Contents

Chapter
Chapter 1 – Accountab1 y1o

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 aggregation1 (a)6.5 T6 (§T (d)-6.9 (at)0 (g)-2 (u)7.( )0.5 (s)-5i.9 (d)-1.9 2)-3.1 (at)0.6 (o)-3 (r)-1.3(e)-2.1 ( )0.5 (ar)-1.4 (e)4 ( ) arsi

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 (1a) and the pass rate on content pedagogy tests (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

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

All certification examinations approved by the EPP are eligible for inclusion.

The examination must be the first or secdt8o((o)-1 (r)0(at)0.6 (e))6 (m)-2p9 (o)-1 (f)0.6 ( )0f1 (r)4.4 (o)-2.94(t)0.6 ( )0.5 (t)0.6 (h)-

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.

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number/ Name	Test Result
Andrea	1	291 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Andrea	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Andrea	3	391 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Andrea	4	391 Core Subjects EC–6	P
Betty	1	211 Core Subjects 4–8	P
Carlos	1	613 LOTE Spanish EC–12	P
Dana	1	158 Physical Education EC–12	F
Dana	2	158 Physical Education EC–12	P
Eduardo	1	232 Social Studies 7–12	P
Eduardo	1	154 English as a Second Language Supplemental	P
Faye	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Faye	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Faye	3	391 Core Subjects EC–6	P
George	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	P
Hector	1		

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number/ Name	Test Result
Oscar	1	613: LOTE Spanish EC–12	P
Patrice	1	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental	P
Patrice	1	291 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Patrice	2	291 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Patrice	3	391 Core Subjects EC–6	P
Quinn	1	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental	F
Quinn	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Roberto	1	291 Core Subjects EC-6	F
Roberto	2	291 Core Subjects EC-6	F
Roberto	3	391 Core Subjects EC-6	F
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

Example Pass Rate Calculation

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

$$=$$

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

$$0.736 \times 100 =$$

73.6%, which rounds to 74%

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Content Pedagogy Tests 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 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 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

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number / Name	Cert Category Pursued by Candidate	[redacted]
Andrea	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading		

Posted on November 17, 2023

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 [illegible] or [illegible] 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.

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 [redacted] .

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
Emergent Bilingual Students	4	Q50 – Q53

Special Methodological Considerations

Optional Sections and Missing Data

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

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

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	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	45	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%

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
Carmen Adams	Intern	0:56
Carmen Adams	Intern	1:02
Carmen Adams	Intern	0:45
[redacted]	[redacted]	1:12
[redacted]	[redacted]	0:46
[redacted]	[redacted]	0:57
[redacted]	[redacted]	0:50
[redacted]	[redacted]	1:14
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:09

Name	Certificate / Assignment	Type	Observation Duration
Jaime Fowler			1:01

Name	Certificate / Assignment Type	Observation Duration
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).

Chapter 7 – Evaluation of Educator Preparation Programs by Teachers (New Teacher Satisfaction)

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 5 is the percent of new teachers who indicate that they were **fully-prepared** or **well-prepared** by their EPP, as measured on the evaluation of educator preparation programs by teachers (teacher satisfaction survey).

The teacher survey is administered between the beginning of April and mid-

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) are included when available.

Calculation

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

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 [redacted].

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	4	Q50 – Q53

Special Methodological Considerations

Optional Sections and Missing Data

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

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.

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 - c

Chapter 8 – Educator Preparation Program Commendations

Per 19 TAC §229.1(d), 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-per -

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, are pooled for this measure. 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

Chapter 9 – Determination of ASEP Index Score

Overview

Per 19 TAC §229.4(b), the ASEP Index Score is 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

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 most recent prior year for which the EPP had actionable data	-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 pedagogy tests	4
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	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

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
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

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
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							