



2017 – 2018 Continuing Approval Review Report

Introduction

A 5-year Continuing Approval Desk Review was conducted by Vanessa Alba of the Stephen F. Austin State University (174501) educator preparation program (EPP) on April 12, 2019. Per 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(b), an entity approved by the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) to certify educators shall be reviewed at least once every five years. Stephen F. Austin State University was originally approved as an EPP on November 10, 1969.

Dr. Judy Abbott, Dean, College of Education is the program Legal Authority and Carrie Baker, Back-up Legal Authority, is the primary EPP contact for the 2017-2018 review. Stephen F. Austin State University is approved for the following certificate classes: Teacher, Educational Diagnostician EC-12, Master Math Teacher 4-8 & 8-12, Master Reading Teacher EC-12, Master Science Teacher 4-8 & 8-12, Principal EC-12, Principal as Instructional Leader EC-12, Reading Specialist EC-12, School Counselor EC-12, and Superintendent EC-12. Certification is offered in these routes: Undergraduate, PB, and ACP. The EPP reported 628 program finishers for the 2016-2017 reporting year and 656 finishers for the 2017-2018 reporting year.

Candidate records were reviewed for forty (40) candidates from the following certificate classes: Five (5) Teacher, ten (10) Principal, ten (10) Educational Diagnostician, five (5) Superintendent, five (5) Reading Specialist, and five (5) School Counselor.

The results were discussed with EPP staff on May 1, 2019. Attending from the EPP were: Dr. Abbott, Katy Snyder Martin, Certification Officer, Dr. Christina Sinclair, Associate Dean & Back-up Legal Authority, Dr. Stacy Hendricks, Associate Dean, Dr. Brandon Fox, Incoming Department Chair of Elementary Education, Dr. Elizabeth Vaughan, Department Chair of Elementary Education, Dr. Jeannie Gresham, Interim Department Chair of Secondary Education & Educational Leadership, Dr. Jay Thornton, Department Chair of Kinesiology & Health Science, Dr. Robbie Steward, Department Chair of Human Services, Carrie Baker, Dr. Barbara Qualls, Dr. Lisa Mize, and Mr. Joseph Strahl, Perkins College of Education Data & Technology Manager.

Results

1. Admission requirements as identified in 19 TAC Chapters 227, 239, 241, and 242 were reviewed.

An application and interview are required for admission to the teacher program. An application was found in all five (5) files reviewed. Four (4) files, 80% did not contain evidence of an interview scored on a rubric. The program did provide a document that contained levels of performance on a 3-point scale from "Exceeds" to "Does Not Meet" for punctuality & attendance, working positively with supervisors & professionals, demonstrates collaboration with teachers & professionals, is organized & prepared for class, interacts ethically with peers, uses respectful language in classrooms, models openness to all students & ideas, shows enthusiasm and an interest in teaching, and uses classroom & technology resources appropriately. That document was provided for three (3) files, but there were no questions, responses, rubric, or scoring documents



provided for TEA to make a determination if the applicant's knowledge, experience, skills, and aptitude were appropriate for the certification sought. The EPP did not provide an interview for the fourth file. One file contained evidence of an interview scored on a rubric and rated as acceptable. The program revealed that an interview was not required until Spring 2016. All five (5) teacher candidates, 100%, were correctly reported as admitted in the Educator Certification Online System, the admit date on each formal admission letter corresponded exactly to the admit date in ECOS, and they were accurately reported on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

Ten (10) principal files were reviewed. An application was required for each principal candidate and found for all ten (10) files reviewed. A bachelor's degree is required for admission and all files contained that evidence. None the files contained evidence of screening activities to determine the candidate's appropriateness for the principal or principal as instructional leader as required. Six (6) out of ten (10) files, 60%, reviewed contained a formal offer of admission letter that corresponded exactly to the admit date in ECOS or was not required at the time of admission. The remaining four (4) files contained formal offer of admission letters, but the dates did not correspond to the admit date in ECOS or the admit date on the GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted. All files were correctly reported on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §241.5(c); 19 TAC §241.45(c); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

Ten (10) educational diagnostician files were reviewed. An application, video, resume, writing sample, and three (3) letters of recommendation are required for admission. Six (6) files, 60%, met the requirement. Four (4) files contained an application and partial information as follows: One (1) file was missing the video, two (2) files only contained the rubric for admission requirements, and one (1) file contained the resume and writing sample only. A valid classroom teaching certificate and a bachelor's degree are also required for admission. All ten (10) files contained evidence of the teaching certificate and degree. All ten (10) files reviewed did contain a formal offer of admission, but only three (3) files, 30%, contained a formal offer of admission that corresponded exactly to the admit date in ECOS or the EPP was not required to provide a formal offer of admission that the applicant was required to accept. The formal admission rule went into effect February 28, 2016. Two (2) candidates were not found on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted and TEA could not make a determination regarding accuracy of the GPA reported correctly for those files. [19 TAC §227.17 (b)-(e); 19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §239.81(a)-(b); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

Five (5) superintendent files were reviewed. All contained evidence of an application and master's degree as required, but no other screening instruments to determine the applicant's knowledge, experience, skills, and aptitude for the certificate sought were provided. Two (2) out of five (5) files reviewed contained evidence of a formal offer of admission that corresponded exactly to the admit date in ECOS. Three (3) files contained a formal offer of admission, but the formal offer did not correspond to the admit date in ECOS or what was reported as the admit date on the GPA spreadsheet. Four (4) out of five (5) files were accurately reported on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted. The fifth file contained an admit date on the GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted, but that date did not correspond exactly to the admit date that was reported in



ECOS. [19 TAC §227.17(b)-(e); 19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §242.5(c); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

Five (5) reading specialist files were reviewed. An application, interview, writing sample, and bachelor's degree are required for admission. All contained evidence of an application and a bachelor's degree as required. Three (3) out of five (5) files contained evidence of an interview scored on a rubric and the other two (2) did not. All five (5) files contained evidence of a writing sample. Four (4) out of five (5) files, 80% contained evidence of a formal offer of admission that corresponded exactly to the admit date in ECOS or a formal letter was not required at the time of admission. The fifth file contained a formal offer of admission letter, but it did not correspond to the admit date in ECOS or the admit date reported on the GPA spreadsheet. All files were accurately reported on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted or were not required to be on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted. [19 TAC §227.17(b)-(e); 19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §239.91; 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

Five (5) school counselor files were reviewed. An application, bachelor's degree, and interview are required for admission. All five (5) files contained evidence of an application and degree at the time of admission. None of the files contained evidence of an interview or other screening instrument to determine that the applicant's knowledge, experience, skills, and aptitude are appropriate for the certificate sought. Two (2) files contained a formal offer of admission letter that corresponded exactly to the admit date in ECOS or the letter was not required at the time of admission. The other three (3) files contained a formal offer of admission, but the date did not correspond to the admit date in ECOS and one (1) of those files was not found as admitted but were listed as other enrolled and as a finisher throughout their time with the program. Four (4) out of five (5) files were found on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted or were not required to be on a GPA spreadsheet. One file was not found on a GPA spreadsheet for the year admitted and a determination could not be made as to whether or not the candidate was accurately reported. [19 TAC §227.17(b)-(e); 19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §239.5; 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

All candidates in both the teacher and non-teacher classes of certification were not granted approval to test or made eligible for testing until formally admitted as required.

Admission requirements as identified in 19 TAC Chapters 227, 239, 241, and 242 were not met by all programs within the EPP and related data were not accurately reported to the Texas Education Agency as required by 19 TAC §229.3.

2. A review of candidate records revealed that candidate status in in the teacher class were correctly reported for four (4) out of five (5), 80%, files reviewed and thirty-three (33) out of thirty-five (35), 94%, non-teacher files reviewed. It was noted that one educational Diagnostician candidate was reported as a School Counselor candidate for four years from 2009-2010-2012-2013, and then did not appear again until the year that the candidate was a finisher in 2016-2017 and was reported as an Educational Diagnostician finisher. It was also noted that one Superintendent candidate was listed as other enrolled in 2014-2015, but not carried over as other enrolled in 2015-2016 or 2016-2017, but was then reported as a finisher in 2017-2018. For all candidates across all programs at Stephen F. Austin State University, thirty-seven (37) out of forty (40) reviewed, the program was 93% compliant. [19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]



3. Candidate records for clinical teaching, internship, and practicum as required by 19 TAC Chapters 228, 239, 241, 242 were reviewed.

All five (5) teacher candidates completed clinical teaching at public or private schools. All five files contained four observations in ECOS that were a duration of 45 minutes or longer. However, only one file was acceptable as reported and observations in ECOS corresponded to dates and duration on e-copies of observation documents provided. Three (3) files contained discrepancies in duration on e-copies of observations and the fourth file did not contain dates on the six (6) e-documents provided. [19 TAC §228.35(g)(1)-(8); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]

Non-teacher classes are required to complete a 160 clock-hour practicum at an accredited public or private school and be observed by a field supervisor for 135 minutes in duration.

Eight (8) out of ten (10) principal candidates had reached the point of practicum. Five (5) out of (8) files, 63%, met the 160 clock-hour practicum as prescribed. One file met the requirement, but because the practicum was during the summer months it did not meet the requirement as prescribed. The other two (2) files completed a practicum that was fewer than 160 clock-hours. One (1) out of (8) files, 13%, completed observations totaling 135 minutes in duration as prescribed, with a first contact within the first quarter of assignment and a pre- and post- observation conference for each formal observation. The remainder did not meet the requirements as prescribed because the actual observation documents were not provided and not all observations were formal observations and included check-ins and mock interviews for future principal employment. [19 TAC §228.2(26); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(A)-(B); 19 TAC §228.35(h)(1)-(3); 19 TAC §241.55; 19 TAC §241.15]

Eight (8) out of ten (10) educational diagnosticians reached the point of practicum. All eight (8) candidates completed the practicum at public or private schools. Seven (7) out of eight (8), 88%, contained evidence that the practicum was a minimum of 160 clock-hours in duration. The eighth candidate contained evidence of a 147 clock-hour practicum. There was documentation of field supervision totaling 135 minutes for all eight (8) educational diagnostician candidates, but the actual standards-based observation documents were not provided for any of the eight (8) files. Three (3) of the files contained evidence that a first contact was made within the first quarter of assignment, and three formal observations as prescribed, but only a one-page document was provided for those files. Three (3) files did not contain evidence of a first contact within the first quarter of assignment and two (2) files contained no evidence of a pre- or post-observation conference for each formal observation. [19 TAC §228.2(26); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(A)-(B); 19 TAC §228.35(h)(1)-(3); 19 TAC §239.83]

All five (5) superintendent candidates reached the point of practicum. Three (3) out of five (5), 60%, completed the practicum at public schools and the location could not be determined for the other two (2) files. The 160 clock-hour practicum could only be determined for one (1) out of five (5), 20%, superintendent candidates. All five (5) files only contained evidence of one formal observation totaling 45 minutes. There was no first contact within the first quarter of assignment, no pre- or post-observation conference for each formal observation, and the required observations were not provided for any file



reviewed. [19 TAC §228.2(26); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(A)-(B); 19 TAC §228.35(h)(1)-(3); 19 TAC §242.15]

All five (5) reading specialist candidates reached the point of practicum. All five (5) completed the practicum in public school. The practicum was a minimum of 160 clock-hours in duration for all files reviewed. The program provided evidence of three (3) observations totaling 135 minutes during the practicum for all files, but the actual standards-based observation documents were not provided. [19 TAC §228.2(26); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(A)-(B); 19 TAC §228.35(h)(1)-(3); 19 TAC §239.92]

One (1) out of five (5) school counselor files reached the point of practicum for a minimum of 160 clock-hours. It was noted that the practicum placement for that candidate was in a school setting. Six observations were provided, a start and stop time was only noted on one observation, and formal observations totaling 135 could not be determined. The field supervision did not meet the requirement as prescribed. [19 TAC §228.2(26); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(A)-(B); 19 TAC §228.35(h)(1)-(3); 19 TAC §239.15]

All documentation in candidate records provided revealed that all the non-teacher programs failed to provide adequate field supervision for candidates completing a practicum. It was also noted that the observation documents used by the field supervisor were not always standards-based.

4. A review of candidate records revealed that all five (5), 100%, teacher candidates who received standard certificates met requirements as identified in 19 TAC Chapter 230. All twenty-seven (27) non-teacher candidates, 100%, who received standard certification met master's degree requirements, years of experience as a classroom teacher as determined by a service record, and teacher certification as required for standard certification. [19 TAC Chapter 230; 19 TAC §241.20; 19 TAC §241.60; 19 TAC §239.84; 19 TAC §242.20; 19 TAC §239.93]
5. Candidate records that evidence candidate eligibility for admission to the program and completion of all program requirements for a period of five (5) years after completion, withdrawal, or discharge were retained as required. [19 TAC §228.40(f)]

Next Steps

The EPP will submit evidence to TEA that deficiencies in these areas have been corrected on or before 9/1/2019:

- Require an interview scored on a rubric with a cut score of all teacher applicants prior to admission. Ensure that all applicants know and understand the requirement by placing it on all admission documents, such as posting it on the website. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(8)]
- Require screening activities to determine each candidate's appropriateness for the certificate sought for all principal and superintendent candidates prior to admission. Utilize a cut score and publish the cut score required for each screening activity to ensure transparency in admission practices. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §241.5(c); 19 TAC §242.5(c)]



- Require a formal offer of admission for all non-teacher applicants, require that each applicant accept the formal offer of admission, and require the EPP to ensure that the date on the formal offer of admission accepted by the candidate corresponds exactly to the admission date uploaded in ECOS. [19 TAC §227.17(b)-(d)]
- Require the EPP to correctly report the admit date on the GPA spreadsheet required for accountability purposes that corresponds exactly to the formal offer of admission letter and the date uploaded as admitted for each candidate admitted each academic year. [19 TAC §227.17(b)-(e); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1)]
- Require that the EPP be consistent in admission requirements as follows: Three (3) letters of recommendation for educational diagnostician applicants; An interview scored on a rubric and writing sample for reading specialist applicants; and an interview scored on a rubric for school counselor applicants. [19 TAC §227.10(9)(b); 19 TAC §239.81(b); 19 TAC §239.91(b); 19 TAC §239.5(b)]
- Require the EPP to accurately report candidates as “other enrolled” for each year that they are in the program until they are considered a “finisher”. [19 TAC 229.3(f)(1)]
- Require that all observations uploaded in the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) system for teacher candidates completing clinical teaching correspond exactly to the documentation retained by the program in terms of frequency and duration. [19 TAC §228.35(g)(1)-(8); 19 TAC §229.3(f)(1); TEC §21.045(b)]
- Require all non-teacher candidates to complete a practicum that is a minimum of 160 clock-hours in duration, occurs at an accredited public or private school approved for that purpose, and includes field supervision totaling 135 minutes in duration. Require a first contact by the field supervisor to occur within the first quarter of assignment, require a pre- and post-observation for each formal observation, require that three (3) formal observations are conducted by the field supervisor during the first, second, and final third of the practicum assignment. Ensure that observations are standards-based for each specific certification class. Observations for non-teacher classes are not required to be uploaded in ASEP, but the program is required to maintain documentation in candidate records. [19 TAC §228.2(26); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(A)-(B); 19 TAC §228.35(h)(1)-(3)]
- Align the verbiage of the EPP to that of Texas Administrative Code (TAC).
- To ensure continuity in record keeping and other related processes, consider creating a procedure manual documenting EPP processes.



“I have reviewed the EPP Report and agree that all required corrections will be made on or before September 1, 2019”.

Signature of Legal Authority **Date**

Printed Name of Legal Authority **Date**