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

Texas Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) Manual

Contents

Chapter

Chapter 1 – Accountability Overview

The Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP) is contained in Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.045. It is an accountability framework for educator preparation programs (EPPs) and provides information for EPPs, policymakers, and the public. Within this statute, the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) is charged with establishing rules governing ASEP. Key provisions of the governing legislation and rules include:

- Establishing minimum standards for initial and continuing approval of EPPs
- Establishing sanctions for EPPs that do not meet standards
- Requiring annual reporting of performance data for each EPP
- Providing publicly available consumer information to support individuals in selection of EPPs and school districts in making recruitment and staffing decisions

About This Manual

This manual provides descriptions and examples of the analyses and calculations used in calculating the values for the ASEP indicators for accreditation. These analytical approaches will be used to compute ASEP values based on the most recently available data. This manual is designed to be adopted into rule by the SBEC.

This manual begins with an overview of ASEP and accreditation, followed by methodological considerations that apply across the system (Chapter 2). Chapters 3–7 elaborate on each individual ASEP indicator and include an explanation of the analysis along with an example. Chapter 8 presents information about the recognition of high-performing EPPs. Chapter 9 describes the determination of accreditation statuses using the ASEP Index.

ASEP Accountability Indicators

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

- ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 2: Appraisal of First-year Teachers by Administrators (Principal Survey)
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a: Frequency and duration of field observations
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b: Quality of field supervision
- ASEP Accountability Indicator 5: Evaluation of Educator Preparation Programs by Teachers (Teacher Survey)

These indicators are further explained in the following chapters, including the performance standards and methods for calculations.

Chapter 2 – Methodological Considerations

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

Small Group Aggregation

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

Illustration 1 summarizes the procedure for the small group aggregation. If 10 or fewer individuals are present in a reporting group in a year, data are combined with data for the next most prior year for which there are data. If the combined (Year 1 and Year 2) group size is more than 10, then the combined group data are reported. If the combined group size is 10 or fewer, then data from the next most prior year for which there are data are combined (Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3) and the performance for the combined group is reported regardless of sample size.

Illustration 1: Overview of Small Group Aggregation Procedure



As illustrated above, use of the small group exception may result in nonreported data for ASEP for some years. Because determination of accreditation status may be based on performance across multiple years, the small group procedure allows for accreditation determinations to be based on data from nonconsecutive years, including only those years in which enough data are available.

Per 19 TAC §229.4(c)(4), if the three-year cumulated group is fewer than 10 individuals, the group is measured against the more favorable outcome of the performance standard in the current year as contained in 19 TAC §229.4(a) or an alternative performance standard of up to one candidate failing to meet the requirement, whichever is more favorable.

Illustration 2: Alternative Evaluation of Three-year Cumulative Group Procedure



Per 19 TAC §229.4(c)(5), if a two- or three-year cumulated group does not meet the performance standard, then the current year group is separately evaluated against the performance standard. If the current year group meets the standard, then the evaluation does not count as an additionally consecutively measured year.

Illustration 3: Alternative Evaluation of Multi-Year Cumulative Group Procedure



Demographic Group Conventions

As prescribed by 19 TAC §229.4(a), ASEP accountability indicators are to be reported with disaggregation by demographic group. [~~in respect to gender, race, and ethnicity.~~] For these categories, TEA uses the demographic groups [~~race, ethnicity, and gender designations~~] defined in 19 TAC §229.2[~~(14)~~].

As of this publication, Educator Certification Online System (ECOS) allows for self-identified gender designations of male and female, which are the disaggregated gender categories reported for ASEP. If no selection is made, the individual is excluded from the disaggregated performance metric calculations. However, the individual is still included in the aggregated performance metric calculations.

[~~Per 19 TAC §229.2(14).~~]ASEP uses these four categories for the race and ethnicity demographic group: African American, Hispanic, White, and Other. If no selection for race and ethnicity is made, the individual is excluded from the disaggregated performance metric calculations. However, the individual is still included in the aggregated performance metric calculations.

Rounding Conventions

Unless otherwise noted, to compute ASEP accountability indicators, conventional rounding rules are applied. For example, when rounding to a whole number, numbers that end with a decimal value of .4999 or less are

rounded down; those that end with a decimal value of .5000 or more are rounded up. When rounding to a one-place decimal, numbers that end with .9499 round to .9, and those that end with .9500 round to 1.0.

Chapter 3 – Certification Exam Pass Rate

Overview

ASEP Indicator 1 is the pass rate on certification exams approved by the EPP. The SBEC has separated this indicator into two measures: the pass rate on pedagogy tests (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. This chapter also presents a worked example for a calculation of the percent of individuals passing content pedagogy tests within a certification category, as it relates to 19 TAC §229.5(c).

Individuals Included

All individuals who are approved by an EPP to register for an examination 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. Individuals who were admitted, not provided preparation, and provided test approval only by an EPP as part of a formal arrangement with TEA upon the closure of another EPP under 19 TAC §229.4(b)(5)(G) or an Agreed Order, or the closure of a certificate route or category under 19 TAC §229.5(c) or an Agreed Order, are not included. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval.

Assessments Included

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

The examination must be the first or second attempt for the particular examination approved by the EPP for the individual. Examinations approved by the EPP and completed prior to the reporting year are used in determining the attempt-count for an individual. Results from examinations taken during the reporting year are used in the calculation of the pass rate. Examinations approved by the EPP but completed after the individual has finished the EPP are included. Examinations that are part of an exam pilot program as of the date they are approved by the EPP are excluded, both from the pass rate and from the determination of which examinations are the first two attempts.

Calculation

ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a:

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

ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b:

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

Special Methodological Considerations

Disaggregation at the Certification Class or Category Level

As described in 19 TAC §229.5(c) the performance of candidates in individual certification classes and categories are also calculated following the same procedure used for Indicator 1b. TEA uses the small group aggregation procedure described in Chapter 2 for the individual exam level. Per 19 TAC §229.5(e), results within individual certification areas are not disaggregated by race, gender, or ethnicity.

The Science of Teaching Reading examination (STR, TExES 293), [~~and~~] the Bilingual Supplemental exam (BIL, TExES 164), the Texas Assessment of Sign Communication (TASC 072), and the Texas Assessment of Sign Communication – American Sign Language (TASC-ASL 073) are used for certification in multiple certification categories (see Figure: 19 TAC §230.21(e)). As guided by 19 TAC §229.5(c), the following approach is used to identify candidates with results for these exams with the applicable certification category.

For candidates who have attempted 293, [~~or~~] 164, 072, or 073 identify the category the candidate is pursuing certification that requires 293, [~~or~~] 164, 072, or 073. TEA associates candidates with categories by reviewing the certification category being pursued, specified by the EPP on the finisher records list in ECOS and with the category(ies) of the certificate associated with the internship, should such an internship exist. In cases of discrepancies between the finisher records list and the internship, the certification category associated with the internship is used. If the candidate with a result for 293, [~~or~~] 164, 072, or 073 cannot be associated with a certification category that requires the 293, [~~or~~] 164, 072, or 073, the results for the candidate are not used in the calculation of pass rates for the purposes of 19 TAC §229.5(c).

For certification categories with multiple content pedagogy tests, the pass rates are calculated independently using the procedure described in the Calculation section of this chapter. Both pass rates are evaluated against the standard for ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b[~~in 19 TAC §229.4(a)(2)~~]. As noted in 19 TAC §229.5(c), failure to meet the performance standard for an exam required for a certification class or category results in the EPP being identified as not meeting the standard for the certification class or category. [~~If an EPP fails to meet the standard for a certification class or category for three consecutive years, the approval to offer that certification class or category is revoked.~~]

Small Group Aggregation and Enrollment Date

As described in Chapter 2, if individual demographic groups contain ten or fewer test individuals, [~~the~~] TEA adds results from the prior year for which there is data. For use in ASEP Accountability Indicators 1a and 1b, these prior-year groups use the existing rules for defining the population and counted tests, as noted in the individuals and assessments included sections above [~~continue to exclude individuals who were admitted prior to December 27, 2016~~].

Tests 291 and 391

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

Worked Examples

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Pedagogy Tests (ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a)

Step 1: Using the test approval list in ECOS, identify the population based on the Individuals Included section above [~~all individuals admitted to the EPP after December 26, 2016~~].

Step 2: Identify a list of pedagogy [~~which~~] tests to include in calculations as described in the assessments included section above [~~Pedagogy tests recommended by the EPP are included. Tests which were part of a pilot program when they were approved by the EPP and completed by the candidate are excluded~~].

Step 3: Retrieve pedagogy test results for individuals [~~candidates~~] identified in Step 1 for the examinations identified in Step 2.

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

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

ASEP Indicator 1a Example

All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual has not yet made a second attempt, already attempted the exam twice, or the test was not eligible for inclusion.

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number/ Name	Test Result
Andrea	1	160: PPR EC–12	F
Andrea	2	160: PPR EC–12	P
Betty	1	160: PPR EC–12	F
Betty	2	160: PPR EC–12	F
Betty	3	160: PPR EC–12	F
Betty	4	160: PPR EC–12	P
Carlos	1	160: PPR EC–12	P

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number/ Name	Test Result
Dana	1	160: PPR EC–12	F
Eduardo	1	160: PPR EC–12	P
Faye	1	160: PPR EC–12	F
Faye	2	160: PPR EC–12	F
Faye	3	160: PPR EC–12	F
Faye	4	160: PPR EC–12	F
George	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Imogen	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Jermaine	1	2021 K-12 Performing Arts [~~160: PPR EC–12~~]	P
Lawrence	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Mel	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Nancy	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Oscar	1	2003 Secondary English-Language Arts (edTPA) [~~160 PPR EC–12~~]	F
Oscar	2	2003 Secondary English-Language Arts (edTPA) [~~160 PPR EC–12~~]	P
Patrice	1	160 PPR EC–12	P
Quinn	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Quinn	2	160 PPR EC–12	P
Roberto	1	160 PPR EC–12	F
Roberto	2	160 PPR EC–12	P
Sally	1	368 Performance Assessment for Schools Leaders (PASL)	P

Inclusion Notes:

The results for Dana, George, Lawrence, Mel, and Nancy are not included because they failed their first attempt and have not yet completed a second attempt.

Step 6: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation, as described in the small group aggregation Chapter 3 section above. [~~If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer~~

~~individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list.~~] See Chapter 2 of this manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation procedures.

Step 7: Calculate the pass rate using the procedures described in the calculation section for ASEP Accountability Indicator 1a above [~~by dividing the number of eligible passed examinations on the first or second attempt (9) by the total number of eligible examinations passed on the first added to the total number of eligible examinations that were passed or failed on the second attempt (11). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number~~].

Example Pass Rate Calculation

$$= \frac{\text{Number of tests passed on first or second attempt}}{\text{Number of tests passed on first or second attempt or failed on second attempt}} \times 100$$

=

$$\frac{9}{11} \times 100 =$$

$$0.81818 \times 100 =$$

$$82\%$$

Example Calculation: Percent of Individuals Passing Content Pedagogy Tests (ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b)

Step 1: Using the test approval list in ECOS, identify the population based on the Individuals Included section above [~~all individuals admitted to the EPP after December 26, 2016~~].

Step 2: Identify a list of content pedagogy [~~which~~] tests to include in calculations as described in the assessments included section above. [~~Pedagogy tests recommended by the EPP are included. Tests which were part of a pilot program when they were approved by the EPP and completed by the candidate are excluded.~~]

Step 3: Retrieve pedagogy test results for individuals [~~candidates~~] identified in Step 1 for the examinations identified in Step 2.

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

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

ASEP Indicator 1b Example

All results that are not shaded in gray are excluded from calculations because the individual has not yet made a second attempt or already attempted the exam twice.

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number/ Name	Test Result
Andrea	1	391 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	613 LOTE Spanish EC–12	P
Imogen	1	232 Social Studies 7–12	F
Imogen	2	232 Social Studies 7–12	F
Imogen	3	232 Social Studies 7–12	F
Imogen	1	233 History 7–12	P
Jermaine	1	211 Core Subjects 4–8	P
Ken	1	235 Math 7–12	P
Lawrence	1	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental	P
Lawrence	1	211 Core Subjects 4–8	P
Mel	1	232 Social Studies 7–12	F
Nancy	1	158: Physical Ed EC–12	F
Oscar	1	613: LOTE Spanish EC–12	P
Patrice	1	164 Bilingual Education Supplemental	P

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number/ Name	Test Result
Patrice	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	F
Patrice	2	391 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 Roberto are combined across 291 and 391. The second attempt fail for 291 was counted, but the second attempt for 391 was not counted, because it was the fourth attempt overall for the combination of 291 and 391.

Step 6: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation, as described in the small group aggregation Chapter 3 section above. [~~If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list.~~] See Chapter 2 of this manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation procedures.

Step 7: Calculate the pass rate using the procedures described in the calculation section for ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b above [~~by dividing the number of eligible passed examinations on the first or second attempt (9) by the total number of eligible examinations passed on the first added to the total number of eligible examinations that were passed or failed on the second attempt (11). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number~~].

Example Pass Rate Calculation

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

=

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

$$0.736 \times 100 =$$

$$73.6\%, \text{which rounds to } 74\%$$

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 the population based on the Individuals Included section above [~~all individuals admitted to the EPP after December 26, 2016~~].

Step 2: Identify a list of [~~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), the Texas Assessment for Sign Communication (TASC), or the Texas Assessment for Sign Communication – American Sign Language (TASC-ASL), content pedagogy tests recommended by the EPP are included. For certificate categories that require STR, [~~or~~] BIL, TASC, or TASC-ASL 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 individuals [~~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 individual [~~candidates~~] in each field at each EPP.

Step 5: Identify which test scores to include in calculations, as defined by the calculation section above. [~~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	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Andrea	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Andrea	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P

Name	Test Attempt	Test Number / Name	Cert Category Pursued by Candidate	Test Result
Betty	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Carlos	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Dana	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Dana	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Eduardo	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Eduardo	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Faye	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Faye	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Faye	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
George	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Hector	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Imogen	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Imogen	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Imogen	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Josefina	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Josefina	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Josefina	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Kim	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Lance	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Manuel	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Manuel	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Nadia	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Naida	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Olga	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Olga	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Olga	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Pent	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Quentin	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Ramon	1	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	F
Ramon	2	391 Core Subjects EC–6	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Ramon	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Sienna	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P
Todd	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Early Childhood: EC-3	P
Uma	1	293 Science of Teaching Reading	Core Subjects with STR: EC-6	P

Inclusion Notes:

The 391 results for Dana [~~and Olga~~] and the 293 results for Imogen are not included because they failed their first attempt and have not yet completed a second attempt.

The 293 result for Todd is not included because he is 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, as described in the small group aggregation Chapter 3 section above. [~~If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list.~~] See Chapter 2 of this manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation procedures.

Step 7: Calculate the pass rate for each exam using the same procedures described in the calculation section for ASEP Accountability Indicator 1b above. Do this for each separate exam category [~~by dividing the number of examinations passed on their first or second attempt (391: 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 (391: 12; 293: 11). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number~~].

Example Pass Rate Calculation

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

=

$$\frac{12}{16} \times 100 =$$

$$0.75 \times 100 =$$

$$75\% \text{ for } 391$$

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

$$1 \times 100 =$$

$$100\% \text{ for } 293$$

Chapter 4 – Appraisal of First-Year Teachers by Administrators (Principal Survey)

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 administrators. This survey is referred to as the principal survey.

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 from ECOS and employment data from the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data. This roster is loaded into ECOS and district-level human resources staff perform roster verification in alignment with the Individuals Included section below.[~~, certifying that the individual is employed as a teacher of record in the district as of the start of the survey, was employed by the PEIMS fall snapshot date for the academic year, 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 at the campus for five or more months of the academic year [~~employed as a teacher of record as of the start of the survey~~]. If the principal does not verify these two statements, the survey is not collected.

The survey application requires the completion of all questions in the four required sections of the survey. These sections are Planning, Instruction, Learning Environment, and Professional Practices & Responsibilities. Additionally, if the principal indicates that the individual worked with students with disabilities or emergent bilingual students, these additional survey sections are displayed and required to be completed.

Following the end of the principal survey data collection period, the data is retrieved from ECOS, cleaned, processed, de-identified, and posted online. Additionally, EPP-specific reports are generated and delivered to EPPs and the public. The aggregated and disaggregated results are used as ASEP Accountability Indicator 2.

Individuals Included

All first-year teachers of record currently enrolled in an EPP or who finished an EPP program within the [~~five~~] last six years including [~~to~~] the current reporting period, who are employed as a teacher as of the start of the survey, and who were employed by the PEIMS fall snapshot date are included. See 19 TAC §229.2[~~(19)~~] for the definition of a first-year teacher. Only teachers whose effective date of [~~on~~] their first enhanced standard, standard, intern, or probationary certificates is active as of the PEIMS fall snapshot date for the academic year are included. Individuals must be reported in the PEIMS fall snapshot to be counted as employed in any year. Any individuals who began their teaching employment in the prior academic year, after the PEIMS fall snapshot, will appear as employed for the first time in the current year because they were not reported as employed in the previous year. [~~Individuals who started employment in the prior academic year after the PEIMS fall snapshot for that year are included in the current year.~~] Individuals who were incorrectly in the principal survey roster as identified by the EPP are not included. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval.

Assessments Included

All complete surveys with valid data for teachers who meet the conditions above are included. Surveys that lack valid data on any of the four required survey sections are excluded. Data from optional sections (i.e., Students with Disabilities, Emergent Bilingual Students) are included when available.

Some first-year teachers are placed at multiple campuses. When this occurs, all principals receive a request for a survey to be completed. When multiple surveys are returned, each one is scored and the survey with the highest average score is retained for the evaluation. All other scored surveys are excluded.

Calculation

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

Scoring Approach

The scoring approach weights all individual categories equally. Each item is weighted by the inverse of the number of items in the subscale. Operationally, this means that the average for each subscale is calculated, and then the average of these subscale values is calculated for the final individual-level score. The individual must average a score of 2 or better, corresponding with *sufficiently prepared*.

The individual subscales and their constituent items are presented in the table below.

Individual Subscales and Constituent Items

Subscale	Number of Items	Items in ECOS Survey
Planning	12	Q4 – Q15
Instruction	13	Q16 – Q28
Learning Environment	7	Q29 – Q35
Professional Practices & Responsibilities	6	Q36 – Q41
Students with Disabilities	6	Q43 – Q48
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.

Worked Example

Example Calculation: Principal Survey (ASEP Accountability Indicator 2)

Step 1: Retrieve principal survey data in ECOS.

Step 2: Confirm teacher included meets the rules described in the Individuals Included section above.

Step 3 [~~2~~]: Average the item scores in each subsection.

Step 4 [~~3~~]: Average the subsection values.

Step 5 [~~4~~]: Identify which surveys have the minimum acceptable score or higher.

Example Survey Data and Calculation

Name	Points by Survey Section						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	EBS	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	EBS		
Number of Questions	12	13	7	6	6	4	12	13	7	6	6	4		
Kurt	27	28	16	16		12	2.25	2.15	2.29	2.67		3.00	2.47	Y
Salvador	26	28	18	15	14		2.17	2.15	2.57	2.50	2.33		2.35	Y
Regina	25	31	19	17	18	9	2.08	2.38	2.71	2.83	3.00	2.25	2.54	Y
Silvia	22	26	16	15	13	12	1.83	2.00	2.29	2.50	2.17	3.00	2.30	Y
Rachael	30	36	20	17	18	7	2.50	2.77	2.86	2.83	3.00	1.75	2.62	Y
Myra	29	32	19	16			2.42	2.46	2.71	2.67			2.56	Y
Darla	26	29	18	14	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	2.00	2.30	Y
Guadalupe	32	33	19	14	16	11	2.67	2.54	2.71	2.33	2.67	2.75	2.61	Y
George	21	24	16	13	12	6	1.75	1.85	2.29	2.17	2.00	1.50	1.92	N
Jessie	22	25	17	13	12	6	1.83	1.92	2.43	2.17	2.00	1.50	1.98	Y
Lewis	24	25	12	7	11	8	2.00	1.92	1.71	1.17	1.83	2.00	1.77	N
Ruby	26	25	16	15	16	5	2.17	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.13	Y
Josefina	33	35	20	16	17		2.75	2.69	2.86	2.67	2.83		2.76	Y
Susan	34	33	20	15	15	11	2.83	2.54	2.86	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.66	Y
Molly	28	29	18	14	15	5	2.33	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	1.25	2.20	Y
Sam	20	25	16	15	17	11	1.67	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.83	2.75	2.33	Y
Lucy	26	29	19	17	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.71	2.83	2.50	2.00	2.41	Y

Name	Points by Survey Section						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	EBS	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	EBS		
Kevin	28	33	20	13	14		2.33	2.54	2.86	2.17	2.33		2.45	Y
Robin	29	35	19	11	13	5	2.42	2.69	2.71	1.83	2.17	1.25	2.18	Y
Mercedes	33	37	20	15	16	5	2.75	2.85	2.86	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.48	Y

Notes:

Public data sets do not include names.

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

The score for Jessie is considered meeting standard because 1.98[~~7~~] rounds to 2 (see Chapter 2).

Step 5: As necessary, perform the small group aggregation, as described in the small group aggregation section above. [~~If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list.~~] See Chapter 2 of this manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation procedures.

Step 6: Calculate the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently-prepared* or *well-prepared* for each exam and the number of surveys in total using the same procedures described in the calculation section above [~~Step 6: Count the number of first year teachers who met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently prepared* or *well prepared* (18)~~].

[~~Step 7: Divide the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently prepared* or *well prepared* (18) by the total number of surveys with valid scores (20). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.~~]

$$\frac{\text{Number of surveys meeting standard}}{\text{Total number of valid surveys}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{18}{20} \times 100 =$$

$$90\%$$

Chapter 5 – Improvement in Student Achievement of Students Taught by Beginning Teachers

Overview

ASEP Accountability Indicator 3 is the improvement of student achievement of students in the classrooms of beginning teachers. This indicator uses student data from the STAAR Annual Growth Points generated as part of the Accountability Rating System of districts, campuses, and charter schools and aggregates it to the EPP by linking the students to the beginning teachers. Once values are determined for the beginning teachers, the value for the EPP is calculated and compared to the performance standard.

Individuals Included

All beginning [~~beginner~~] teachers of record currently employed within a Texas public school who are currently enrolled in an EPP or who finished an EPP program within the last six [~~five~~] years including [~~prior to~~] their first year employed as a certified teacher of record are eligible for inclusion. Beginning [~~Beginner~~] teachers are defined in 19 TAC §229.2 [~~as teachers of record with fewer than three years of experience as a certified classroom teacher~~]. These teachers are verified through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). Certified teacher of record is identified as a teacher whose effective date for their enhanced standard, standard, intern, and probationary certificate is active in their first-year of teaching. Teachers are included in the data for up to two additional years after their first certified teacher of record year [~~their on standard, intern, and probationary certificates are included~~]. Teachers who are teaching under an emergency permit who have never held an enhanced standard, standard, intern, or probationary certificate are excluded. Teachers who previously were employed as a teacher of record without an SBEC certificate or under an emergency permit are eligible once they have an active enhanced standard. [~~a~~] standard, intern, or probationary certificate. Teachers who received initial teacher certification through a route other than preparation by a Texas EPP are excluded. Teachers with teaching assignments that include Self-Contained, English Language Arts, and Mathematics in the Class Roster data who taught students with STAAR Annual Growth Points are included. Students' STAAR Annual Growth Points are associated with the corresponding teacher in the corresponding subject area. Teachers must have 10 or greater student progress measure values associated with them within a subject area for that subject area data to be included for the teacher.

Assessments Included

The model utilizes the STAAR Annual Growth Points for individual students, calculated as described in 19 TAC Figure: §97.1001(b). The STAAR Annual Growth Points indicate the amount of improvement or growth a student has made from year to year. For STAAR assessments (with or without accommodations), progress is measured as a student's gain score—the difference between the scaled score a student achieved in the prior year and the scaled score a student achieved in the current year. Individual student progress is grouped into categories, as described in 19 TAC Figure: §97.1001(b). A student must have scores in the subject test in the prior and current year in order to have an academic growth point score. Currently, STAAR results for grades 4–8, English II, and Algebra I end-of-course (EOC), are used. Available data from all students, including students with disabilities, are used in the calculation of this measure.

Scoring Approach

The scoring approach uses multiple levels of aggregation to arrive at an evaluation of EPP performance. In the first level, TEA uses each student's STAAR Annual Growth Points associated with each teacher to evaluate whether the teacher meets the SBEC standard. In the second level, the individual teacher performances (met or did not meet the standard) are then aggregated at the EPP level, and the EPP performance is determined by calculating the percentage of teachers who met the SBEC performance standard.

First level: Teacher level

The value for the individual teacher is generated by first taking the average of the students' STAAR Annual Growth Points for each STAAR subject area taught by that teacher and multiplied by 100. In cases where there are multiple subject areas for one teacher, we calculate [~~Next, we find~~] the average of all the subject-level progress measures associated with the teacher. Then, this [~~This~~] value is compared to a value of 50, which corresponds with the students maintaining their learning progress [~~neutral annual growth~~]. If the value is 50 or greater, the individual teacher is considered to have met the individual standard.

Second Level: EPP Evaluation

Following the first level of evaluation, the value for the EPP is determined. First, we identify the number of teachers included in the population [~~sample~~] prepared by the EPP with an Annual Growth Point [~~annual growth point~~] score. Second, we count the number of teachers associated with the EPP who met the individual standard. Third, we divide the number of teachers who met the standard by the total number associated with the EPP [~~in the sample~~] and multiply [~~multiplied~~] by 100 to get a percent. This is the EPP value for Indicator 3, which is compared with the performance standard.

Special Methodological Considerations

Small Group Aggregation

Per 19 TAC §229.4(c), the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is conducted for ASEP Accountability Indicator 3. Only data from years in which ASEP Accountability Indicator 3 has been a consequential indicator are used in this aggregation. The small group aggregation procedure uses results calculated using the scoring approach effective for the year in which the values were calculated.

Worked Example

Example Calculation: Student growth of Beginning Teachers (ASEP Accountability Indicator 3)

Step 1: Identify beginning teachers [~~in their first three years serving as a teacher of record~~] who were prepared for certification by a Texas EPP, as described in the Individuals Included section above.

Step 2: Connect student rosters to STAAR assessment outcomes and teachers to student rosters, as described in the individuals and assessments included section above.

Step 3: Average the student Annual Growth Points measures for each unique combination of teacher and STAAR area, as described in the Individuals Included section above.

EPP Code (E)	Teacher (T)	Annual Growth Points (GS_S)	Course (C)
123456	111	75	Math
123456	112	65	Math
123456	112	70	ELAR
123456	113	40	ELAR

Step 4: Average the values by individual teacher.

Step 5: Compare individual teacher values to the individual standard score.

Teacher	Teacher Growth Score	Individual Standard	Met Standard?
111	75	50	Yes
112	67.5	50	Yes
113	40	50	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 number of teachers with Annual Growth Points and the number of teachers with Annual Growth Points that met the individual standard and complete the EPP evaluation described in the calculation section above [~~Count the total number of teachers with growth scores associated with the EPP (38)~~.

~~Step 7: Count the total number of teachers associated with the EPP who met the standard (29).~~

~~Step 8: Divide the number in Step 7 by the number in Step 6 and multiply by 100. This is the value for the EPP.~~]

$$\frac{\text{Number of teachers meeting individual standard}}{\text{Total number of teachers with growth scores}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{29}{38} \times 100 =$$

$$76\%$$

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

Overview

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

Individuals Included

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a, all individuals who completed an internship, residency, or clinical teaching appointment during the reporting period are included. In the cases where an internship or clinical teaching appointment overlaps two reporting years, the internship, residency, or clinical teaching 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, or probationary extension[~~, or probationary second extension~~] certificate which expires in the reporting year. Individuals completing a clinical teaching appointment are identified as being marked as a completer by the program without having held an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate. Beginning in the 2025-2026 academic year, individuals completing a clinical teaching appointment will be identified using the clinical experience record.

Individuals who have their internship certificate deactivated prior to the expiration of the certificate are removed from the data set. These deactivations must be communicated to the TEA by the EPP. Beginning in 2024-2025 academic year, these deactivations must meet the requirements specified in 19 TAC §228.73(h) in order to be removed from the calculation. Additionally, individuals who do not complete their internship, residency, or clinical teaching, due to extenuating circumstances or the issuance of a standard certificate prior to the conclusion of their internship, residency, or clinical teaching, are removed from the data set. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval.

Beginning in the 2025-2026 academic year, only individuals with clinical experiences that began on or after 9/1/2024 will be included in the evaluation of Indicator 4a.

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b

For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b, all individuals who apply for an initial enhanced standard or standard teaching certificate during the academic year are asked to submit surveys, which are completed in ECOS. Only surveys associated with an issued certificate are used for accountability purposes. Surveys are used for

accountability in the reporting year [~~academic year~~] in which the individuals are issued an initial standard teaching certificate.

Data Included

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a

All observations reported to the TEA through ECOS are used in the calculation for ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a. Observations must be reported in ECOS in the academic year during which they occurred. EPPs report the candidate's name, candidate's TEA ID, field supervisor's name, field supervisor's TEA ID, assignment begin date, assignment end date, observation date, observation duration, assignment type, notes, and any other field required by ECOS for each observation. Observations must occur within the date range of the clinical experience, as reported by EPPs in the associated clinical experience record or within the active dates of the certificate associated with the internship if a clinical experience record is not available.

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b

All exit surveys with complete data that are submitted in the reporting year are included in the data set.

Calculation

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a:

Divide the number of individuals who completed an internship, residency, or clinical teaching appointment in the reporting year who had the minimum number of required observations (as specified in 19 TAC §228.35(g) effective 8/31/2024) by the number of individuals who completed an internship, residency, or clinical teaching appointment in the reporting year. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

For 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 academic years, individuals will be evaluated against the frequency and duration requirements that were effective 8/31/2024. Beginning in the 2025-2026 academic year, individuals will be evaluated against the frequency and duration requirements specified in Chapter 228, Subchapter F that were effective as of 9/1/2024. These include the frequency and duration requirements described in 19 TAC §§228.103(b)(1), 228.105(b), 228.105(c)(1), 228.107(b), 228.107(d), 228.109(b)(1), 228.109(b)(2), 228.109(c)(1), 228.109(c)(2), and 228.111.

ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b:

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

Scoring Approach:

Individuals rate their field experience on 11 survey items (items 3–9, 11–14) on the Exit Survey using a 4-point scale where 4 = *Rarely*; 3 = *Occasionally*; 2 = *Frequently*; and 1 = *Always/Almost Always*. To meet the standard of *frequently* or *always/almost always* providing the components of structural guidance and ongoing support provision of high-quality field supervision, 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.

Special Methodological Considerations

[~~For ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a, results are disaggregated by race, gender, and ethnicity categories.~~] Per 19 TAC §229.4(c)(1), the small group aggregation procedure does not apply to indicator 4a. Per 19 TAC §229.4(c), the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is conducted for ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b. Only data from years in which ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b has been a consequential indicator are used in this aggregation. The small group aggregation procedure uses results calculated using the survey and scoring approach effective for the particular administration of the survey.

Worked Examples

Example Calculation: Frequency and Duration of [~~Internship and Clinical Teaching~~] Field Observations (ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a)

Step 1: Identify a list of all individuals completing an internship between September 1 and August 31 of the reporting year, as described in the Individuals Included ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a above. [~~These individuals are those who have an intern, probationary, probationary extension, or probationary second extension certificate which expired in the reporting year.~~]

Step 2: Identify a list of all individuals who completed clinical teaching between September 1 and August 31 of the reporting year, as described in the Individuals Included ASEP Accountability Indicator 4a above. [~~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 and connected to individuals on the list found in Step 3 [~~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 Chapter 228, Subchapter F as described in the Calculation section [~~§228.35(g) effective 8/31/2024,~~] for each individual [~~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
Carmen Adams	Intern	1:12
Carmen Adams	Intern	0:46
Christina Boyd	Intern	0:57
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	0:50
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:14

Name	Certificate / Assignment Type	Observation Duration
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Marjorie Brock	Clinical Teaching	1:09
Dora Cain	Intern	0:47
Dora Cain	Intern	0:51
Dora Cain	Intern	0:40
Dora Cain	Intern	1:00
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	1:13
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	0:38
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	0:53
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	0:47
Dianne Cannon	Clinical Teaching	1:01
Billie Daniels	Probationary	1:15
Billie Daniels	Probationary	0:58
Billie Daniels	Probationary	0:54
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	1:10
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Madeline Doyle	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Jaime Fowler	Intern	0:59
Jaime Fowler	Intern	1:07
Jaime Fowler	Intern	1:01
Jaime Fowler	Intern	1:00
Jaime Fowler	Intern	0:49
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	1:11
Chad Frazier	Clinical Teaching	1:25
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	0:58
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	0:50
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	1:00
Jean Hawkins	Probationary Ex	0:59
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	0:52
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Grace Hoffman	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Doris Hunter	Probationary	1:03
Doris Hunter	Probationary	1:19
Doris Hunter	Probationary	0:45
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	0:53
Melba Jensen	Clinical Teaching	1:01

Name	Certificate / Assignment Type	Observation Duration
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	1:20
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:58
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:50
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:59
Edmund Kennedy	Intern	0:57
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	1:47
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	0:51
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	1:05
Neil Newton	Clinical Teaching	1:02
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	1:15
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	1:01
Elsie Pearson	Probationary	0:55
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:58
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:52
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:47
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Christopher Ray	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:58
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:45
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:53
Charlie Schultz	Intern	0:52
Charlie Schultz	Intern	1:23
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	1:17
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:53
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:46
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:48
Duane Soto	Clinical Teaching	0:55
Penny Sutton	Clinical Teaching	0:59
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	0:49
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	0:45
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	0:57
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	1:25
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	1:15
Marty Wood	Clinical Teaching (28 week)	1:25

Notes:

The observations of Dora Cain and Dianne Cannon highlighted in blue, above, are not counted because these observations were less than the requirement in 19 TAC §228.35(g) effective 8/31/2024.

Step 6: Count the number of individuals on list 3 and the number of individuals who met the minimum requirement of observations required as described in the calculation section can complete the calculation [~~Identify candidates and interns who meet the minimum requirement of the number of observations required in 19 TAC §228.35(g) effective 8/31/2024~~].

Example Data Summary

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

[~~Step 7: Divide the number of candidates who received at least the minimum field observations required by 19 TAC §228.35(g) (14) by the total number of candidates who completed clinical teaching (21).~~]

$$\frac{\text{Number of candidates who met minimum requirement}}{\text{Number of candidates with field experiences}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{14}{21} \times 100 = 66.67\%, \text{which rounds to } 67\%$$

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

Step 1: Identify a list of [~~Access~~] the Exit Survey results completed by candidates between September 1 and August 31 of the academic year who meet the criteria in the Individuals Included ASEP Accountability Indicator 4b section above [~~These results are recorded without personally identifiable information~~].

Step 2: Identify which candidate scores were within acceptable values for their field supervision rating, as described in the Scoring Approach section above. [~~Candidates rate their field experience on 11 survey items (items 3–9, 11–14) on the Exit Survey using a 4-point scale where 4 = *Rarely*; 3 = *Occasionally*; 2 = *Frequently*; and 1 = *Always/Almost Always*. To meet the standard of *frequently* or *always/almost always* providing the components of structural guidance and ongoing support provision of high-quality field supervision (see 19 TAC §229.4(a)(4)(B)), responses to the applicable items must sum to equal or less than 22 points (11*2=22), corresponding with an average score of 2 or less across survey items.~~]

Example Data

Name	Total Points	Within Acceptable Values
Candidate 1	21	Y
Candidate 2	20	Y
Candidate 3	23	N
Candidate 4	19	Y
Candidate 5	18	Y
Candidate 6	18	Y
Candidate 7	17	Y
Candidate 8	14	Y
Candidate 9	19	Y
Candidate 10	25	N
Candidate 11	23	N
Candidate 12	18	Y
Candidate 13	14	Y
Candidate 14	14	Y
Candidate 15	28	N
Candidate 16	19	Y
Candidate 17	26	N
Candidate 18	13	Y

Name	Total Points	Within Acceptable Values
Candidate 19	19	Y
Candidate 20	13	Y
Candidate 21	16	Y
Candidate 22	18	Y
Candidate 23	21	Y
Candidate 24	20	Y
Candidate 25	33	N
Candidate 26	40	N
Candidate 27	26	N
Candidate 28	17	Y
Candidate 29	17	Y
Candidate 30	19	Y

Step 3: Count the number of individuals on list 1 and 2 to execute the calculation section above [~~Count the number of candidate scores that were within acceptable criteria (22)~~].

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

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

$$\frac{22}{30} \times 100 =$$

73.33%, which rounds to 73%

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

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 evaluation of educator preparation programs by teachers. This survey is referred to as the [~~(~~]teacher survey[~~)~~].

The teacher survey is administered between the beginning of April and mid-June at the end of the relevant academic year. The survey is delivered using the Qualtrics survey platform. The population of new teachers is determined using certification data from ECOS and employment data from 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 meet the eligibility requirements for inclusion.

Teachers are required to complete all questions in the four required sections of the survey. Additionally, if the teacher indicates that he or she worked with students with disabilities or students who are emergent bilingual students, those additional sections are displayed and are required to be completed by the teacher.

Following the close of the teacher survey data collection period, the data is retrieved from Qualtrics, cleaned, processed, de-identified, and posted online. The aggregated and disaggregated results are used as ASEP Accountability Indicator 5.

Individuals Included

All first-year teachers of record currently enrolled in an EPP or who finished an EPP program within the last six [~~five~~] years including [~~to~~] the current reporting period, who are employed as a teacher as of the start of the survey, and who were employed by the PEIMS fall snapshot date are included. See 19 TAC §229.2[~~(19)~~] for the definition of a first-year teacher. Only teachers whose effective date of [~~on~~] their first enhanced standard, standard, intern, or probationary certificates is active as of the PEIMS fall snapshot date for the academic year are included. Individuals must be reported in the PEIMS fall snapshot to be counted as employed in any year. Any individuals who began their teaching employment in the prior academic year, after the PEIMS fall snapshot, will appear as employed for the first time in the current year because they were not reported as employed in the previous year. [~~Individuals who started employment in the prior academic year after the PEIMS fall snapshot for that year are included in the current year.~~] Individuals who were incorrectly in the teacher survey roster as identified by the EPP are not included. EPPs communicate these exceptions to TEA via a provided form during a review period specified by TEA. These exceptions are subject to TEA approval.

Assessments Included

All complete surveys with valid data for teachers who meet the conditions above are included. Surveys that lack valid data on one or more of the four required survey sections are excluded. Data from additional sections (i.e., Students with Disabilities, Emergent Bilingual Students) 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 *sufficiently prepared*.

The individual subscales and their constituent items are presented in the table below.

Individual Subscales and Constituent Items

Subscale	Number of Items	Items in Survey (Question #)
Planning	12	Q4 – Q15
Instruction	13	Q16 – Q28
Learning Environment	7	Q29 – Q35
Professional Practices & Responsibilities	6	Q36 – Q41
Students with Disabilities	6	Q43 – Q48
Emergent Bilingual Students	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 ASEP Accountability Indicator 5. Only data from years in which ASEP Accountability Indicator 5 has been a consequential indicator are used in this aggregation. The small group aggregation procedure uses results calculated using the survey and scoring approach effective for the particular administration of the survey.

Example Calculation: Teacher Survey (ASEP Accountability Indicator 5)

Step 1: Access teacher survey results from Qualtrics.

Step 2: Confirm teacher included meets the rules described in the Individuals Included section above.

Step 3 [~~2~~]: Average the item scores in each subsection.

Step 4 [~~3~~]: Average the subsection values.

Step 5 [4]: Identify which surveys have the minimum acceptable score or higher.

Example Survey Data and Calculation

	Points by Survey Section						Average by Survey Section						Overall Average	Met Standard
Name	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	EBS	PL	INS	LE	PPR	SWD	EBS		
Number of Questions	12	13	7	6	6	4	12	13	7	6	6	4		
Kurt	27	28	16	16		12	2.25	2.15	2.29	2.67		3.00	2.47	Y
Salvador	26	28	18	15	14		2.17	2.15	2.57	2.50	2.33		2.35	Y
Regina	25	31	19	17	18	9	2.08	2.38	2.71	2.83	3.00	2.25	2.54	Y
Silvia	22	26	16	15	13	12	1.83	2.00	2.29	2.50	2.17	3.00	2.30	Y
Rachael	30	36	20	17	18	7	2.50	2.77	2.86	2.83	3.00	1.75	2.62	Y
Myra	29	32	19	16			2.42	2.46	2.71	2.67			2.56	Y
Darla	26	29	18	14	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	2.00	2.30	N
Guadalupe	32	33	19	14	16	11	2.67	2.54	2.71	2.33	2.67	2.75	2.61	Y
George	21	24	16	13	12	6	1.75	1.85	2.29	2.17	2.00	1.50	1.92	Y
Jessie	31	35	21	17	16	9	2.58	2.69	3.00	2.83	2.67	2.25	2.67	N
Lewis	24	25	12	7	11	8	2.00	1.92	1.71	1.17	1.83	2.00	1.77	Y
Ruby	26	25	16	15	16	5	2.17	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.13	Y
Josefina	33	35	20	16	17		2.75	2.69	2.86	2.67	2.83		2.76	Y
Susan	34	33	20	15	15	11	2.83	2.54	2.86	2.50	2.50	2.75	2.66	Y
Molly	28	29	18	14	15	5	2.33	2.23	2.57	2.33	2.50	1.25	2.20	Y
Sam	20	25	16	15	17	11	1.67	1.92	2.29	2.50	2.83	2.75	2.33	Y
Lucy	26	29	19	17	15	8	2.17	2.23	2.71	2.83	2.50	2.00	2.41	Y
Kevin	28	33	20	13	14		2.33	2.54	2.86	2.17	2.33		2.45	Y
Robin	29	35	19	11	13	5	2.42	2.69	2.71	1.83	2.17	1.25	2.18	Y
Mercedes	33	37	20	15	16	5	2.75	2.85	2.86	2.50	2.67	1.25	2.48	Y

Notes:

Public data sets do not include names.

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, as described in the small group aggregation section above. [~~If the aggregated group or any of the disaggregated groups contain ten or fewer individuals, perform steps 1–5 for the prior year and add those individuals to the list.~~] See Chapter 2 of this manual for further explanation of the small group aggregation procedures.

Step 6: Calculate the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as s*ufficiently-prepared* or *well-prepared* for each exam and the number of surveys in total using the same procedures described in the calculation section above [~~Step 6: Count the number of first year teachers who met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently prepared* or *well prepared* (18)~~].

[~~Step 7: Divide the number of surveys which met the criteria for being designated as *sufficiently prepared* or *well prepared* (18) by the total number of surveys with valid scores (20). Multiply this value by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.~~]

$$\frac{\text{Number of surveys meeting standard}}{\text{Total number of valid surveys}} \times 100 =$$

$$\frac{18}{20} \times 100 =$$

$$90\%$$

[Chapter 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. Commendations will not be awarded for the 2023-2024 academic year. The TEA worked with the SBEC and the EPP stakeholder advisory groups in 2018 to identify and refine a framework for recognition and issues related to EPP eligibility and calculations. In 2019, the SBEC established a four part framework for recognizing high-performing EPPs. This ASEP chapter presents that framework, related performance standards or metrics, sources of data, and descriptions of relevant calculations.

High-Performing EPP Framework

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

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

The measures within each dimension are presented in the table below. The Rigorous and Robust Preparation measures, the Preparing the Educators Texas Needs measures, and the Preparing Educators for Long-Term Success measures are calculated annually to reflect EPP performance in the prior academic year. The Innovative Educator Preparation commendation is awarded at the discretion of the Board. The TEA conducts these calculations in conjunction with the ASEP accountability calculations and presents both sets of the results to the SBEC for approval on similar schedules. In all cases, the small group aggregation procedure as described in ASEP Manual Chapter 2 is applied to these measurements. However, if the small group aggregation is used, only programs with more than 10 individuals over the three years necessary for the calculation are eligible to receive a commendation related to the measure.

High-Performing EPP Framework

Dimension	High-Performing EPP Measures	Standard
Rigorous and Robust Preparation	First test pass rate	95% or greater
	First Test Pass rate in teacher shortage areas	95% or greater
	Principal Survey % of candidates Met Standard	95% or greater
Preparing the Educators Texas Needs	Preparing teachers in shortage areas	Top 5 EPPs
	Preparing Educators of Color	Top 5 EPPs
	Preparing Teachers for Rural Schools	Top 5 EPPs
Preparing Educators for Long-Term Success	Teacher Retention as a Texas public school teacher for 5 years	85% or greater
	Educator Retention as a Texas public school professional for 5 years	85% or greater

Dimension	High-Performing EPP Measures	Standard
	Principal Employment in Principal or Assistant Principal Role within 3 years	75% or greater
Innovative Educator Preparation	Approved by the SBEC per EPP application	

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 teacher shortage subject areas. These shortage areas are identified annually and reported to the United States Department of Education. For this measure, only those content pedagogy tests necessary for certification in the specified categories are included. The standard is set at 95% or greater.

The third indicator in this category is EPP performance on the principal survey. Following the procedure in ASEP Manual Chapter 4, results on the principal survey are computed at the EPP level. The standard is set at 95% or more individuals being rated as "met standard."

Preparing the Educators Texas Needs

This dimension of high-performance identifies EPPs that prepare high percentages of educators identified by the SBEC and TEA as targeted for growth. For measures in this category, the top five programs, as a percentage of their completers, are recognized. As with all high-performing recognitions, only EPPs with an accreditation status of "Accredited" are eligible for recognition. This means that fewer than five EPPs may be recognized in any of these categories. Additionally, although the small group aggregation procedure is applied, only those programs which prepare more than 10 educators in any of the specified categories or groups once three years of data are aggregated are eligible for these commendations.

The first measure in this dimension is preparation of educators in teacher shortage subject areas. This indicator identifies EPPs that specialize in the preparation of educators for Texas identified, federally-recognized teacher shortage areas. The total number of newly standard certified teachers with a certificate in each shortage area is identified, and this is divided by the total number of newly standard certified teachers at the EPP. The top five EPPs in each identified certification category are eligible to be recognized. Each shortage area is calculated separately, and an EPP may receive a commendation for one or multiple shortage areas.

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

The third measure is preparation of teachers for rural schools. Using first year employment data available in the PEIMS database and the district level geographic designations, the TEA identifies a) teacher completers who are employed and b) teacher completers who are employed in a rural district as a teacher. The percentage of teachers working in a rural district is then calculated. The EPPs with the five highest percentages are eligible to be recognized.

Preparing Educators for Long-term Success

This dimension of high performance identifies EPPs that prepare educators who continue working in Texas public schools for at least five years. The first measure identifies the percentage of teachers who were initially certified during a given academic year and were employed as regular classroom teachers in the next academic year. A teacher is considered retained only if they maintain continuous employment as a teacher in Texas public schools on a half-time or more basis. The number of teachers continuously employed as a teacher for five consecutive years is identified and used in this measure. Using the number of educators retained for five years and the original number of employed educators five years prior, the TEA computes a percentage. The standard for recognition on this measure is set at 85% or higher.

The second measure in the dimension is continued employment in any role in the Texas public education system. The calculation for this measure is similar to the prior measure; however, this measure reports the percentage of individuals originally certified as classroom teachers continuously employed in any role for five years. The standard for recognition on this measure is 85% or higher.

The third measure in this dimension is the employment of newly prepared principals. The calculation for this standard is the percentage of newly prepared principals working in a public school in Texas in an educational leadership role (principal, assistant principal, instructional leader, etc.) within three years of obtaining principal certification. The standard for recognition on this measure is 75%.

Innovative Educator Preparation

The final dimension of recognition gives the SBEC the opportunity to designate EPPs that have implemented innovative approaches to educator preparation. Specific topic areas for innovation are updated using input from the SBEC. EPPs respond to a call for applications in a format and a timeline determined by TEA and the SBEC. EPPs must submit a complete set of materials to be eligible for recognition. TEA reviews applications for topic alignment and completeness. Appropriate applications are reviewed by an SBEC committee and approved by the full SBEC. Recognition is awarded at the discretion of the committee and the SBEC.

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

Chapter 8 [~~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 accountability. For these categories, TEA uses the demographic group [~~race, ethnicity, and gender~~] designations defined in 19 TAC §229.2[~~(14)~~]. The table below presents a matrix representation of this model.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests							
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests							
2: Principal survey							
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers							
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations							
4b: Quality of field supervision							
5: Teacher Survey							

As described in the following section, weights are assigned to the individual measure. Additionally, a weight is assigned to the "All" category, separate from the individual demographic categories.

The total number of points achieved is calculated based on the EPP performance in each measure for each group. Values are assigned for each cell in the matrix based on the current year performance and performance in the most recent prior year for which the EPP had actionable data.

Performance	Value
Met Standard	1
Did Not Meet Standard and Met Standard within the two most recent prior years	0
No Data/Small Group Exception	<blank>
Did Not Meet Standard and Did Not Meet Standard in the two most recent prior years 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 survey	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: Teacher Survey	2

The table below presents the demographic group weights.

All	6
Female	1
Male	1
African American	1
Hispanic / Latino	1
Other	1
White	1

Worked Example

Example Calculation: ASEP Index

Step 1: Identify the EPP results for all ASEP Indicators for all groups.

Step 2: Populate the results table.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	Met (1)	Met (1)	Did not meet 3 years in a row (-1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)
2: Principal survey	Met (1)	Met (1)	Did not meet (0)	Met (1)	Did not meet (0)	Met (1)	Met (1)
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	Met (1) [~~Report Only~~]	Met (1) [~~Report Only~~]	Small Group [~~Report Only~~]	Small Group [~~Report Only~~]	Met (1) [~~Report Only~~]	Small Group [~~Report Only~~]	Small Group [~~Report Only~~]
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)
4b: Quality of field supervision	Met (1)	Small Group	Small Group	Small Group	Small Group	Small Group	Small Group
5: Teacher Survey	Met (1)	Met (1)	Met (1)	Small Group	Met (1)	Small Group	Met (1)

[~~Note: Per 19 TAC §229.4(a)(3), Indicator 3 is not consequential for ASEP ratings until TEA has data necessary to calculate this performance standard for two years following the 2019-2020 academic year.~~]

Step 3: Multiply each cell by the corresponding measure weight and demographic weight.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	12	2	-2	2	2	2	2
2: Principal survey	6	1	0	1	0	1	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	18	3			3		
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	18						
5: Teacher Survey	12	2	2		2		2

Step 4: Sum all the cells to find the total points achieved (176 [~~152~~]).

Step 5: Populate the data available table.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
2: Principal survey	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	Yes (1) [~~No (0)~~]	Yes (1) [~~No (0)~~]	No (0)	No (0)	Yes (1) [~~No (0)~~]	No (0)	No (0)
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)
4b: Quality of field supervision	Yes (1)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)	No (0)
5: Teacher Survey	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	Yes (1)	No (0)	Yes (1)	No (0)	Yes (1)

Step 6: Multiply each cell by the corresponding measure weight and demographic weight.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	12	2	2	2	2	2	2
2: Principal survey	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	18	3			3		
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	18						
5: Teacher Survey	12	2	2		2		2

Step 7: Sum all the cells to find the total points possible (182 [~~158~~]).

Step 8: Divide the points achieved by the points possible. Multiply by 100. Round to the nearest whole number.

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

$$\frac{176}{182} \times 100 =$$

[~~$\frac{152}{158} \times 100 =$~~]

96.70%, which rounds to 97%

[~~96.20%, which rounds to 96%~~]