chapter 7 – New Teacher Satisfaction[.....] | 30 |
| Chapter 8 – Educator Preparation Program Commendations[.....] | 34 |
| Chapter 9 – Determination of ASEP Index Score[.....] | 37 |

Chapter 1 – Accountability Overview

The Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP) ~~is contained in Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.045. [was the result of state legislation¹ that implemented]~~ It is an accountability framework for educator preparation programs (EPPs) and ~~provides [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 ~~statute, legislation~~ the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) ~~is [was]~~ charged with establishing rules^[2] 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 2021-2022 ~~[2020–2021]~~ 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 these 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 tests ~~[and professional responsibilities (PPR) exams]~~
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests ~~[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

^[1] ~~Texas Education Code (TEC) §§21.045, 21.0451, and 20.0452.]~~

^[2] ~~Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 229]~~

- ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a: Frequency and duration of field observations
- 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(14)(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(14)(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 pedagogy tests [PPR exams] (1a) and the pass rate on content pedagogy tests [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 2021-2022 [2020–2021] 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 2021-2022 [2020–2021] AY, all certification examinations approved by the EPP are eligible for inclusion.

The examination must be the first or second attempt for the particular examination^[3] 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.

PASL

As specified in 19 TAC §229.4(a)(1)(B), for 2021-2022, the Performance Assessment for School Leaders is included in the pass rate calculation for content pedagogy tests.

[3-Examinations are uniquely identified by test number and test type]

Calculation

ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a:

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

ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b:

Divide the number of passed content pedagogy tests [non-PPR certification examinations] on the first or second attempt by the total number of passed content pedagogy tests [non-PPR certification examinations] on the first attempt plus the number of content pedagogy tests [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 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 content pedagogy tests [~~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.]

Tests 291 and 391

Test 291 Core Subjects EC-6 had its last operational date 12/31/2021. Test 391 Core Subjects EC-6 was available beginning 1/1/2021 and has now replaced 291. During the overlapping time period, candidates could attempt either 291 or 391 to fulfill the testing requirement. Since 391 was the replacement for 291, the tests are combined at the candidate level for the purpose of determining which tests are included in pass rate calculations. The first and second attempt for the combination of all 291 or 391 attempts by a candidate approved by the EPP are the attempts used for the calculation.

Worked Examples

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Pedagogy Tests [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. Pedagogy tests [PPR examinations] 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. For 2021-2022, PASL exams are excluded.

Step 3: Retrieve pedagogy test [PPR exam] results for candidates identified in Step 1 for the examinations 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

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, or the test was not eligible for inclusion.

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

| Name | Test Attempt | Test Number/ Name | Test Result |
|--------------|--------------|--|-------------|
| Quinn | 1 | 160 PPR EC-12 | F |
| Quinn | 2 | 160 PPR EC-12 | P |
| Roberto | 1 | 160 PPR EC-12 | F |
| Roberto | 2 | 160 PPR EC-12 | P |
| Sally | 1 | 160 PPR EC-12 | P |
| <u>Tomas</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>368 Performance Assessment for Schools Leaders (PASL)</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 2021-2022 [~~2020-2021~~] reporting year.

The result for Tomas is not included because PASL is not included in indicator 1a for 2021-2022.

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 Content Pedagogy Tests (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. Content pedagogy tests [~~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. PASL exams are included.

Step 3: Retrieve content pedagogy tests [~~non-PPR exams~~] results for candidates identified in Step 1 for the 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.

ASEP Indicator 1b 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.

| <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>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Andrea</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Andrea</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>391 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>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Faye</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Faye</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>P</u> |
| <u>George</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>P</u> |

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Test Attempt</u> | <u>Test Number/ Name</u> | <u>Test Result</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> |
| <u>Mel</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>232 Social Studies 7 – 12</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Naney</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>391 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>391 Core Subjects EC – 6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Sally</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>613 LOTE Spanish EC – 12</u> | <u>F</u> |

| <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>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Andrea</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | <u>F</u> |
| <u>Andrea</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>391 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> |

| Name | Test Attempt | Test Number/ Name | Test Result |
|-----------------|--------------|---|-------------|
| <u>Dana</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>158 Physical Education EC-12</u> | F |
| <u>Dana</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>158 Physical Education EC-12</u> | P |
| <u>Eduardo</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u> | P |
| <u>Eduardo</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>154 English as a Second Language Supplemental</u> | P |
| <u>Faye</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Faye</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Faye</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | P |
| <u>George</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | P |
| <u>Hector</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>368 Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)</u> | P |
| <u>Imogen</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u> | F |
| <u>Imogen</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u> | F |
| <u>Imogen</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u> | F |
| <u>Imogen</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>233 History 7-12</u> | P |
| <u>Jermaine</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u> | P |
| <u>Ken</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>235 Math 7-12</u> | P |
| <u>Lawrence</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u> | P |
| <u>Lawrence</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>211 Core Subjects 4-8</u> | P |
| <u>Mel</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>232 Social Studies 7-12</u> | F |
| <u>Nancy</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>158: Physical Ed EC-12</u> | F |
| <u>Oscar</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>613: LOTE Spanish EC-12</u> | P |
| <u>Patrice</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u> | P |
| <u>Patrice</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Patrice</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Patrice</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | P |
| <u>Quinn</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>164 Bilingual Education Supplemental</u> | F |
| <u>Quinn</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>291 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |
| <u>Roberto</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>391 Core Subjects EC-6</u> | F |

| Name | Test Attempt | Test Number/ Name | Test Result |
|---------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Roberto | 4 | 391 Core Subjects EC-6 | F |
| Sally | 1 | 613 LOTE Spanish EC-12 | F |

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.

Results for Andrea, Patrice, and Roberto are combined across 291 and 391. For Andrea, the first 391 attempt was counted because it was the second attempt overall for the combination of 291 and 391. For Patrice, the second attempt fail for 291 was counted, and the result for 391 was not counted, because the 391 attempt was his third attempt overall for the combination of 291 and 391. Finally, for Roberto, the second attempt fail for 291 was counted, but the second attempt for 391 was not counted, because it was the fourth attempt overall for the combination of 291 and 391.

Results for Hector are included because PASL is included in Indicator 1b for 2021-2022.

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

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{\text{Number of tests passed}}{\text{Number of tests completed}} \times 100 \\
 &= \\
 &\frac{14}{19} \times 100 = \\
 &0.736 \times 100 = \\
 &73.6\%, \text{ which rounds to } 74\%
 \end{aligned}$$

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Content Pedagogy Tests [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), content pedagogy tests [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 content pedagogy tests [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 |
| Josefina | 1 | 293 Science of Teaching Reading | Core Subjects with STR: EC-6 | P |
| Kim | 1 | 291 Core Subjects EC-6 | Core Subjects with STR: EC-6 | P |
| Lance | 1 | 291 Core Subjects EC-6 | Core Subjects with STR: EC-6 | P |

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

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% for 291

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

$$1 \times 100 =$$

100% 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 emergent bilingual students [~~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] See 19 TAC §229.2(18) for the definition of a first-year teacher. Teachers on standard, intern, and probationary certificates are included. Teachers who are teaching under an emergency permit are excluded. Individuals who were incorrectly in the principal survey roster as identified by the EPP are not included. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval.

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.,

^[4] See TAC §229.2(18) for the definition of a first year teacher.

Students with Disabilities, Emergent Bilingual Students (~~English Language Learners~~) are included when available.

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 |
| <u>Emergent Bilingual Students</u> (English Language Learners) | 4 | Q50 – Q53 |

Special Methodological Considerations

Optional Sections and Missing Data

As noted above, the Students with Disabilities section and the Emergent Bilingual Students (~~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 | EBS [ELL] | PL | INS | LE | PPR | SWD | EBS [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 | <u>22</u> [24] | <u>25</u> [35] | <u>17</u> [24] | <u>13</u> [17] | <u>12</u> [16] | <u>6</u> [9] | <u>1.83</u> [2.5] [2.69] | <u>1.92</u> [2.69] | <u>2.43</u> [3.00] | <u>2.17</u> [2.83] | <u>2.00</u> [2.67] | <u>1.50</u> [2.25] | <u>1.98</u> [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 |

[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.

| Name ^[5] | Points by Survey Section ^[6] | | | | | | Average by Survey Section | | | | | | Overall Average | Met Standard |
|---------------------|---|-----|----|-----|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | PL | INS | LE | PPR | SWD | <u>EBS</u> <u>[ELL]</u> | PL | INS | LE | PPR | SWD | <u>EBS</u> <u>[ELL]</u> | | |
| 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 |

Notes:

Public data sets do not include names.

PL = Planning; INS = Instruction; LE = Learning Environment; PPR = Professional Practices & Responsibilities; SWD = students with disabilities; EBS: Emergent Bilingual Students. Empty cells denote missing data.

The score for Jessie is considered meeting standard because 1.97 rounds to 2 (see Chapter 2).

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.

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 who left the teacher work force prior to three consecutive years of teaching and subsequently re-entered the teacher work force 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. Teachers must have 10 or greater student progress measure values associated with them within a subject area for that subject area data to be included for the teacher.

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. Only include those combinations of teacher and STAAR area where the teacher has 10 or more associated student scores.

| 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 | 40 [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 internship or clinical teaching ~~[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 internship or clinical teaching ~~[field experience]~~, due to extenuating circumstances or the issuance of a standard certificate prior to the conclusion of their internship or clinical teaching ~~[field experience]~~, are removed from the data set. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval. [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 | Observation Duration [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 |

[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 | Observation Duration [Visit_Hours?] |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 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 |
| 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 |

| Name | Certificate / Assignment Type | Observation Duration [Visit_Hours?] |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 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 |

Notes:

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

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 |

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

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Pre-Certification Teaching Experience</u> | <u>Number of 45-Minute Field Observations</u> | <u>Meet Minimum Requirement?</u> |
|------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| <u>Carmen Adams</u> | <u>Intern</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Cristina Boyd</u> | <u>Intern</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>N</u> |
| <u>Dora Cain</u> | <u>Intern</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>N</u> |
| <u>Billie Daniels</u> | <u>Probationary</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Jaime Fowler</u> | <u>Intern</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Jean Hawkins</u> | <u>Probationary Ex</u> | <u>4</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Doris Hunter</u> | <u>Probationary</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Edmund Kennedy</u> | <u>Intern</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Elsie Pearson</u> | <u>Probationary</u> | <u>3</u> | <u>Y</u> |
| <u>Charlie Schultz</u> | <u>Intern</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>Y</u> |

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

Example Data Summary

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

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 3-9, 11-14 [~~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*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 |

| Name | Total Points | Within Acceptable Values |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| 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 emergent bilingual students [~~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.^[§] See 19 TAC §229.2(25) for the definition of a new teacher. 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. Individuals who were incorrectly in the teacher survey roster as identified by the EPP are not included. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval.

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, Emergent Bilingual Students [~~English Language Learners~~]) are included when available.

^[§] See TAC §229.2(25) for the definition of a new teacher

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.

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 |
| Emergent Bilingual Students [English Language Learners] | 4 | Q50 - Q53 |

Special Methodological Considerations

Optional Sections and Missing Data

As noted above, ~~the~~ Students with Disabilities section and ~~the~~ Emergent Bilingual Students [~~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.

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 ^[40] | | | | | | Average by Survey Section | | | | | | Overall Average | Met Standard |
|----------------------------|--|-----|----|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|------|------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | PL | INS | LE | PPR [PL] | SWD [INS] | EBS [LE] | PL | INS | LE | PPR [PL] | SWD [INS] | EBS [LE] | | |
| <i>Number of Questions</i> | 12 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 6 [13] | 4 [7] | 12 | 13 | 7 | 6 [12] | 6 [13] | 4 [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 |

Notes:

Public data sets do not include names.

^[9] Public data sets do not include names.

^[40] PL = Planning; INS = Instruction; LE = Learning Environment; PPR = Professional Practices & Responsibilities; SWD = students with disabilities; ELL = English language learners. Empty cells denote missing data.

PL = Planning; INS = Instruction; LE = Learning Environment; PPR = Professional Practices & Responsibilities; SWD = students with disabilities; EBS: Emergent Bilingual Students. Empty cells denote missing data.

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).

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(d)~~(e)~~, 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. The Rigorous and Robust Preparation measures, the Preparing the Educators Texas Needs measures, and the Preparing Educators for Long-Term Success measures ~~[These measures]~~ are calculated annually to reflect EPP performance in the prior academic year. The Innovative Educator Preparation commendation is awarded at the discretion of the Board. 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 [±±] | 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 | 85% [95%] or greater |

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

| Dimension | High-Performing EPP Measures | Standard |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | Educator Retention as a Texas public school professional for 5 years | 85% [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 | |

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 pedagogy tests and content pedagogy tests [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 content pedagogy tests [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 total number of newly standard certified teachers with a certificate in each shortage area is identified, and this is divided by the total number of newly standard certified teachers at the EPP. The top five EPPs in each identified certification category are eligible to be recognized. Each shortage area is calculated separately, and an EPP may receive a commendation for one or multiple shortage areas.

The second measure in this dimension recognizes EPPs that prepare the highest percentage of educators who identify as African American and Hispanic. The total number of newly standard certified educators who identify as African American is identified, and this is divided by the total number of newly standard certified educators

at the EPP. Separately, the total number of newly standard certified educators who identify as Hispanic is identified, and this is divided by the total number of newly standard certified educators at the EPP. The top five EPPs with respect to each demographic group are eligible to be recognized. Each race/ethnicity category is calculated separately, and an EPP may receive a commendation for one or multiple race/ethnicity categories.

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) teacher completers who are employed and b) teacher completers who are employed in a rural district as a teacher. The percentage of teachers [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 were initially certified during a given academic year and were employed as regular classroom teachers in the next academic year. A teacher is considered retained only if they maintain continuous employment as a teacher in Texas public schools on a half-time or more basis. The number of teachers continuously employed as a teacher for five consecutive years is identified and used in this measure. [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 the number of educators retained for five years and the original number of employed educators five years prior [these numbers], the TEA computes a percentage. The standard for recognition on this measure is set at 85% [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 individuals originally certified as classroom teachers continuously [still] employed in any role for [after] five years. [The eligible population is educators from all certification classes prepared by the EPP.] The standard for recognition on this measure is 85% [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 for innovation are updated using input from the SBEC. EPPs respond to a call for applications in a format and a timeline determined by TEA and the SBEC. 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 committee and approved by the full SBEC. Recognition is awarded at the discretion of the committee and the SBEC.

For the current Innovative Educator Preparation commendation, the SBEC seeks to recognize EPPs that engage in innovative development of EPP faculty and staff, field supervisors, and/or cooperating and mentor teachers, in alignment with current research and best practices. Examples include, but are not limited to, co-teaching models, coaching practices, high quality instructional materials implementation, and/or response to intervention (RTI).

[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), 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(14)(~~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 <u>pedagogy tests [PPR exams]</u> | | | | | | | |
| 1b: Certification examination results for <u>content pedagogy tests [non-PPR exams]</u> | | | | | | | |
| 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 and performance in the most recent prior year for which the EPP had actionable data.

| 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 <u>most recent prior year for which the EPP had actionable data</u> [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 <u>pedagogy tests</u> [PPR exams] | 4 |
| 1b: Certification examination results for <u>content pedagogy tests</u> [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 <u>pedagogy tests [PPR exams]</u> | Met (1) | Met (1) | Met (1) | Met (1) | Met (1) | Met (1) | Met (1) |
| 1b: Certification examination results for <u>content pedagogy tests [non-PPR exams]</u> | 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) |

Note: Per 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.

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 <u>pedagogy tests [PPR exams]</u> | 24 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

[¹² Per 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.]

| ASEP Measure | All | Female | Male | African American | Hispanic / Latino | Other | White |
|--|-----|--------|------|------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|
| 1b: Certification examination results for <u>content pedagogy tests</u> [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 <u>pedagogy tests</u> [<u>PPR exams</u>] | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) |
| 1b: Certification examination results for <u>content pedagogy tests</u> [non-PPR exams] | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) | Yes (1) |
| 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 <u>pedagogy tests [PPR exams]</u> | 24 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 1b: Certification examination results for <u>content pedagogy tests [non-PPR exams]</u> | 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.

$$\frac{\text{Number of ASEP Points Earned}}{\text{Number of ASEP Points Possible}} =$$

$$\frac{152}{158} \times 100 =$$

96.20%, which rounds to 96%

[=]

ATTACHMENT III

Figure: 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1) [~~Figure: 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1)~~]

| Data required to support Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.045(a) and (b); TEC, §21.0452; and 19 TAC §229.4, disaggregated by demographic group | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Accountability System Data | | Description of Data | Required Submission Date and Method of Reporting |
| 1 | Record of all candidate observations, including candidates in a certification class other than classroom teacher. | Individual records of each field observation that occurred in the academic year. | By September 15 of each year, each Educator Preparation Program (EPP) will document field supervision in a format determined by TEA staff. |
| <u>2</u> | <u>Record of all candidate clinical teaching, internship, and practicum experiences</u> | <u>Individual records of each clinical teaching, internship, and practicum experiences that were completed in the academic year.</u> | <u>By September 15 of each year, each EPP will submit data in a format designated by TEA staff for the preceding academic year.</u> |
| <u>3</u> (2) | Record of applicants | Report submitted by the EPP. This is the record of individual candidates who applied to be admitted to the program during the academic year. | By September 15 of each year, each EPP will submit data in a format designated by TEA staff for the preceding academic year. Data will be reported on the TEA website. |
| <u>4</u> (3) | Record of candidates admitted | Report submitted by the EPP. This is the record of individual candidates who were admitted during the academic year. | By September 15 of each year, each EPP will submit data in a format designated by TEA staff for the preceding academic year. Data will be reported on the TEA website. |
| <u>5</u> (4) | Record of candidates retained | Report submitted by the EPP. This is the record of individual candidates who have been admitted to the EPP but have not completed the EPP. | By September 15 of each year, each EPP will submit data in a format designated by TEA staff for the preceding academic year. Data will be reported on the TEA website. |
| <u>6</u> (5) | Record of candidates completing all EPP requirements | Report submitted by the EPP. This is the record of individual candidates who have completed all EPP requirements. | By September 15 of each year, each EPP will submit data in a format designated by TEA staff for the preceding academic year. Data will be reported on the TEA website. |
| <u>7</u> (6) | All information required by federal law | Reports submitted by the EPPs in accordance with federal law. | EPPs will submit data required by federal law to the U.S. Department of Education or its agents in accordance with deadlines set by those entities. TEA website will include a link to the Title II website to enhance access to the data. |