

CSOTTE Topics

Topic One – Continuing Entity Reviews

Topic Two – Alignment of Surveys with Standards

Topic Three – ASEP Annual Report

At each table, choose a timekeeper, scribe, and presenter

For each topic, review the prompt, discussion each question, and record your responses

After each topic is discussed, presenters will share out table responses with the large group

Scribes will turn in written responses at the end of the session to TEA staff so that all responses can be shared in writing with the large group

Continuing Entity Reviews

At the time of a review, the entity shall submit to the TEA staff a status report regarding its compliance with existing standards and requirements:

- ownership and governance of the EPP;
- criteria for admission to the EPP;
- EPP curriculum;
- EPP coursework and/or training, including ongoing support during clinical teaching, internship, and practicum experiences;
- certification procedures;
- assessment and evaluation of candidates for certification and EPP improvement;
- professional conduct of EPP staff and candidates;
- EPP complaint procedures; and
- required submissions of information, surveys, and other accountability data.

Questions to discuss at your table:

1. What should a status report contain?
2. How is a discretionary review status report different from a five-year review status report?
3. What should the relationship be between process inputs and performance outcomes?

Continuing Entity Reviews

TEA staff shall, at the minimum, use the following risk factors to determine the need for discretionary reviews and the type of five-year reviews:

- a history of the program's compliance with state law and board rules, standards, and procedures, with consideration given to:
 - the seriousness of any violation of a rule, standard, or procedure;
 - whether the violation resulted in an action being taken against the program;
 - whether the violation was promptly remedied by the program;
 - the number of alleged violations; and
 - any other matter considered to be appropriate in evaluating the program's compliance history;

Questions to discuss at your table:

1. How should TEA staff distinguish between the seriousness of violations?
2. How should violations that do not result in actions be considered?
3. What should determine promptness?
4. Should it be the number of violations or a percentage based on the number of candidates?
5. What other matters should be considered and how should they be considered?

Continuing Entity Reviews

TEA staff shall, at the minimum, use the following risk factors to determine the need for discretionary reviews and the type of five-year reviews:

- whether the program meets the accountability standards under Texas Education Code, §21.045; and

Questions to discuss at your table:

1. How should action plans be incorporated into discretionary or five-year reviews?
2. Should there be difference in which standards are being met? Is one standard more important than another?
3. Should a program that has met all standards over five years, a program that has been increasing the number of standards met over time, and a program that has been decreasing the number of standards met over time be reviewed differently? If so, how should the reviews be different?

Continuing Entity Reviews

TEA staff shall, at the minimum, use the following risk factors to determine the need for discretionary reviews and the type of five-year reviews:

- whether a program is accredited by other organizations.

Questions to discuss at your table:

1. What accrediting organizations should be considered?
2. How should a program's accreditation by another organization be considered?
3. How should a program's accreditation review by another organization be considered?

Alignment of Surveys with Standards

Principal Survey - The results of appraisals of first-year teachers by administrators, based on a survey in a form to be approved by the SBEC. The performance standard shall be the percentage of first-year teachers from each EPP who are appraised as "sufficiently prepared" or "well prepared."

Teacher Satisfaction Survey - The results from a teacher satisfaction survey, in a form approved by the SBEC, of new teachers administered at the end of the first year of teaching under a standard certificate. The performance standard shall be the percentage of teachers who respond that they were "sufficiently prepared" or "well prepared" by their EPP.

Alignment of Surveys with Standards

Questions to discuss at your table:

1. To what degree should the Principal and Teacher Satisfaction Surveys be aligned to the Texas Teacher Standards?
2. If it needs to be aligned to the standards, should it be aligned at the standard or proficiency level?
3. To what degree should the Principal and Teacher Satisfaction Surveys be aligned to the Texas Teacher Evaluation and Support System rubric?
4. If it needs to be aligned to the rubric, should it be aligned at the dimension or descriptor level?
5. If it needs to be aligned to the rubric, how should “sufficiently prepared” or “well prepared” be aligned with the rubric ratings?
6. To what degree should the Principal and the Teacher Satisfaction Surveys be aligned with each other?

An ASEP Annual Report populated with 2014-2015 data will be published on the TEA web site in December of 2016 for each EPP. EPPs will be sent their own data for review in late October so that any discrepancies can be addressed.

Question to discuss at your table:

1. What changes need to be made to format or footnotes on the Minimum Accountability Standards page?
2. What changes need to be made to format or footnotes on the Annual Performance Report Indicators page?
3. What changes need to be made to format or footnotes on the Consumer Information page?