ASEP Accountability Indicators

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

- ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy and professional

Chapter 2 – Methodological Considerations

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

Small Group Aggregation

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

Illustration 1 summarizes the procedure for the s

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

Special Methodological Considerations

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

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

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

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

ASEP Indicator 1a Example

Name	Admission Date Test Date	Certificate Description Test Number / Name	Test Result
Andrea	1/15/2017	Core Subjects EC-6	
Andrea	February 2019	160:	Febr90.7 (u)-0.7 (ar)0.7 (y)]TJ0 Tc 0 Tw 7072 0 Td(66F)5.3 (e)0.00.7 (0CID 36.4BD.I

[redacted]

Example Pass Rate Calculation

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

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

Step 2: Identify which tests to include in calculations. Non-PPR exams which are necessary for the category(ies) necessary for the certificate(s) under which an individual is serving an internship and tests necessary for the category(ies) identified by the EPP on the finisher records list are included.

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

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

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

ASEP Indicator 1b Example

Name	Admission Date Test Date	Certificate Description Test Number / Name	Test Result
Andrea	1/15/2017	Core Subjects EC-6	
Andrea	October 2018	291 Core Subjects EC-6	F
Andrea	December 2018	291 Core Subjects EC-6	F
Andrea	February 2019	291 Core Subjects EC-6	F
Andrea	April 2019	291 Core Subjects EC-6	P
Betty	6/15/2017	Core Subjects	

Name	Admission Date Test Date	Certificate D

Chapter 4 – Appraisal of First-Year Teachers by Administrators

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 2 is the percent of first-year teachers who are designated as sufficiently prepared or well-prepared based on survey ratings by their principals. The SBEC has approved a new survey for use in the 2018-2019 AY, which was previously piloted in the 2017-2018 AY.

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

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

19 AY, t9 (u) (c)-4.84 g0.001 (,)-4 ((t)-2)-evo

Worked Example

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

Step 1: Retrieve principal survey data in ECOS.

Step 2: Average the item scores in each subsection.

Step 3: Average the subsection values.

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

Example Survey Data and Calculation

Name[5]	Points by Survey Section[6]						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	ELL	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	ELL		
Number of Questions	12	13	7	6										

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

Overview

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

Individuals Included

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a, all individuals who completed an internship or clinical teaching appointment during the reporting period are included. In the cases where an internship or clinical teaching appointment overlaps two reporting years, the field experience is reported in the reporting year in which it ended. Individuals serving an internship are identified for the data set if they have an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate which expires in the reporting year. Individuals completing a clinical teaching appointment are identified as being marked as a completer by the

Data Included

All observations reported to the TEA through ECOS are used in the calculation for ASEP Accountability Indicator

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 Date	Visit_Hours[7]

Name	Certificate / Assignment Type	Observation Date	Visit_Hours[7]
Jaime Fowler	Intern	11/1/18	1:07
Jaime Fowler	Intern	12/2/18	1:01
Jaime Fowler	Intern	2/7/19	1:00
Jaime Fowler	Intern	5/1/19	0:49
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	9/27/18	0:46
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	11/19/18	0:55
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	2/1/19	1:11
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	3/18/19	1:25
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	10/1/18	0:58
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	12/2/18	0:50
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	2/10/19	1:00
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	4/20/19	0:59
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	10/5/18	0:52
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	12/10/18	0:59
Doris Hunter	Probationary	9/25/18	1:03
Doris Hunter	Probationary	11/30/18	1:19
Doris Hunter	Probationary	3/30/19	0:45
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	10/1/18	0:46
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	1/10/19	0:53
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	4/5/19	1:01
Edmund Kennedy	Intern		

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

Example Data Summary

Name	Pre-Certification Teaching Experience	Number of 45-Minute Field Observations	Meet Minimum Requirement?
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	3	N
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	4	N
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	3	N
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	3	N
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	5	Y
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	6	Y
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching	6	Y

494n 494n

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

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

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

Example Data

Name	Total Points	Within Acceptable

Name	Total Points	Within Acceptable Values
Candidate 29	17	Y
Candidate 30	19	Y

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

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

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

$$\frac{66}{74} \times 100 =$$

73.33%, which rounds to

Chapter 7 – New Teacher Satisfaction

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 5 is the percent of new teachers who indicate that they were sufficiently-prepared or well-prepared by their EPP, as measured on the teacher satisfaction survey. The SBEC has approved a new survey for use in the 2018-2019 AY, which was previously piloted in the 2017-2018 AY.

The teacher survey is administered between the beginning of April and mid-June at the end of the relevant academic year. In the 2018-2019 AY, the survey was delivered using the Qualtrics survey platform. The sample of new teachers is determined using certification data and PEIMS data. This roster is loaded into Qualtrics and an email containing a link to the survey is sent to the teacher. New teachers verify that they are completing

Worked Example

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

Step 1: Access teacher satisfaction survey results.

Step 2: Average the item scores in each subsection.

Step 3: Average the subsection values.

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

Example Survey Data and Calculation

Name[9]	Points by Survey Section[10]						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
	PL	INS	LE	PL	INS	LE	PL	INS	LE	PL	INS	LE		
Number of Questions	12	13			13	7	12	13	7	12	13	7		

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

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

Step 7: Divide the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as sufficiently-prepared or well-prepared

Chapter 8 – Educator Preparation Program Commendations

Per 19 TAC §229.1(c), an accredited EPP may receive commendations for success in areas identified by the SBEC. The TEA worked with the SBEC and the EPP stakeholder advisory groups in 2018 to identify and refine a framework for recognition and issues related to EPP eligibility and calculations. In 2019, the SBEC established a four-part framework for recognizing high-performing EPPs. This ASEP chapter presents that framework, related performance standards or metrics, sources of data, and descriptions of relevant calculations.

High-Performing EPP Framework

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

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

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

High Performing EPP Framework

Dimension	High-Performing EPP Measures	Standard
Rigorous and Robust Preparation	First test pass rate[11]	95% or greater
	First Test Pass rate in teacher shortage areas	95% or greater
	Principal Survey % of candidates Met Standard	95% or greater
Preparing the Educators Texas Needs	Preparing teachers in shortage areas	Top 5 EPPs
	Preparing Educators of Color	Top 5 EPPs
	Preparing Teachers for Rural Schools	Top 5 EPPs

Preparing Educators for Long-Term 0 Ti/P 4MCs.72 0..8 214.0g Erd

This dimension of high-performance uses the same data as the ASEP accountability indicators. The first measure is the overall pass rate for a candidate's first attempt on exams. All exams, including PPR and non-PPR exams, are pooled for this measure. Following ASEP Indicator Accountability 1, only tests necessary for the certificate(s) under which an individual is serving an internship and tests necessary for the category(ies) identified by the EPP on the finisher records list in ECOS are included. The standard is set at 95% or greater.