



Compliance Audit Report 2010-2011 Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Principal Preparation Program

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

Contact Information: Dr. Art Hernandez, Dean of the College of Education, Texas A&M-Corpus Christi

County-District Number: 178-504

Texas Education Agency (TEA) program specialists Vanessa Alba and Sandra Nix, conducted a Texas Education Agency compliance audit on April 5-7, 2011 in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(c). The Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi's Principal Preparation Program and the associated curriculum was the focus of the visit.

Data Analysis:

Information concerning compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) governing educator preparation programs was collected by various qualitative means. A review of the self-report submitted on March 8, 2011, documents, syllabi, and curriculum correlations charts provided evidence regarding compliance. In addition, electronic questionnaires were sent to Texas A&M-Corpus Christi Principal Preparation Program participants by TEA staff. A total of forty-three (43) out of one hundred eighty (180) responses to the questionnaires were received. The responses included three (3) out of eleven (11) advisory committee members, two (2) out of four (4) field supervisors, fourteen (14) out of ninety-seven (97) principal candidates, and twenty-four (24) out of sixty-eight (68) campus principal mentors. Qualitative methods of content analysis, cross-referencing, and triangulation of the data were used to evaluate the evidence.

Opening and Closing Session:

The opening session on April 5, 2011 was attended by thirty-seven (37) people, including Dr. Art Hernandez, Dean, College of Education, and Dr. Raul Prezias, Chair, Department of Educational Administration and Research. In addition, the entire Department of Educational Administration and Research staff were present at both the opening and closing sessions. They included: Dr. Phyllis Hensley, Associate Professor; Dr. Michael Moody, Assistant Professor; and Dr. James Walter, Visiting Professor. The closing session on April 7, 2011 was attended by thirty-nine (39) people. It is important to note that the Provost was present at the closing session.

The following are the findings and recommendations for program improvement.

Principal Program Approval – September 1, 2000

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Findings:

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi educator preparation program was automatically approved to offer the principal (PRN) certificate on September 1, 2000. This was a result of the administrator/mid-management (AMI) certificate being phased out. In a review of Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi's cumulative paper file, it was discovered that no documentation of a compliance audit visit specifically for the principal preparation program existed. Documentation does exist that shows that the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi educator preparation program as a whole has received the rating of "Accredited" since the 2004-2005 academic year. During the 2009-2010 year, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi educator preparation program as a whole earned the rating of "Accredited with an Action Plan" for one demographic group, African Americans, with a pass rate of sixty-three percent (63%) for eleven (11) individuals in that demographic group. During the same year, the principal certificate pass rate was at seventy-three point three percent (73.3%) for thirty (30) tests attempted and twenty-two (22) tests passed. It is important to note that an acceptable pass rate for completion year 2010 was seventy percent (70%). This year the pass rate will move to seventy-five percent (75%). Based on the passing standard for this year, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi's educator preparation program would be below the passing standard for the principal certificate and would be in jeopardy of losing the ability to offer the principal certificate in its educator preparation program.

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

Findings:

Program support was indicated per Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.20(c) by the governing body of Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Principal Preparation Program as evidenced by Dean Art Hernandez's participation in all aspects of the compliance audit. In addition, Dr. Raul Prezas, Chair of Department of Educational Administration and Research presented at both the opening and closing sessions. Dr. Prezas and his team were available to TEA program specialists after the opening session and at a scheduled appointment on the second day of the visit to clarify questions about the program as well as to provide a broad picture of the principal preparation program.

This is the first year that the staff of Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi's principal preparation program has held an advisory committee meeting. It was reported in the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Principal Preparation Program's self-report that the advisory committee meetings for the 2010-2011 academic year were held on December 9, 2010, and February 24, 2011. The opening session presentation by Dr. Prezas provided different information than the self-report

and listed the advisory committee meeting date as February 24, 2011. A second meeting was scheduled for May 18, 2011. In reviewing the documents provided for the advisory committee meeting dates, minutes, and sign-in rosters, it was noted that the advisory committee did meet on February 24, 2011. The members present at that meeting included seven (7) campus administrators, one (1) Education Service Center (ESC) representative, and three (3) Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi representatives. Topics discussed included: Standards and competencies for the TExES test framework for the principal program; virtual mentoring and the role of virtual mentors in the principal program; opportunities for input including the need for a course entitled "Advanced Supervision of Instruction", and the assignment of campus mentors. Because it was unclear if the advisory committee met in previous years or if the advisory committee planned to meet again during this academic year, TEA program specialists requested clarification from Dr. Prezias, the Educational Administration Department Chair. He indicated that this was indeed the first year that the advisory committee had met and that the advisory committee had plans to meet again on May 18, 2011. Minutes were provided for the December meeting. The questionnaire data provided by the advisory committee members indicated that sixty-eight percent (68%) of advisory committee respondents reported meeting two times per year and thirty-three percent (33%) reported meeting more than two times per year. While it was evident that the advisory committee met once this year and plans to meet again in the spring, it was unclear to TEA program specialists if advisory committee meetings have occurred two times per year as prescribed in TAC §228.20(b). Advisory committee meetings do not meet the requirements of TAC §228.20(b). It is recommended that the principal preparation program advisory committee meet two times per academic year as prescribed in TAC §228.20(b).

It was reported in the self-report that the advisory committee consisted of a total of seven (7) members: five (5) members from public/private education, one (1) member from an education service center, and one (1) member from higher education. The names and the information provided in the self-report did not correlate with the names and information provided in the email list provided for the questionnaires sent out to advisory committee members. A total of eleven (11) advisory committee members were sent questionnaires and three (3) responded to the questionnaire. One hundred percent (100%) of the respondents represented public school districts. Sign-in sheets for the advisory committee meeting on February 24, 2011 reflected that eleven members were present. They represented campus administration, an education service center representative, and Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. It was not evident to the TEA program specialists that the advisory committee met the requirements of TAC §228.20(b). As a result, TEA program specialists recommended to the Dean of the College of Education and the Educational Administration Department Chair that the advisory committee be expanded to include a broader membership, including business and community members per TAC §228.20(b).

It was reported in the self-report that the roles and responsibilities of the advisory committee members are "...discussed in a face-to-face meeting and recorded in the minutes. Consensus is established in person." The number of respondents to the advisory committee questionnaire was low. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of respondents to their questionnaire reported having served on the committee for less than six (6) months and thirty-four percent (34%) reported serving for between one to three years. There was no advisory committee handbook provided during the document review. Based on the documentation provided, it was not evident to the TEA program specialists that the roles and responsibilities of the principal program advisory committee

members have been approved by Texas A&M-Corpus Christi educator preparation program per TAC §228.20(b). In order to ensure that the roles and responsibilities of the advisory committee are clear to all members per TAC §228.20(b), yearly advisory committee training should be conducted and an advisory committee handbook should be developed.

It was reported in the self-report that the advisory committee is not involved in the design, delivery, evaluation, and major decisions of the educator preparation program. However, the advisory committee respondents to their questionnaire reported that they are familiar with Texas Administrative Code that govern educator preparation programs (100%), that they are familiar with Texas Administrative Code that governs principal preparation programs (100%), that they participate in the design and revision of the principal program's curriculum (100%), that they participate in major policy decisions affecting the principal preparation program (100%), and that they participate in the overall evaluation of the principal preparation program (67%). Because the data regarding governance of educator preparation programs provided in the self-report and the advisory committee questionnaire responses is conflicting, it was not evident to TEA program specialists that the advisory committee members assist in the design, delivery, policy decisions, and program evaluation per TAC §228.20(b). It is recommended that the governing body of the principal preparation program use an advisory committee meeting template to ensure that all aspects of governance, especially as they relate to the design/delivery of curriculum, policy decisions, and program evaluation, are discussed and appropriate input is provided at advisory committee meetings. All discussions and input should be documented in the form of detailed minutes accordingly.

In the advisory committee questionnaire, the members were asked to identify strengths and areas to improve within the principal preparation program. The following were listed as strengths: professors; curriculum; and mentors. The area for which the principal preparation program could improve upon was communication.

Based on the evidence presented above, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.20 – GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS.

COMPONENT II: ADMISSION CRITERIA - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §227.10 & §241.5 - ADMISSION CRITERIA

Findings:

There were a total of seventy-six (76) candidates admitted into the educational administration principal preparation program during the 2009-2010 academic year. A total of sixteen (16) principal candidate files were reviewed in both paper and electronic formats via the Banner online record-keeping system with Mr. Scott Simmons, certification officer for the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi principal preparation program. Records included: six (6) files for candidates who were admitted in the years 2006-2008 and who took the principal TExES exam more than one time; five (5) candidates who were reported as finishers in 2009-2010; and five (5) candidates who were reported as finishers in 2010-2011. All candidate files reviewed

contained an official transcript showing documentation of a baccalaureate degree as required of applicants seeking admission into a principal preparation program per TAC §241.5(a).

In order to be admitted into Texas A&M-Corpus Christi principal preparation program, an applicant must have a minimum of a four year degree from an institution of higher education accredited by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB), a grade point average (GPA) of three point zero (3.0) or higher on a four point (4.0) scale or a GPA of two point five (2.5) in the last sixty (60) hours. All candidate files met the GPA requirement. One candidate file contained a transcript with a GPA of two point sixty-six (2.66). In conversations with the certification officer, it was determined that the candidate was granted conditional admittance to the degree program and did not intend to be in the principal certification program. The certification officer corrected that candidate record during the TEA audit. Sufficient evidence exists that principal candidates admitted have a minimum GPA of 2.5 or at least 2.5 in the last sixty (60) hours per TAC §227.10(A).

All candidate files reviewed contained a signed and dated application. This was documented in the paper files or was shown to TEA program specialists as an item that was checked off in electronic files. The signed applications presented as evidence during the folder review meet the requirements of TAC §227.10(6).

The prospective candidate must provide a written philosophy statement, and secure faculty approval for admission. It was noted in the self-report that faculty members in the department of educational administration review the philosophy statements that describe why the applicant would like to be admitted into the program. Because the philosophy statement was listed as being required of all candidates seeking admission into the principal preparation program, the statements were reviewed by TEA program specialists. It was noted that there was inconsistency in terms of how the philosophy statement was evaluated. For instance one candidate's file contained an annotation that the "philosophy statement is weak". Upon further review and in conversations with Mr. Bill Coari, academic advisor for Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, he stated that the goal statement approval was "subjective". In conversations with Dr. Prezas and the educational administration faculty team, it was determined that the professors work with applicants to ensure that each philosophy statement meets the requirements of the university. It is recommended that the professors in the department of educational administration utilize a holistic scoring rubric that the program has already developed for the superintendent program admissions requirements to also evaluate the principal program applicants' written philosophy statements. The use of the rubric will ensure consistency and equality of academic criteria for admission per TAC §227.10(7). Based on the evidence provided as it relates to TAC §227.10(7), Texas A&M-Corpus Christi principal preparation program staff have demonstrated that they do not apply admission criteria consistently.

Because the principal certificate is a professional class of certificate, in addition to the admission requirements stated in TAC §227.10, the university is also required to follow the admission requirements per TAC §241.5. One of those requirements is that the program must implement procedures that include screening activities to determine the candidate's appropriateness for the principal certificate [TAC §241.5(c)]. In a review of five (5) 2010-2011 program finisher files, inconsistent evidence was found that candidates had two years of teaching experience as

verified by a service record, or lack thereof, in each candidate's file. Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi principal preparation program does not meet the requirements of TAC §241.5(c).

The website, the 2010-2011 Graduate Catalogue, and tri-fold brochures provided evidence of documentation of publicly published admission criteria and meet the requirements of TAC §227.10(7).

Based on the evidence presented above, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi Principal Preparation Program is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10 – Admission Criteria.

COMPONENT III: CURRICULUM - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §241.15 - EDUCATOR PREPARATION CURRICULUM / STANDARDS FOR THE PRINCIPAL CERTIFICATE

Findings:

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi principal preparation program staff stated that they had not reviewed their curriculum in the past five years. However, during conversations with Dr. Raul Prezas, Educational Administration Department Chair, he stated that he and his staff had recently completed a curriculum review to ensure alignment with the principal standards detailed in TAC §241.15. In addition, evidence of curriculum review was noted in the advisory committee minutes for the February 24, 2010 meeting.

The qualifications required to be a course instructor in the department of educational administration were provided in the self-report. They included: an advanced degree, Texas Teacher certificate in a corresponding content and grade level, principal and superintendent certification, and experience as a principal and superintendent. This information was verified during the review of instructors' qualifications and credentials. All five of the instructors who taught coursework specifically leading to the principal certificate held an advanced degree at the doctoral level. All had classroom teaching experience, either in the state of Texas or outside of Texas, and all had served as a campus principal and superintendent either in Texas or in another state. It is important to note that only one professor is certified and trained in delivery of the content for the Professional Development and Appraisal System (PDAS). As a result, that identified professor is currently the only person qualified to teach that course. The principal program staff is working toward ensuring that a second trained instructor is also able to teach that course. All other courses can be taught by any of the professors in the Department of Educational Administration.

The information provided in the self-report indicated that all syllabi for the coursework leading to the advanced degree and principal certification included the following information: instructor contact information; course content description; goals; objectives; TExES standards and competencies covered in each course; focused reading assignments; instructional strategies; classroom policies; and assignments tied to calendar dates. This information was verified in the

document review of the course syllabi and in the principal candidates' responses to their questionnaire related to items included in their coursework. The principal candidates reported that they received a clear and complete syllabus and overview for each course, a description explaining exactly what the course would cover, competencies that they would demonstrate at the end of the course, and essential activities/assignments tied to due dates at a rate of hundred percent (100%). They also reported (87.5%) that course instructors and their contact information was provided. In addition, respondents reported that lists of important dates, such as lectures, special assignments, and exams do exist. This was also verified in a review of course syllabi.

Sufficient evidence exists that the standards and competencies specified in TAC §241.15 are the basis for the curricula and coursework for the principal program. This was verified in the curriculum alignment chart that was provided for review. There are twelve (12) courses in four (4) blocks. The first block of coursework includes courses that are required courses for certification purposes only and includes EDFN 5301: Introduction to Research and EDFN 5302: Studies in Equality of Educational Opportunities. The second block of coursework is a set of specialized courses and includes EDAD 5304: Introduction to the Principalship; EDAD 5366: School Personnel Management; EDAD 5376: Supervision of Instruction; and EDAD 5377: Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS). The third block of courses consists of general administrative competencies and includes EDCI 5340: Instructional Techniques for Effective Teaching; EDAD 5363: Classroom Management & Legal Issues; EDAD 5378: Application of Administrative Concepts; and EDAD: Internship in Educational Administration. The fourth block of coursework consists of general electives that may be taken at any time throughout the program. They include EDAD 5360: Organizational Theory; EDAD 5364: Management of Educational Programs & Special Units; EDAD 5374: Campus Finance & Budgeting; EDAD 5375 Communication & Community Relations; and ETEC 5380: Technology for Administrators. Candidates must select two of the aforementioned courses. The course syllabi and the curriculum alignment chart provided evidence that the standards and competencies are being covered in the courses. The educational administration team clarified that they covered all of the standards and all standards were taught in spiraled format in all coursework. This was noted in the syllabi review where courses contained multiple standards and competencies. The table below entitled *Testing Record of Principal Candidates 2009-2010* illustrates the percentage of candidates who passed the principal TExES content exam on the first attempt for each year listed. When reviewing individual candidate testing data for candidates who tested more than one time for each year listed in the table, it was noted that candidates' scores were well below the minimum passing standard of two hundred forty (240). For example, one candidate had an overall score of two hundred twenty (220) on the first attempt and a two hundred twenty-seven on the second attempt. Another candidate had an overall score of two hundred twenty-two (222) on the first attempt, two hundred thirty-three (233) on the second attempt, and a two hundred twenty-three (223) on the third attempt. Neither candidate had passed the principal exam at the time of the visit. A further review of Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi principal preparation program exam pass rates on the paper-based test in the Educational Testing Service (ETS) data for administration year 2009-2010 was conducted. It was noted that for the sixty-one (61) testing attempts, the overall program's average scaled score was below the passing standard of two hundred forty (240) in each of the domains. Specifically, the overall average scaled score was two hundred thirty-six point five (236.5). The exam measures the standards and competencies that should be covered in depth in a principal preparation program. The average scaled score for Domain I was two hundred

thirty-six point eight (236.8). Domain I includes the following standards and associated competencies that should be addressed and taught in a principal preparation program: Learner-Centered Values and Ethics of Leadership and Learner-Centered Communications and Community Relations. The average scaled score for Domain II was two hundred thirty-seven point six (237.6). Domain II includes the following standards and associated competencies that should be addressed and taught in a principal preparation program: Learner-Centered Human Resources Leadership and Management; Learner-Centered Curriculum Planning and Development; Learner-Centered Instructional Leadership and Management; and Learner-Centered Leadership and Campus Culture. The average scaled score for Domain III was two hundred thirty-eight point three (238.3). Domain III includes the following standards that should be addressed and taught in a principal preparation program: Learner-Centered Organizational Leadership and Management. What is important to note as it relates to Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi principal preparation program is that based on testing data, it does not appear that candidates in the program have received depth of content in their program of study and although the staff assured the TEA program specialists that the curriculum provided was adequately covered, the evidence provided during the visit coupled with the ETS testing data for the program do not provide adequate evidence that the program has met the curriculum requirements of TAC §241.15. Since the curriculum had not been reviewed for alignment with the standards in the past five years, it was recommended that the program staff continue to use the seven standards and their associated competencies per TAC §241.15 as the foundation for the principal preparation program to ensure that not only the breadth, but the depth of content knowledge is adequately covered.

**Testing Record of Principal Candidates
2009-2011
% Passing Content Exam on the 1st Attempt**

Year	Total Number of Candidates Taking the TExES Principal Exam	Total Number of Candidates not passing the TExES Principal Exam on the First Attempt	Total Number of Candidates passing the TExES Principal Exam in the First Attempt	% Passing TExES Principal Content Exam on the 1 st Attempt
2007-2008	50	16	34	68%
2008-2009	24	8	16	67%
2009-2010	30	10	20	67%

Candidates were asked to identify curriculum strengths and areas to improve. Among the strengths listed were that the professors were knowledgeable in the content, insight into the administrator's position, and practical experiences. Areas to improve were listed as course offerings and scheduling.

Based on the evidence presented above, Texas A&M-Corpus Christi Principal Preparation Program is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §241.15 – EDUCATOR PREPARATION CURRICULUM / STANDARDS FOR THE PRINCIPAL CERTIFICATE.

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

Findings:

Currently, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi curriculum is delivered in a face-to-face format to candidates who enter at various times throughout the year. From the data provided in the self-report and during the program visit, it was determined that forty-seven (47) candidates have been admitted into the practicum during the 2010-2011 academic year. The principal practicum is offered during the third block of coursework. The sequence of courses leading to the practicum is listed in Component II-Curriculum. The total coursework, including the practicum course is equal to five hundred forty (540) hours and meets the program hours requirement of TAC §228.35(b). This was verified in the hours chart provided by the program staff as well as in a review of candidate folders which contained a degree plan and/or a certification plan that included a check mark for courses completed by the candidate.

It was reported in the self-report that field-based experiences (practicum) are documented as follows: time logs, classroom discussions, and classroom activities. It was also reported in the principal candidate questionnaires that eighty-eight point nine percent (88.9%) of candidates participated in a structured practicum with experiences at diverse types of campuses and ninety-five percent (95%) of campus principals reported in their questionnaires that they supervised their candidate. In addition, sixty-two point five percent (62.5%) of candidates reported that their practicum was one hundred sixty (160) hours and twenty-five percent (25%) of candidates reported that their practicum was one hundred (100) hours or less in their questionnaires. The program staff provided a list of names of seven (7) candidates and the various projects that each had completed such as: Response to Intervention (RTI); using data to assess drug and alcohol high school program needs; structuring a case management system; meeting students' diverse needs through art; and organization & implementation of end of course examinations. In addition, a photo album was provided during the document review as evidence of compliance with practicum activities and program hours. A sample log of activities completed by one candidate during the candidate's practicum was provided. This log was divided by the domain and included activities in each of the domains. The candidate was required to provide the date of the activity, a code indicating that they observed, assisted, facilitated, or researched the activity, a reflection of the work toward the activity, and the date that the activity was completed during the practicum. The particular candidate log that was reviewed had completed a total of seventy-two point five (72.5) hours of the practicum and all were within the first three Domains which cover many standards and competencies, described in TAC §241.15, required of candidates seeking the principal certificate. A specific concern of

the TEA program specialists was the fact that the candidate spent a total of six point five (6.5) hours on activities related to decorating the school for a special event for teachers and that was considered an acceptable activity for Competency 001: “The principal knows how to shape campus culture by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.” Upon request by the TEA program specialist, more candidate logs were provided by one of the professors involved in the program. However, after reviewing the candidate logs, it remained unclear whether or not these activities were supervised by the field supervisor and whether or not all field supervisors utilized and retained the logs. The evidence provided made it unclear to the TEA program specialists whether or not the program staff provided a practicum that is one hundred sixty clock-hours per TAC §228.35(d)(3) and it was unclear whether or not the candidates were supervised with the structured guidance of an experienced educator per TAC §228.35(f) because there was no consistent documentation of the practicum activities or supervision for all candidates.

Evidence was provided in the review of advisory committee minutes and in the form of an “Internship Commitment Form” that each candidate did have a campus principal mentor per TAC §228.35(e). It was reported in the self-report that the program documents training for mentors in the form of scheduled meetings. However, there was no documentation to support that the campus principal had received training per TAC §228.35(f). In conversations with the Educational Administration department chair, it was noted that training is provided to each campus principal at the campus, but there was no record of documentation. In addition, nine (9) of the nineteen (19) campus principals responded in their questionnaires that they did not receive training and six (6) of the nineteen (19) responded that they received training from the university supervisors. Principal mentor training does not meet the requirement of TAC 228.35(e).

The field supervisors for the principal candidates in the program are the Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi educational administration professors. It was noted in the document review that each professor had appropriate credentials, but it was unclear which professor was the field supervisor for which candidate because no evidence was provided during the document review. Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi principal preparation program does not meet the requirements for field supervision per TAC §228.35(f).

The initial contact between the field supervisors and principal candidates occurs on the first day of the EDAD practicum course and prior to the practicum. This was documented in the form of a check mark on the “Principal Certification Plan” or the “Degree Plan” in admission folders for principal candidates. Initial contact between field supervisors and candidates meets the requirement of TAC §228.35(f).

The principal preparation program is required to conduct a minimum of three observations within the one hundred sixty (160) hour practicum experience. TAC §228.35(f) states that the first observation must be conducted within the first six weeks of the practicum assignment. Each observation must be at least forty-five (45) minutes in duration and must be conducted by the field supervisor. The field supervisor documents practices observed related to the principal standards, provides written feedback through an interactive conference with the candidate, and provides a copy of the written feedback to the candidate's campus administrator. Informal

observations and coaching shall be provided by the field supervisor as appropriate. Currently Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi principal preparation program is not providing any observations of candidates during the practicum experience and does not meet the requirements for observations per TAC §228.35(f).

It is recommended that the program staff ensure that field supervisors provide a minimum of three (3) formal documented observations that are a minimum of forty-five (45) minutes in duration and conducted by the field supervisor per TAC §228.35(f). In addition it is recommended that the first observation occur during the first six weeks of the practicum assignment per TAC §228.35(f). It is also recommended that standards-based practices observed are documented and written feedback through an interactive conference with the candidate be provided to the candidate and to the principal mentor per TAC §228.35(f). It was noted after conversations with the Educational Administration Department Chair and program staff that informal coaching and observations were provided in a course entitled “Fall 2010 Strategies of Success” and documented in a log that was provided upon request. In addition, a copy of one of the professors’ calendars was provided with dates and names of candidate conferences. However, there was no systematic process in place for ensuring that informal observations and coaching are documented for all principal candidates per TAC §228.35(f).

Based on the evidence presented above, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.35 – PREPARATION PROGRAM COURSEWORK AND/OR TRAINING

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

Findings:

Program benchmarks and structured assessments are present per TAC §228.40(a). Evidence was provided during the document review in the form of a summary of the benchmarks. In addition, candidates are unable to progress to the next sequence of courses until they have successfully completed the courses in the previous block. This was verified during the candidate record review.

It was not evident to the TEA program specialists that Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi principal preparation program had a process in place to determine the readiness of each candidate to take the appropriate assessment per TAC §228.40(b). While it was stated that “the principal certificate also requires that the student obtain a passing score on the TExES examination for principals” in the summary of benchmarks that was provided for the document review, the data provided in the table listed in Competency III: Curriculum entitled *Percent of Candidates Passing the Principal TExES Exam on the First Attempt*, shows that thirty-four (34) candidates out of one hundred four (104) over the course of three years from 2008-2010 were

not prepared to test. The actual percentages of candidates passing on the first attempt were sixty-eight percent (68%) in 2008, sixty-seven percent (67%) in 2009, and sixty-seven percent (67%) in 2010. As a result of the comparison between the documentation provided and the data presented, it was not evident that Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi is in compliance with TAC §228.40(b). It is recommended that the program staff review individual candidate data to determine the readiness of each candidate to take the appropriate certification assessment per TAC §228.40(b) and that they create a programmatic process to determine all candidates' readiness to test per TAC §228.40(b).

The program staff did state that while they did have course benchmarks & assessments and program benchmarks, they did not have a process in place to evaluate the overall program. A document entitled "Academic Program Review of the Master of Science Degree in the Educational Administration and Research" dated August 28, 2009, was provided in the document review. The report was completed by James A. Vornburg, Professor of Educational Administration, Texas A&M University-Commerce and Fred Bonner, Professor of Higher Education Administration, Texas A&M University-College Station. The document listed strengths & weaknesses of the program and made several recommendations based on concerns. Of particular interest to the TEA program specialists were the recommendations made for overall program improvement:

- "The educational administration faculty should review the course requirements as related to SBEC proficiency area and to ensure that all students seeking K-12 principal certificates have the needed coursework to insure passage of the proficiency requirements prior to taking the exam. Student indications sometimes indicated that they felt a need for additional knowledge in these areas"; and
- "Additional structure or changes to the principal internship should be developed to help narrow the gaps in aspects of the intern's experience and give more assistance and supervision from the supervisor."

This document, in particular the recommendations, were shared and discussed with the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi staff as a means to begin to evaluate the overall program. TEA program specialists recommended that the staff continue to use program benchmarks and structured assessments to evaluate the overall program per TAC §228.40(a). It was also recommended that the program staff utilize the accountability system for educator preparation (ASEP) data, scientifically-based research practices, and internal & external assessments to continuously evaluate the design and delivery of the principal program's curriculum per TAC §228.40(c).

Documents pertaining to eligibility for admission into the program and evidence of completion of all program requirements were retained in paper and electronic format in a secure environment. Retention of records met the requirement of TAC §228.40(e).

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

Senate Bill 174/Texas Administrative Code §229

Currently, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi holds a status of “Accredited with an Action Plan” [TAC §229.3 and TAC §229.11] for one demographic group-African Americans. That demographic group had a sixty-three percent (63%) pass rate during completion year 2009-2010 and is noted in the table below, *Standard I: Results of Certification Exams*. This action plan was based on a passing standard of seventy percent (70%). The action plan was provided for review. The plan included faculty members maintaining awareness of state standards for successful programs, pre-testing all candidates to identify baseline needs for TExES exams, and providing support/re-teaching for African American candidates who demonstrate a need for extra instruction. Recommendations in the action plan included: staying abreast of current changes that are academic and/or professional in nature, providing African American candidates with more opportunities for test practice activities, and ensuring that all candidates seeking K-12 principal certificates have the needed coursework to ensure passage of the proficiency requirements prior to taking the TExES principal exam. The action plan is scheduled to begin this spring and is to be re-evaluated in August 2011. It is also important to note that members of the Department of Educational Administration stated that they work to support all principal candidates, and not just the demographic group who are indicated in the action plan.

In reviewing the pass rates for the Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi’s professional educator preparation program, it is important to discuss the pass rate performance for not only the principal certification exam, but all exams that lead to professional certification. The 2009-2010 pass rate for the principal certification exam was seventy-three point three percent (73.3%) and includes nine (9) candidates who have taken the principal exam more than one time during the 2009-2010 year. In addition, the educational diagnostician exam pass rate is fifty percent (50%) and the superintendent exam pass rate has been at fifty percent (50%) and fifty-seven percent (57%) for the 2009 and 2010 completion years. Albeit number of candidates taking these two exams is fewer than ten (10) for each test, the fact that they are not ready to test is of concern. In addition, the percent and number of candidates who passed the principal TExES exam on the first attempt were calculated for Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and presented at the opening session. Those results are noted below in the table, *Percent of Candidates Passing the Principal TExES Exam on the First Attempt*. Based on the evidence presented, it was not evident to the TEA program specialists that the candidates who took the principal TExES exam were prepared to do so.

Standard I: Results of Certification Exams

Pass Rate Performance:	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
	Final 80% Standard	Final 80% Standard	70% Pass Rate
Overall:	96%	97%	89%
Demographics (Identify only if below Standard)			
African American	NA	NA	63%
Certification Areas At Risk (Identify only if below Standard)			
Educational Diagnostician	NA	NA	50%
Superintendent	NA	50%	57.1%

Percent of Candidates Passing the Principal TExES Exam on the First Attempt

Year	Principal TExES Test	Total Number of Candidates Tested	Total Number of Candidates Passing on the First Attempt
2007-2008	68%	50	34
2008-2009	67%	24	16
2009-2010	67%	30	20

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION

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

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

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

Governance of Educator Preparation Programs

- Ensure that advisory committee meets two times per year per TAC §228.20(b); and
- Ensure that the roles and responsibilities of the advisory committee are clear to all members per TAC §228.20(b).

Admission Criteria

- Ensure that an appropriate interview or other screening instrument is used to determine each candidate's appropriateness for the principal certificate per TAC §227.10(6);
- Ensure that admission criteria are applied consistently for all applicants per TAC §227.10(7) and TAC §241; and
- Ensure that candidates have two years of creditable teaching experience prior to the issuance of the Standard Principal Certificate per TAC §241.20(4).

Curriculum

- Continue to use the seven standards and their associated competencies per TAC §241.15 as the foundation for the Principal Preparation Program's curriculum to ensure not only breadth, but depth of the standards within the curriculum.

Program Delivery & On-Going Support

- Provide consistency in documentation of the 160 clock hours required for the practicum per TAC §228.35(d)(3);
- Implement the appropriate schedule of observations per TAC §228.35(f);
- Conduct a minimum of three on-site observations within the 160 hours of the practicum with the first observation occurring within the first 6 weeks of practicum placement per TAC §228.35(f);
- Provide principal mentor training to mentors and document that the training has occurred per TAC §228.35(e);
- Ensure that the field supervisor observations of the candidate are a minimum of 45 minutes in duration and that the interactive portion of the observation must be in addition to the 45 minute observation per TAC §228.35(f); and
- Document standards based practices observed, provide written feedback through an interactive conference with candidates, and provide a copy of the written feedback to the candidates' campus principal per TAC §228.35(f).

Assessment and Evaluation of Candidates for Certification and Program Improvement

- Review individual candidate data to determine the readiness of each candidate to take the appropriate certification assessment per TAC §228.40(b); and
- Utilize accountability system for educator preparation (ASEP) data, scientifically-based research practices, and internal & external assessments to continuously evaluate the design and delivery of the overall program and the program's curriculum per TAC §228.40(c).

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS: No progress report is necessary.

- Use an advisory committee meeting template to ensure that all aspects of governance, especially as they relate to the design/delivery of curriculum, policy decisions, and program evaluation, are discussed and input is secured at advisory committee meetings and that the information is documented in the form of detailed minutes accordingly;
- Utilize the rubric that your program has created to evaluate applicants' written philosophy statements as a means to ensure that admission criteria are applied consistently for all applicants;
- Utilize a checklist to ensure that all admissions requirements, as they relate to principal certification, are documented in every applicant's file;
- Ensure the appropriateness of the practicum activities as they relate to the principal standards;
- Continue to ensure that field supervisors are experienced educators as prescribed in TAC §228.35(f);
- Continue to use program benchmarks and structured assessments per TAC 228.40(a) as candidates matriculate through the educational administration program certification coursework;
- Follow the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) meetings and minutes to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current Texas Administrative Code;
- Read the Educator Standards and Educational Testing Services (ETS) newsletters to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about curriculum and testing requirements;
- Participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Standards to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about requirements and changes in TAC rules; and
- Participate in the Dean/Director meetings to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about requirements and changes in TAC rules.

