

Compliance Audit Report 2014-2015 University of Houston

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 Texas Education Agency (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 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.texas.gov for details.

Contact Information: Amber Thompson, Director of Teacher Education

County/District Number: 101-502

SBEC Approval Date: November 10, 1969

Texas Education Agency Education Preparation Program Specialist, Vanessa Alba, conducted a desk compliance audit of University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP), located at 4800 Calhoun Road, Houston, TX 77004, in October, 2015, as required by Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(c) and TAC §229.6(a) which states that educator preparation programs "shall be reviewed at least once every five years". The focus of the audit was the traditional undergraduate program. The program's accreditation status is "Accredited". The following are the findings of the desk audit.

Scope of the Compliance Audit:

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

Data Analysis:

Information concerning compliance with TAC governing educator preparation programs was collected by various qualitative means. A self-report was submitted to TEA on July 8, 2015. A TEA review of documents, student records, course material, and curriculum correlations charts provided evidence regarding compliance. In addition, TEA sent electronic questionnaires to University of Houston EPP stakeholders. A total of 349 out of 2099 (17%) responded to the questionnaires as follows: six (6) out of 22 (27%) advisory committee members; 82 out of 932 educator candidates (9%); 69 out of 311 (22%) principals; 173 out of 803 (22%) cooperating teachers/mentors; and 19 out of 31 (61%) field supervisors. Qualitative methods of content analysis, cross-referencing, and triangulation of the data were used to evaluate the evidence. Evidence of compliance was measured using a rubric aligned to Texas Administrative Code.

Findings, Compliance Issues, and Recommendations:

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

Ongoing Communication and Compliance Plan:

Communication between TEA program specialist and the University of Houston EPP Director of Teacher Education occurred via phone conference on October 28, 2015, to discuss findings and request additional information. A follow-up call with the Director of Teacher Education occurred on December 11, 2015.

The compliance plan phone conference was held on December 11, 2015, and was attended by the same individuals. The compliance plan was developed to guide implementation of compliance issues. General recommendations were incorporated into the report.

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

FINDINGS:

1. Amber Thompson, Director of Teacher Education, participated in all aspects of the desk audit, including the audit conference. Amber Thompson provided support and is accountable for the quality of the educator preparation program and the candidates whom the program recommends for certification [TAC §228.20(c) and TAC §228.2(8)];
2. The advisory committee currently consists of 24 members representing two groups (19 members represent public/private schools and four (4) members represent higher education. There is also a Dean’s Advisory Council consisting of 25 members. Eight (8) members of the Dean’s advisory council are from public/private schools, three (3) members represents an institution of higher education, one (1) member represents the Education Service Center (ESC), nine (9) members represent business and community, and it is unclear who the other three (3) members represent. University of Houston EPP does not meet TAC §228.20(b) minimum requirements for advisory committee composition;
3. There was limited evidence in minutes and agendas verifying advisory committee meetings were held twice during the past three academic years. There were Operations Meeting Agendas dated as follows: August 26, 2011, March 11, 2011, February 16, 2013, May 17, 2013, November 27, 2013 (Cooperating Teacher Training discussed), and April 25, 2014. The April 25, 2014 meeting began to function more like an Advisory Committee Meeting. There was one Principal Advisory Group Meeting agenda dated May 21, 2014. There were no meetings held for 2012. University of Houston EPP does not meet TAC §228.20(b) minimum requirements for advisory committee meetings twice during each academic year (September 1-August 31);

4. Agendas, minutes, and attendee records did not indicate that the members assist in the design, delivery, evaluation, and major policy decisions of the EPP and did not meet the minimum requirements of TAC §228.20(b) and TAC §228.1(a);
5. There was limited evidence that advisory committee members understand their roles and responsibilities as noted in Operations Committee Meeting notes. The Dean's Advisory Council appeared to address the Advisory Committee requirement as noted in topics of discussion in the meeting notes provided. University of Houston EPP did not meet minimum requirements of TAC §228. 20(b).

Compliance Issues to be addressed:

- Require the Advisory Committee to include members from at least three (3) stakeholder groups [TAC §228.20(b) and TAC §228.1(a)];
- Require that the advisory committee members assist in the design, delivery, evaluation, and major policy decisions of the educator preparation program [TAC §228.20(b) and TAC §228.1(a)];
- Require the EPP to approve the roles and responsibilities of each member of the advisory committee [TAC §228.20(b)]; and
- Require the Advisory Committee to meet twice during each academic year (September 1-August 31) [TAC §228.20(b)].

Recommendations:

- Consider an Advisory Committee Handbook and/or Bylaws for the purpose of ensuring understanding of the purpose of the Advisory Committee and ensuring continuity of the Advisory Committee as membership changes;
- Utilize the TEA Advisory Committee Training PPT to train members in their roles and responsibilities. This can be emailed to members with a read receipt to serve as documentation that members have been trained annually;
- Consider a sign-in sheet for each member of the committee for each of the two meetings per academic year noting the area the member represents. It will serve as documentation that the membership is balanced and representative of all stakeholder groups and that the meetings are consistently held;
- Consider conducting the meetings via SKYPE or other electronic communication;
- Rotate the terms of the Advisory Committee members to bring fresh ideas and insights to the group; and
- Provide an incentive to the members of the Advisory Committee for their involvement and assistance with the University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP) by providing Continuing Professional Education (CPE) credit to members who need CPE hours for the renewal of their Texas certificates.

Based on the evidence presented, University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.20 – Governance of Educator Preparation Programs.

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

FINDINGS:

1. The University of Houston EPP admission requirements as identified on the website require the applicant to:
 - A. Be enrolled in an educator preparation program from an institution of higher education that is accredited by a regional accrediting agency, as recognized by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) [TAC §227.10(a)(1) and TAC §230.11];
 - B. Have a minimum 2.5 GPA or at least a 2.5 in the last 60 semester credit hours [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(A)];
 - C. Demonstrate basic skills in reading, written communication and mathematics as demonstrated by satisfactory scores on the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA) or an approved exemption [TAC §227.10(a)(4) and TAC §230.37(a)];
 - D. Demonstrate oral communication skills as listed in TAC §230.11(b)(5), a TOEFL oral speaking score of 26 and a foreign transcript evaluation by a TEA approved evaluation service [TAC §227.10(a)(5)];
 - E. Submit an application [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
 - F. Complete an interview [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
 - G. Complete a writing assessment [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
 - H. Complete a PPR Benchmark exam [TAC §227.10(a)(6)]; and
 - I. Registered for CUIIN 4375 [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
2. Fifteen (15) candidate records were provided to verify that admission requirements are followed;
3. Transcripts for each of the fifteen (15) candidates were provided to verify a GPA range of 2.2-3.92 at the time of admission [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(A)];
4. Files were provided for review (12 out of 15 files) to document that candidates met the basic skills requirement in reading, written communication and mathematics as verified on transcripts by SAT, TAAS, ACT, TAKS, or THEA [TAC §227.10(a)(4) and TAC §230.37(A)];
5. There were a total of thirteen (13) out-of-country candidates admitted between 2011-2014. Their records were provided for review as evidence that a TOEFL is required. Transcript evaluations were also provided for the files reviewed [TAC §227.10(a)(5); TAC §227.10(e); TAC §230.11(b)(5)];
6. Files reviewed contained a completed signed and dated application (13 out of 15 files reviewed) [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];

7. Documents were provided as evidence of the Interview which were scored with a rubric. It was noted that the results of the interview do not deny an applicant entry into the program [TAC §227.10(a)(6)]; The faculty are currently working to revise the Professional Dispositions and interview process. This will be finalized in the 2016-2017 academic year [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
8. A writing assessment is required and was noted on the interview form. Files were provided noting the interview and date with a 3 point rating scale for files reviewed [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
9. Applicants are required to be registered for CUIIN 4375. Files were provided for review to verify this requirement [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];
10. There were 19 candidates admitted who met the exception to the minimum GPA requirement. Documentation was signed by the program director noting the reason for acceptance for each of the 19 files reviewed [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(B)];
11. It was verified that evidence of a candidate's eligibility for admission to the program and evidence completion of all program requirements are kept for a period of 5 years. The program provided photos of files and it was noted that the program is moving to e-files [TAC 228.40(d)].

Compliance Issues to be addressed:

- None

General Recommendations:

- Strongly consider making the Interview a requirement for admission with a cut score and more than one evaluator to interview prospective candidates, to ensure inter-rater reliability, and to ensure that all potential interview bias is eliminated; and
- Consider requiring a cut score on the Dispositions to Teach to ensure that all applicants meet a standard requirement.

Based on the evidence presented, University of Houston EPP is in compliance with TAC §227.10 - Admission Criteria.

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

FINDINGS:

1. The curricular scope of the desk audit focused on the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) EC-12 content.
2. The PPR EC-12 alignment chart, Tech Apps Alignment Chart, syllabi, course outlines, and focused field-based experiences verified that the content is taught in the PPR coursework [TAC §228.30(a)];
3. A TEKS Correlation Alignment Chart completed by the program served as evidence that the relevant Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) are taught to all candidates [TAC §228.30 (a)];

4. Documentation detailing the structured assessment activity, timeline for completion, person responsible and syllabi detailing the assessments used in each course were provided for each course offered. However, there was no specific evidence (such as a transcript) to document that each candidate had met the requirement [TAC §228.40(a)];
5. A review of curriculum, course outlines, activities, and assessments served as verification that the curriculum for each educator preparation program shall rely on scientifically based research to ensure teacher effectiveness and align to the TEKS [TAC §228.30(b)];
6. It was noted that reading instruction was taught in CUIIN 3347, CUIIN 4332, CUIIN 3322, and ELED 3322. Reading in the Content Areas, Balanced Reading, and Word Study PPTs were provided as evidence of compliance that all five components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) are taught within the specific reading courses [TAC §228.30(b)(1)];
7. The code of ethics and standard practices for Texas educators, pursuant to Chapter 247 of this title (relating to Educators' Code of Ethics) is provided in the Student Handbook. There was evidence of a Handbook provided to candidates. It was also noted that the updated Code of Ethics was provided as evidence of compliance [TAC §228.30(b)(2)].
8. The coursework and training is sustained, interactive, student-focused, performance-based and included the required subject matter as required in TAC §228.30(b)(3)(A-E). PPR alignment charts, syllabi, and course outlines provided evidence of compliance. This specifically included instructional planning and delivery [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(A)]; knowledge of students and student learning was addressed in CUIIN 3316 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(B)]; content knowledge and expertise [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(C)]; and learning environment [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(D)];
9. Evidence that data-driven practice was addressed could not be located within the documentation provided [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(E)].
10. Professional practices and responsibilities are adequately addressed within the PPR EC-12 coursework [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(F)].
11. Instruction in detection and education of students with dyslexia as indicated in the Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.044(b) was provided to candidates in ELED 3322 [TAC §228.35(a)(4)].
12. Instruction in detection and education of students with mental and emotional disorders, as indicated in the Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.044(c-1) and (c-2) was provided to candidates in coursework [TAC §228.35(a)(5)].

Educator candidates and mentor/cooperating teachers reported the following regarding instruction in their respective questionnaires:

Instruction Provided in the Following Areas:	Candidates Yes/No/Don't Know	Mentor/Cooperating Teachers Yes/No
Reading Instruction for all certification areas at all grade levels	77% / 15% / 8%	79% / 21%
Dyslexia Training	38% / 51% / 11%	
Child/Adolescent Development	88% / 11% / 2%	91% / 9%
Instructional Methods for Motivating Students	88% / 13% / 0%	82% / 18%
Theories of How People Learn	94% / 6% / 0%	85% / 15%
TEKS Organization, Structure, Skills	98% / 2% / 0%	86% / 14%
Utilizing TEKS in Content Areas	97% / 2% / 2%	87% / 13%
Teacher Responsibilities for Administering the STAAR or End of Course Exams	52% / 37% / 11%	65% / 35%
How to Develop a Lesson Plan	97% / 3% / 0%	89% / 11%
Process of Curriculum Development	82% / 12% / 6%	79% / 21%
How to Utilize A Variety of Classroom Assessments with Students	95% / 5% / 0%	86% / 14%
How to Use Formative Assessments to Diagnose Student Learning Needs	91% / 9% / 0%	82% / 18%
Models and Methodologies in Classroom Management Prior to Placement as a Teaching Candidate	91% / 9% / 0%	78% / 23%

Laws and Strategies Regarding Students with Special Needs	86% / 14% / 0%	72% / 28%
Teaching Strategies for Students Designated as GT	68% / 30% / 3%	65% / 35%
Standards and Teaching Strategies for Students with Limited English Proficiency	91% / 8% / 2%	80% / 20%
Conducting Parent Conferences	61% / 33% / 6%	66% / 34%
Variety of Instructional Strategies in Your Classroom	94% / 5% / 2%	88% / 12%
Differentiating or Changing Instruction to Meet Individual Student Needs	94% / 6% / 0%	
Characteristics and Identification of Students with Mental or Emotional Disorders	60% / 34% / 6%	

Compliance Issues to be addressed:

- Provide specific instruction to candidates in data-driven practice [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(E)]; and
- Provide structured assessments of each candidate’s progress throughout the EPP [TAC §228.40(a)];

Recommendations:

- Continue to ensure that the program is addressing the most current Code of Ethics, which is located in TAC § 247.2. The most current Code of Ethics was amended to be effective December 26, 2015. Utilize the TEA Ethics video.

Based on evidence presented, University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code Section §228.30.

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

FINDINGS:

1. University of Houston EPP undergraduate program curriculum review revealed that the program has a total of 600-1230 clock-hours in the traditional program and 645 clock-hours in the post-bac program, depending on the certificate area [TAC §228.35(a)(1) and TAC §228.2(5)]. The program requires that candidates complete 315-675 clock-hours of coursework and training (traditional program) or 360 clock-hours of coursework and training (post-bac program) [TAC §228.35(a)(3) and TAC §228.2(5)] and 105 clock hours of field-based experiences prior to student teaching or internship. The total program hours and program hours prior to student teaching provided in the document review were verified in the degree plan and program hours chart;
2. Candidates are required to complete from 315-675 clock-hours (varies by certificate area) of field-based experiences prior to student teaching, documentation for the 15 files reviewed was provided as evidence of compliance [TAC §228.35(a)(3); TAC §228.35(d)(1); TAC §228.2(9)];
3. The program requires candidates to complete more than 80 clock-hours of coursework and training prior to student teaching. The evidence presented was a candidate benchmark chart [TAC §228.35(a) (3)(B)];
4. The Field-based experiences candidate records and time logs signed by the observed teacher provided by the program served as documentation that the field-based experiences were completed prior to student teaching in the 15 files reviewed [TAC §228.35(d)(1)];
5. It was noted in one candidate's file review that the candidate utilized the option of completing up to 15 clock-hours of field-based experience by use of electronic transmission, or other video or technology-based method. The documentation reviewed provided evidence of compliance [TAC §228.35(a)(3)(A); TAC §228.35(d)(1)];
6. The program provided sufficient evidence to document that field-based experiences prior to student teaching were in a variety of educational settings with diverse student populations, including observation, modeling, and demonstration of effective practices to improve student learning. [TAC §228.35(a)(3)(A); TAC §228.35(d)(1)(A-E)].
7. The program requires all coursework and training to be completed prior to educator preparation program completion and standard certification. Evidence was found in the candidate records noting where each candidate was in the process of program completion. This included benchmarks, a review of the program's schedule of coursework, and database records. Degree plans and transcripts for each candidate reviewed were provided as evidence of compliance [TAC §228.35(a)(4)];
8. The program allows candidates to complete student teaching or internship depending on if the candidate is in an initial or post-bac certification track within University of Houston EPP. All files reviewed were for candidates that had completed student teaching. Program requirements in the Student Handbook and degree plans were offered as

evidence. Specific candidate files were provided for review as evidence of compliance [TAC 228.35(d)(1); TAC §228.35(d)(2)(A); TAC §228.2(4)].

9. Documentation in the form of candidate placement lists was provided to verify that student teaching occurred in an actual school setting [TAC §228.35(d)(2)(C)(ii)].
10. A candidate placement list matched with cooperating teacher assigned and start/end dates of student teaching served as evidence of campus support. The program did meet the requirement as prescribed [TAC §228.35(e); TAC §228.2(6)].
11. There was limited evidence that University of Houston EPP provided mentor/cooperating teacher training. A narrative regarding mentor/cooperating teacher training was provided in the document review along with an initial message sent to cooperating teachers by the program director. Additionally, a PPT with Mentor Teacher Training – *Developing a new generation of math and science teachers* was provided. However, specific documentation for the cooperating teachers assigned to the candidates reviewed was not provided [TAC §228.35(e)].
12. It was documented by the program and verified that there are 37 field-supervisors at University of Houston. All but two hold an appropriate in-state or out-of-state certificate. The program provided candidate placement lists with field supervisors assigned matched to candidates. It was verified that field supervisors met the requirements as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].
13. The field supervisors did not receive yearly training as prescribed. As a result, the program did not meet the field-supervisor training requirement as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].
14. University of Houston EPP provided evidence that field supervisors made initial contact within the first three (3) weeks of the student teacher's assignment. The program met the requirements of initial contact by the field-supervisor as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].
15. Documentation verifying three (3) observations for each candidate within the 12 weeks of the student teaching assignment was inconsistent. Observation forms signed by the field supervisor and field supervisor contact logs were provided as evidence. The program did not meet the requirements of field-supervision [TAC §228.35(f)(4)].
16. A blank copy of the Observation Form was provided as evidence that observations were 45 minutes in length. It included student teacher name/field supervisor name/ ID/ lesson topic/grade level/date/start and stop time/duration. Additionally, a blank copy of a Music Evaluation Form was provided. The Student Teaching syllabi for all students was provided. However, there was no documentation for each candidate reviewed to verify that each observation was 45 minutes in duration [TAC §228.35(f)(1)].
17. Because there were no candidate observation forms, it could not be verified that the first observation occurred within the first six (6) weeks of assignment for each candidate reviewed [TAC §228.35(f)(2)].
18. It could not be verified that each field supervisor documented instructional practices observed or provided written feedback to the candidate through an interactive conference with each candidate [TAC 228.35(f)].

19. There was no evidence that the program provided a copy of the observation to the campus administrator. The documentation provided was the part of the Teacher Handbook that stated that a copy of the observation feedback is to be left with the campus administrator. The program did not meet the requirements as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].
20. There was documentation provided for one candidate to verify that additional observations and coaching were provided as requested by TEA. The field supervisor log for that candidate was provided as evidence. The program met the requirements of informal observations and coaching as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].

Compliance Issues to be addressed:

- Retain verification such as attendance lists or read receipts that mentor/cooperating teacher training occurs each year or allow the school district to provide that training and the mentor provides the documentation to the program. [TAC §228.35(e)];
- Retain verification such as attendance lists that field supervisor training occurs each year [TAC §228.35(f)];
- Require each field supervisor to conduct a formal observation and document instructional practices observed for each of the three formal observations of the candidate, require each observation to be 45 minutes in length, require an interactive conference to be held with the candidate, and provide a copy of the dated observation instrument to the candidate [TAC § 228.35(f)];
- Provide the campus administrator with a copy of each observation of the candidate [TAC §228.35(f)].

Recommendations:

- Strongly consider utilizing a standard observation instrument for each observation conducted by the field supervisors. This will assist the program in ensuring that the observations occur as prescribed and appropriate documentation is distributed and maintained by the program, field supervisor, candidate, and campus administrator and ensures that all candidates receive the same type of feedback at each formal observation.
- Consider providing Continuing Professional Education (CPE) credit to field-supervisors for their annual field supervisor training, if they need CPE hours for certificate renewal.

Based on evidence presented, University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code Section §228.35 – Program Delivery and On-Going Support.

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

FINDINGS:

1. University of Houston EPP has established benchmarks to ensure that candidates are prepared to receive standard certification [TAC §228.40(a)]. Documentation detailing the benchmark activity, timeline, and person responsible and the candidate record showing

progression through the program by verifying benchmarks was provided as evidence for 13 out of 15 files reviewed.

2. The program provided evidence that the readiness of each candidate to take the appropriate certification assessment of pedagogy and professional responsibilities, including professional ethics and standards of conduct was determined as required. It was noted by the program that 13 out of 15 candidates were listed in a spreadsheet verifying readiness to test. The University of Houston met the requirement of determining each candidate's readiness to test as prescribed [TAC §228.40(b); TAC §230.21(c)].
3. The program continuously evaluates the design and delivery of the educator preparation curriculum based on performance data, scientifically-based research practices, and the results of internal and external assessments [TAC §228.40(c)]. The evidence provided included a PACE Report, sample copies of Cooperating Teacher Evaluations, the Principal Survey, a sample copy of Student Teacher Evaluation, candidate Exit Survey results, and documentation detailing the evaluation activity, timeline, and person responsible.

Compliance issues to be addressed:

- None

Recommendations:

- Ensure that the Advisory Committee is involved in curriculum and program evaluation.

Based on evidence presented, University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.40 – Assessment and Evaluation of Candidates of Candidates for Certification and Program Improvement.

COMPONENT VI: Professional Conduct (TAC) §228.50

Findings:

1. TAC §228.50(a) states that during the period of preparation, the educator preparation entity shall ensure that the individuals preparing candidates and the candidates themselves demonstrate adherence to Chapter 247 of this title (relating to Educators' Code of Ethics).
2. The University of Houston EPP provided documentation indicating that there is no specific procedure to inform and/or discuss the Code of Ethics with program faculty. However, a system will be implemented beginning fall of 2015.
3. The University of Houston EPP provided a Student Handbook that included the Code of Ethics, but was lacking Standards 3.8 and 3.9. A blank copy of a Student Statement of reading and understanding the Code of Ethics was provided, but specific evidence for the candidates being reviewed was not provided.

Compliance issues to be addressed:

- Require the individuals preparing candidates to demonstrate adherence to Chapter 247 of this title relating to Educators' Code of Ethics [TAC §228.50]; and
- Require the candidates to demonstrate adherence to Chapter 247 of this title relating to Educators' Code of Ethics [TAC §228.50].

Recommendations:

- Ensure that the University of Houston is informing both faculty/staff and candidates about the most current Code of Ethics. It is located in TAC §247.2.

Based on evidence presented, University of Houston Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.50(a) regarding Professional Conduct.

Standard Recommendations for University of Houston EPP:

- Align the verbiage of University of Houston EPP to the verbiage of Texas Administrative Code (TAC) (ex. Field supervisor, cooperating teacher, candidate, etc.);
- Continue to follow the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) meetings and/or review the minutes to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current Texas Administrative Code;
- Continue to participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Preparation to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current requirements and changes in Texas Administrative Code;
- Continue to maintain communication with the program specialist assigned to the program; and
- Ensure that TEA staff has the most current contact information by sending update emails to the assigned program specialist.