

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

### Compliance Audits

1. When will TEA post updated **Compliance Visit documents** online for the 2015-2016 year? Will it be posted at TEA's "Program Provider Resources" web page?  
[http://tea.texas.gov/Texas Educators/Preparation and Continuing Education/Program Provider Resources/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Program_Provider_Resources/)

*The current Compliance Audit Handbook for 2015-2016, the self-report, and the rubrics are currently posted at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/Texas Educators/Preparation and Continuing Education/Program Provider Resources/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Program_Provider_Resources/) under the "Forms and Documents" section.*

2. When will programs receive a **letter or email announcing an upcoming TEA compliance visit** for 2015-2016? Who all will receive it? Deans and Executive Directors only? How far in advance of the visit will it be sent?

*The programs who will be reviewed during the 2015-2016 academic year received a notification letter emailed to the legal authority in September after the TEA budget for the fiscal year was approved. All programs were notified at the same time, so the advance notice ranged from two to nine months.*

3. TEA Audits. What are the expectations for TEA Audits? Why does T.E.A. would want to see class notes, hand-outs, tests, etc. when they come for an audit. Where is it written in rule that institutions must provide those?

*The TEA continuing approval review expectations are shared with programs through a series of preparation webinars conducted shortly after program notification. The review materials are also posted at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/Texas Educators/Preparation and Continuing Education/Program Provider Resources/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Program_Provider_Resources/) under the "Forms and Documents" section. 19 TAC §228.10(b) requires a program to be reviewed at least once every five years under procedures approved by the TEA staff. TEA staff review instructional materials under these procedures in order to make an informed judgment on a number of TAC rules which include the extent to which:*

- *the curriculum relies on scientifically-based research;*
- *the curriculum is aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS);*
- *the coursework and training in sustained, rigorous, interactive, student-focused, and performance-based;*
- *the knowledge and skills required in the educator standards are being addressed; and*
- *the program has established benchmarks and structured assessments of candidate progress.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

Related Items = *Documentation*

4. Do EPPs have to submit their formal **Complaint Process** in writing to TEA for approval? By when?

*The deadline for EPPs to send their TEA program contact, for inclusion in the EPP's records, a complaint procedure that is in compliance with 19 TAC §228.70 is December 1, 2015. The deadline for each EPP to post on its website and at all of its physical sites used by employees and candidates information regarding filing a complaint with TEA staff is January 1, 2016. An example of a complaint procedure is posted at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/Texas\\_Educators/Preparation\\_and\\_Continuing\\_Education/Program\\_Provider\\_Resources/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Program_Provider_Resources/) under the “Forms and Documents” section. All program contacts will be send an email about these deadlines before October 30.*

5. Why is TEA requiring all programs to collect a teacher service record twice from its professional certificate and master teacher candidates, once at admission and again at exit? The state rule is that the teaching experience must be completed for certification completion, not for admission. This is a burden on the educators and the school district human resource departments to have to produce this record twice. Instead, if TEA is having a problem with a few programs not informing their candidates of the requirement, then at the time TEA audits a program, have TEA check that the program has made it clear in its program materials about the requirement.

*The issue of candidates finding out after they have completed a program that they cannot be recommended for certification because they do not have the required creditable years of teaching experience is an issue that needs to be addressed proactively by programs rather than reactively by TEA staff. Each applicant should be informed by the program of the requirements for certification prior to enrollment in the program. Applicants who do not meet certification requirements at the time of enrollment should be placed on a deficiency plan that addresses all of the requirements for certification. If a program reviews service records as part of the admission process, the program would only need to review records as part of the certification recommendation process for those candidates who did not meet the teaching experience requirement at admission. While TEA staff did require the inclusion of teacher service record data in the 2014-2015 ASEP data collection for audit purposes, TEA staff plans to distribute any changes to reporting requirements for the 2015-2016 academic year by December 1, 2015.*

6. How long has the requirement to send all observations to the campus principal been in effect? We thought that there was room in the SBEC proceedings to recommend a more appropriate person at the school. Tim asked for that when we met with him.

*The requirement to provide observations to the campus administrator has been in effect since December 14, 2008. The rule does not use “campus principal” so there is flexibility as to which campus administrator should receive a copy of the written observation feedback. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

7. For monitoring visits, do we have to show 2 years of giving observation notes to principals if it's not in TAC yet or was just approved into code recently?

*The continuing approval reviews are evidenced-based meaning that a program must have tangible evidence that the rule is being addressed in the program's operation. 19 TAC §228.35(f) requires the field supervisor to provide a copy of the written observation feedback to the candidate's campus administrator. Documentation of this provision has been included in the continuing approval rubric since 2009 and can be accomplished in a number of ways. One common option is to scan the observation and email it with a delivery/read receipt to the campus administrator. Another option is to have the campus administrator's designee sign off that the feedback has been received.*

Related Items = 227/228/229

8. What is the rationale behind increasing the Field Supervisor visits from 3 to 5 during a candidate's Internship?

*An increase in the number of field supervision formal observations is being discussed as a proposed revision to 19 TAC §228 to improve the level of ongoing support for educator candidates participating in 24-week clinical teaching and one-year internship experiences. By increasing the number of formal observations during a 24-week clinical teaching experience from three to four, candidates would receive valuable feedback from field supervisors approximately once every six weeks instead of once every eight weeks. By increasing the number of formal observations during an internship from three to five, candidates would receive valuable feedback from field supervisors approximately once every seven weeks instead of once every twelve weeks. Adding language that requires pre-observation conferences for clinical teaching and internship experiences would also improve the level of ongoing support for educator candidates. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

9. Proposed language in TAC227 regarding both Contingency and Formal Admission:  
*An alternative certification program or post-baccalaureate program shall not provide any service to applicants that leads to initial certification in any class of certificate prior to formal admission. Services may include but are not limited to coursework, training, pre-admission content examination preparation, and examination approval.* The wording that states, "services may include but are not limited to", is very broad and extremely vague, leaving the rule up to one's interpretation. This can have devastation consequences during a program's audit as you are at the mercy of the auditor's interpretation of "services" and "not limited to". If the intent of the rule is to hold EPPs accountable for content test, then the rule should state, "no pre-admission content examination preparation and examination approval". Is TEA open to changing the wording to be more specific to the services of "pre-admission content examination preparation and examination approval"?

*At the October 2015 SBEC meeting, the SBEC approved proposed revisions to 19 TAC §227 to be published in the Texas Register. The proposed revisions removed the "any services" and "include but not limited to" language. The specific services that would not be allowed prior to*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

*admission would be coursework, training, pre-admission content examination preparation, and examination approval. Stakeholders are encouraged to provide public comment, including suggestions for amending the proposed rules, during the thirty days that the proposed rules are published in the Texas Register. A link to the proposed rules will be placed on the SBEC rules website at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/About\\_TEA/Laws\\_and\\_Rules/SBEC\\_Rules\\_\(TAC\)/State\\_Board\\_for\\_Educator\\_Certification\\_Rules\\_-\\_Texas\\_Administrative\\_Code/](http://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/Laws_and_Rules/SBEC_Rules_(TAC)/State_Board_for_Educator_Certification_Rules_-_Texas_Administrative_Code/). There is also a link on the SBEC rules website to join a listserv to be notified when rules are posted. After the rules are posted, stakeholders are encouraged to provide public comment by sending an email to [sbecrules@tea.texas.gov](mailto:sbecrules@tea.texas.gov).*

### 10. Ch. 228, ITEM 11:

We wholeheartedly agree that the # of Advisory Committee meetings should be reduced from two to one. Attendance has been very low because the constituents are so busy during the school year and tired at the end of the day (when we have tried to meet so that we could avoid their school day commitments). We would like to see one meeting in early June (when school is out, but before administrators leave in July). This meeting would be much more substantial with more time to reflect on the previous school year as it relates to our program goals. Definitions-(pg. 13)

*A decrease in the minimum number of advisory committee meetings is being discussed as a proposed revision to 19 TAC §228. 19 TAC §228.20(b) states that an advisory committee shall assist in the design, delivery, evaluation, and major policy decisions of the EPP. During a continuing approval review, the review team looks for evidence (detailed minutes) that the advisory committee has performed these duties. TEA staff understands the issue of attendance and encourages the exploration of technology such as web-based conferencing and phone conferencing to include as many advisory committee members as possible in meetings. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

**11. Field Supervisor**—A currently certified educator...we were under the impression that the board asked us to present them with alternative ways to show that our faculty members are highly qualified. We have been working on a list or rubric that might include things like:

- teaches on-site undergraduate teacher education courses EC-12 schools
- models teaching in EC-12 schools
- coaches in EC-12 schools
- teaches coaching classes to field supervisors and/or teachers
- conducts research in EC-12 classrooms
- conducts workshops for teachers
- writes curriculum for EC-12

Is this still up for discussion?

*Whether or not to amend the definition of field supervisor to allow for other credentials and activities to substitute for a current certificate is being discussed as a proposed revision to 19 TAC §228. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

12. **Teacher of Record**-An educator employed...who teaches the majority of the instructional day. It was our understanding that this is still being discussed with the intent to provide some flexibility for innovative programs that begin classroom experiences as early as freshman year in college. If 4 hours is considered a half day, then, 4 1/2 hours is more than that and could be considered the majority of the instructional day to meet compliance (for student teaching purposes).

*The classroom teacher and teacher of record definitions apply to the requirements for an internship because an intern is an employee. Classroom teacher is defined in TEC §5.001(2) as an educator who is employed by a school district and who, not less than an average of four hours each day, teaches in an academic instructional setting or a career and technology instructional setting. Teacher of record is defined in 19 TAC §230.1(18) as an educator employed by a school district who teaches the majority of the instructional day in an academic instructional setting and is responsible for evaluating student achievement and assigning grades. The current rules related to clinical teaching reference a full day or half day. TEC §25.082(a) currently defines a school day as at least seven hours, including intermissions and recesses. Recent changes in statute as a result of HB 2610 reference a day to mean 420 minutes of instruction, including intermissions and recesses. Clarifying the requirements of clinical teaching and internship experiences are being discussed as a proposed revision to 19 TAC §228. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

13. 228.30 (pg. 15)

What is the difference between “Texas teacher standards” (3) and “Educator Standards?”, and Curriculum Standards? Exactly which standards have to align with our curriculum?

*The Texas teacher standards are the standards in 19 TAC §149.1001 (Texas Education Agency Rules) that were developed to inform the training, appraisal, and professional development of teachers. The educator standards are the sets of standards that have been approved by the SBEC and are currently posted at [http://tea.texas.gov/Texas Educators/Preparation and Continuing Education/Approved Educator Standards/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Approved_Educator_Standards/). Under current SBEC rules, the EPP curriculum shall include the Texas teacher standards and the educator standards for the certification being sought. Clarifying which of the curriculum requirements are for all classes of certifications and which requirements are appropriate for the classroom teacher class of certificate are being discussed as a proposed revision to 19 TAC §228. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

### Testing

14. Is there a policy on introducing new certification exams and its impact on the 80% EPP passing rate score currently needed for accreditation?

*There is nothing in current rule or policy that addresses the introduction of new certification exams and their impact on the passing rate that is used for accreditation. When new exams have been introduced, the passing standards on the new exams are based on the recommendations of committees of educators and the approval of the SBEC. The passing standards are intended to distinguish between the “just qualified” candidate and a candidate who is not qualified. Clarifying how new examinations are included in the pass rate that is used to determine accreditation status will be included in the discussion of proposed revisions to 19 TAC §229. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §229, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

15. How does TEA justify using tests taken before Sept. 1 as the first attempt under the 5 attempt rule when using tests taken before the law went into effect seems to make the law retroactive, and therefore against the US Constitution, specifically Article 1, Section 9, Clause 3, in which ex post facto laws are expressly forbidden.

*The new law created by HB 2205 is not an ex post facto law because it is not a retroactive change. The amendments to TEC §21.048 in the new law specifically provide a prospective change to the number of times one can retake a test. That is, a person who initially took an exam before September 1, 2015 may retake the exam up to four times after that date regardless of how many times he or she took it prior to September 1, 2015. Rules related to implementing the retake limitation will be discussed as part of the proposed revisions to 19 TAC §230, Subsection C. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §230, Subsection C, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

16. What impact will the current Core Subjects exam/s have towards candidates' limited number of retakes? And on EPP accreditation?

*An individual has five attempts to pass all portions of the Core Subjects exams. For the Core Subjects EC-6 (291) exam, an individual has five attempts to pass all five subject area subtests (801-805). For the Core Subjects 4-8 (211) exam, an individual has five attempts to pass all four subject area subtests (806-809). An individual is required to attempt the entire Core Subjects exam (291 or 211) on the first attempt. After the first attempt, each testing session counts as another attempt, whether the session included the entire examination or one of the subject area subtests. More information about educator certification exam retakes can be found at [http://tea.texas.gov/Texas\\_Educators/Certification/Educator\\_Testing/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Certification/Educator_Testing/).*

QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

*Unless there is a change in rule or policy, the results of the Core Subjects exams will be included in the pass rate for the 2015-2016 academic year. Under current rules, if a candidate passes all of the subtests of the Core Subjects exam before the end of the academic year in which the candidate completes the program, the result will be a passed exam for the program. If a candidate attempts the Core Subjects exam but does not pass all of the subtests before the end of the academic year in which the candidate completes the program, the result will be a failed exam for the program.*

17. We heard that the current Core Subjects exam will be divided into two 5 hr. test settings. When will this occur and will fees increase with this change?

*Dividing the Core Subjects EC-6 and Core Subjects 4-8 exams into two separate exams has been discussed as an option at the June, August, and October SBEC meetings. TEA staff has not recommended that the format of the exams change. TEA staff will continue to monitor the administration of the Core Subjects exams and provide information to the SBEC at their February 2016 meeting.*

18. What is the revised passing standard for core subject exams?

*At the June 2015 SBEC meeting, the SBEC approved a decrease of the minimum passing standards for the Core Subjects EC-6 and Core Subjects 4-8 exams for a period of one year. This change was effective on September 1, 2015. Although fewer items are needed to pass, all cut scores have been scaled to 240 to indicate a passing score. The number of questions that must be answered correctly to achieve a passing score can vary from form to form, because test forms vary slightly in difficulty. This difference is adjusted in the statistical process of calculating final, reported scores. Therefore, the table below should not be used to calculate final pass or not pass status. It is intended only to provide an estimate of the number of correct answers required to reach a passing score.*

<b>Core Subjects Passing Standards Effective September 1, 2015</b>					
<i>The approximate number of items needed to pass will vary slightly depending on the test form</i>					
<b>Core Subjects EC-6 (291) Subtests</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>	<b>Approximate Number of Items Needed to Pass</b>	<b>Core Subjects 4-8 (211) Subtests</b>	<b>Number of Items</b>	<b>Approximate Number of Items Needed to Pass</b>
<b>(801) English Language Arts and Reading</b>	65	37	<b>(806) English Language Arts and Reading</b>	65	48
<b>(802) Mathematics</b>	40	24	<b>(807) Mathematics</b>	35	17
<b>(803) Social Studies</b>	35	20	<b>(808) Social Studies</b>	35	19
<b>(804) Science</b>	45	25	<b>(809) Science</b>	35	21
<b>(805) Fine Arts, Health, &amp; Physical Education</b>	45	22			

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

19. It says this on the ETS website: “If a candidate chooses to register again for the same test after completion of the fifth testing attempt, scores will not be counted towards certification and candidates will assume responsibility for test fees paid.” It sounds like the ETS website won’t stop them from registering, they can pay the \$131, and take a test that they can’t use even if they pass it? What’s the point in even allowing them to register if they can’t use it for certification?

***Until the TEA and ETS technology systems are updated to implement the limitation of retaking a test more than four times, candidates and EPPs are responsible for limiting testing to four retakes. When the systems have been updated, EPPs will not be able to grant test approval and candidates will not be able to register for a test that has already been taken five times.***

20. Why are the Generalist EC-6 and Generalist 4-8 tests at a glance and preparation manuals still available on the ETS site? Can we get them removed to avoid student confusion?

***The preparation resources for discontinued tests (Generalist EC-6, Generalist 4-8, Bilingual Generalist EC-6, Bilingual Generalist 4-8, ESL/Generalist EC-6, ESL/Generalist 4-8, Journalism 8-12, Mathematics/Physical Science/Engineering 8-12, Physics/Mathematics 8-12, Pedagogy & Professional Responsibilities for Trade and Industrial Education 8-12) have recently been removed from the ETS website.***

21. How soon will the Music EC-12 content area test be revised since the new Music TEKS went into effect this fall? When will a new test be developed and how will it differ?

***Our draft standards and exam development plan calls for a review of all of the fine arts standards in 2016-2017. Depending on the extent of the changes and how the SBEC is going to adopt standards into rule, the process to review and revise the standards and develop or revise the testing frameworks could result in new or revised tests by 2018-2019. How the Music EC-12 test will differ from the current test will be determined by the music educator committee and the extent of the changes that were made to the music TEKS.***



## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

### ASEP

22. **ASEP Ratings** calculations – Any recent changes to how each of the four standards (Pass Rates, Beginning Teacher Performance, Student Achievement Improvement, and Field Supervision) will be calculated? How will accreditation ratings be measured for the following years (give us examples of how entity XYZ’s ASEP ratings will be calculated based on the four standards)?
- 2015 (2013-2014 data)
  - 2016 (2014-2015 data)
  - 2017 (2015-2016 data)
  - 2018 (2016-2017 data)

*The 2014 accreditation ratings that were approved by the SBEC in June 2015 used the 2013-2014 pass rate performance of certification exams. We plan to bring recommended 2015 accreditation ratings that are based on the 2014-2015 pass rates to the SBEC for approval in February 2016. We anticipate the accreditation ratings for 2016 to include, at the minimum, the 2015-2016 pass rate performance of certification exams. Accreditation ratings for 2017 and subsequent years will be determined by the rules that are in effect for each year. Clarifying how the five statutory standards (Pass Rates, Teacher Performance, Student Achievement, Field Supervision, and Teacher Satisfaction) will be calculated and used to determine accreditation status is being discussed as proposed revisions to 19 TAC §229. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §229, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

23. Do they anticipate another last minute change to the GPA reporting requirements?

*TEA staff plans to distribute any changes to reporting requirements for the 2015-2016 academic year by December 1, 2015.*

24. When can programs see the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 **Principal Surveys** about their beginning teachers? Results are not yet posted on the Consumer Information page: [http://tea.texas.gov/index2.aspx?id=2147485421&menu\\_id=2147483671](http://tea.texas.gov/index2.aspx?id=2147485421&menu_id=2147483671)

*Programs will receive their 2013-2014 principal survey individual reports by November 24, 2015. The 2013-2014 principal survey public reports will be posted on the Consumer Information page by December 1, 2015. We are currently working on the analysis of the 2014-2015 principal survey data and will have the reports distributed and posted as soon as possible. Beginning with the 2015-2016 data collection, we plan to have principal survey reports distributed and reported by December 1 of each year.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

25. Can TEA clarify what is required for the 2015-2016 ASEP reporting for Observations for undergraduates. In the past, we only reported observation in the TEA green screen ECOS for the postbac, alternative probationary 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers. It has been stated that TEA is planning to require all student teachers observations to be recorded on the ECOS green screen for the 2015-2016 year. Can TEA clarify what they will require?

*A plain reading of HB 2205 indicates that clinical teaching observations should be treated just as internships have been treated in the past. This would imply three observations of at least 45 minutes duration as explained in 19 TAC §228.35. Given the projected effective date of any proposed revisions to 19 TAC §229, we do not anticipate that programs will be held accountable for observations of clinical teaching in the 2015-2016 academic year. Programs are encouraged to record clinical teaching data in ECOS during the 2015-2016 academic year. This will enable programs to monitor their own compliance with the new law, allow them to train staff in ECOS procedures, and will help develop institutional habits and procedures that will ensure accurate reporting for 2016-2017. TEA staff plans to distribute any changes to reporting requirements for the 2015-2016 academic year by December 1, 2015. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §229, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

26. Ch. 227, ITEM 10:

Why does it still say in TEC 21.0441-(pg.7) that the overall gpa of each candidate, as well as overall cohort gpa may: “include the gpa of each person in the incoming class based on all course work previously attempted at a public or private institution of higher education OR the last 60 hours...,” yet the new TAC wording (pg. 11 and pg. 14) says “all coursework...at an accredited institution of higher education from which: the applicant is currently enrolled.” The latter reflects our recent discussions about not necessarily including transfer work, but the TEC language does not. We understand that TAC is what actually matters, we just want to make sure that this is what is being put forth for final approval on Oct. 16 to the SBEC board.

*At the October 2015 meeting, the SBEC proposed revisions to 19 TAC §227 to be published in the Texas Register. The proposed revisions did not include language that was specific to transfer grades. The intent of the rule is for EPPs to use the official transcripts to determine GPA. If adopted as proposed, unless an institution accepts grade information from transfer institutions, grade information from transfer institutions would not be included in the minimum GPA requirement for admission. Additional language could be proposed to allow transfer grades from courses that are accepted as course credit towards a bachelor’s degree at an undergraduate university to be used for the determination of a GPA from the last 60 hours. Stakeholders are encouraged to provide public comment, including suggestions for amending the proposed rules, during the thirty days that the proposed rules are published in the Texas Register. A link to the proposed rules will be placed on the SBEC rules website at [http://tea.texas.gov/About\\_TEA/Laws\\_and\\_Rules/SBEC\\_Rules\\_\(TAC\)/State\\_Board\\_for\\_Educator\\_Certification\\_Rules\\_-\\_Texas\\_Administrative\\_Code/](http://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/Laws_and_Rules/SBEC_Rules_(TAC)/State_Board_for_Educator_Certification_Rules_-_Texas_Administrative_Code/). There is also a link on the SBEC rules website to join a listserv to be notified when rules are posted. After the rules are posted, stakeholders are encouraged to provide public comment by sending an email to [sbecrules@tea.texas.gov](mailto:sbecrules@tea.texas.gov).*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

### Curriculum/Program

27. Can you discuss the new or changing roles of content area coursework in Educator Preparation Programs?

*There are numerous references in the current TEC and TAC regarding an EPP's responsibility for providing coursework and training related to the content areas for the certification fields in which the EPP is approved to provide preparation:*

- *TEC §21.048(a) (a) the SBEC shall propose rules prescribing comprehensive examinations for each class of certificate issued by the board.*
- *19 TAC §230.21(b) a candidate seeking certification as an educator must pass the examination(s) required by the TEC, §21.048, and the SBEC in TAC §233.1(e)*
- *19 TAC §233.1(e) a person seeking an initial standard certification must pass the appropriate grade level of pedagogy and professional responsibility certification examination and the appropriate content subject examination(s) for the certification sought as established by the SBEC.*
- *TEC §21.0443(b) an EPP must adequately prepare candidates for educator certification and meet the standards and requirements of the board.*
- *19 TAC §228.20(c) the governing body and chief operating officer of an entity approved to deliver educator preparation shall provide sufficient support to enable the EPP to meet all standards set by the SBEC and shall be accountable for the quality of the EPP and the candidates whom the program recommends for certification.*
- *19 TAC §228.30(a) the educator standards adopted by the SBEC shall be the curricular basis for all educator preparation.*
- *19 TAC §228.35(a)(1) an EPP shall provide coursework and/or training to ensure the educator is effective in the classroom.*
- *19 TAC §228.40(a) to ensure that a candidate for educator certification is prepared to receive a standard certificate, the entity delivering educator preparation shall establish benchmarks and structured assessments of the candidate's progress throughout the EPP.*

*Clarifying that an EPP is responsible for providing coursework and training that prepares a candidate to pass the content certification exam(s) that are required for standard certification unless an EPP requires a candidate to demonstrate content knowledge on a content certification exam prior to admission is included in the discussion of proposed revisions to 19 TAC §228. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

28. How can we get more diverse students into Educator Preparation Programs, including students who come from English Language Learner or bilingual backgrounds and can draw on these experiences to help learners?

*The Teacher Education Pathway Summit that was recently hosted by St. Edward's University is an example of how school districts, institutions of higher education, education service centers, and educator preparation programs are working together to develop an effective, incentivized, recruitment program that results in a pipeline to teacher certification for students with more diverse backgrounds. The Academy for Teacher Excellence at the University of Texas at San Antonio (<https://ate.utsa.edu/>) and the Bilingual Education Program at Texas A&M University (<http://ldn.tamu.edu/>) are two examples of nationally recognized programs that have been successful in preparing teachers with more diverse backgrounds.*

29. How can we prepare students while decreasing rather than increasing required coursework hours, which can become a deterrent to enrollment for students with less advantaged socioeconomic status?

*In responding to this question, we are assuming it refers to the 2005 legislation that limited the number of semester credit hours that a public university may require for any bachelor's degree it offers. We are also assuming that the question presumes that if a university received permission to add hours beyond the limit, the additional cost of the hours would be a deterrent to students with less advantaged backgrounds. Based on these assumptions, we can improve the enrollment and preparation of educators with less advantaged economic backgrounds by improving the collaborative effort among the TEA, the THECB, public schools accredited by the TEA, TEA-recognized private schools, educator preparation programs, regional education service centers, institutions of higher education, business interests, and community interests.*

30. A new **Teacher Standards matrix** was sent to all the educator preparation programs months ago for completion. Is there a due date for its completion? Will a new **Principal Standards matrix** be sent out soon and when is the completion due date?

*A new teacher standards matrix was sent to all programs because amendments to program requirement rules were adopted by the SBEC in August 2014. TEA staff sent the new teacher standards matrix to inform all programs about the rule change. There is no required due date for its completion unless a program has been notified of a continuous approval review.*

*The tentative schedule for any changes to 19 TAC §241, which include the educator standards for the principal certificate, involves stakeholder meetings, SBEC discussion in December, SBEC proposal in February, SBEC adoption in April, SBOE review in July, and an effective date of August 2016. After any changes to the standards become effective, a new principal standards matrix will be distributed to all programs.*

QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

31. **Online programs** - Is there a new application form to complete when offering a currently approved program as all online?

*Programs may submit amendments to their existing program by using the appropriate sections of the new program approval application. Significant program changes may require SBEC approval. The application will be posted on the Educator Preparation Program resource page at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/Texas\\_Educators/Preparation\\_and\\_Continuing\\_Education/Program\\_Provider\\_Resources/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Program_Provider_Resources/) by December 1, 2015. Clarifying what a significant program change is and adding standards for online delivery of program requirements are being discussed in proposed revisions to 19 TAC §228. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

32. If our students do well in their rigorous content courses at our university, does this content have to be repeated in the content methodology education courses? For science teachers, for example, how could all of their science content (minimum 15 hrs.) be included in a 3-hr. science methods class? We were led to understand that if those students didn't take the PACT in science (which they don't need for admission to the program because we use ACT and SAT scores, as well as content course grades), that this content has to be covered in the science methodology class. Please clarify.

*Content does not have to be repeated, but it must be able to be applied. An EPP needs to have curriculum, coursework, training, and assessments to ensure that an educator candidate is prepared to receive a standard certificate and is effective in the classroom. If an EPP substitutes prior experience and/or training by developing and implementing specific criteria and procedures for the substitution, an EPP is responsible for providing coursework and training for the remainder of the program requirements which include the pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) standards. Standard One of the PPR standards requires coursework and training so that the beginning teacher is able to design instruction appropriate for all students that reflects an understanding of relevant content and is based on continuous and appropriate assessment. Content and pedagogy, selection of instructional goals and objectives, designing coherent instruction, and assessment of learning are four components of standard one. If stakeholders have suggestions for amending 19 TAC §228, please send proposed language to [edstandards@tea.texas.gov](mailto:edstandards@tea.texas.gov) prior to November 2.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

### Other

33. **EPAC** - While we applaud the implementation of advisory groups, how will we know who are the representatives serving so we can contact members? How will agendas/minutes be shared?

*The Educator Preparation Advisory Committee (EPAC) membership was approved by the SBEC at their August 2015 meeting. The agenda item which included the proposed membership is posted at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/About\\_TEA/Leadership/State Board for Educator Certification/SBEC Meetings/2015/August/August 7, 2015 SBEC Meeting Agenda/](http://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/Leadership/State_Board_for_Educator_Certification/SBEC_Meetings/2015/August/August_7,_2015_SBEC_Meeting_Agenda/). Information related to the Educator Preparation Advisory Committee, including the current membership, meeting schedule, agendas, and minutes, will be posted on the Educator Preparation Program resource page at*

*[http://tea.texas.gov/Texas Educators/Preparation and Continuing Education/Program Provider Resources/](http://tea.texas.gov/Texas_Educators/Preparation_and_Continuing_Education/Program_Provider_Resources/) by December 1, 2015.*

34. **DACA – Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.** According to the 2012 federal DACA changes, undocumented children who migrated to the USA before age 16 can now apply for employment authorization when they become an adult here. They can also apply for a SSN. Many will be eligible to complete an educator preparation program and eligible to become certified by TEA/SBEC as an educator. However, will school districts be allowed to hire them since they are not US citizens? Do you see any challenges for them in becoming employed as a teacher? <http://www.immigrationequality.org/get-legal-help/our-legal-resources/path-to-status-in-the-u-s/daca-deferred-action-for-childhood-arrivals/>

*An employer can consider hiring a person who has been granted deferred action, has been authorized to work, and meets the other requirements for employment. An employer is not allowed to discriminate on the basis of national origin.*

35. **Educator Employment Data** - Could TEA please give all the educator preparation programs a list each year, from PEIMS, of where all of our recent cohort of finishers have become employed in Texas school districts, (include educator names, district names, TEA ID#, campus names, positions, and grade levels)?

*The report would involve linking the ASEP finisher lists from September 2015 with the PEIMS snapshot data from October 2015. TEA staff could produce this report in April of each year.*

## QUESTIONS FOR SBEC PANEL AT CSOTTE 2015

36. TEC 21.0455 (pg.16)-A statement about program closure can easily be placed on our Web site. However, placing a large poster in a highly visible area is more difficult and doesn't seem like good publicity for our program. We can imagine how someone walking into our building would feel about our program, if one of the prominent things that they see is a large poster about what would happen if our program closes. Our building doesn't have posters or signs, so it would be the only one. If having it in hard copy is the objective, we can put it in our Policies and Procedures that students read and sign. Would this be acceptable?

***There is currently nothing in rule pertaining to closing procedures for an EPP but this can be discussed as part of the proposed revisions to 19 TAC §229. TEC §21.0455 requires an EPP to notify candidates for teacher certification of a complaint process to direct a complaint against an EPP to the TEA. The notice must include the name, mailing address, telephone number, and Internet website address of the TEA for the purpose of directing complaints to the TEA. The EPP shall provide for that notification on the Internet website of the EPP and on a sign prominently displayed in program facilities. An EPP may also include this information in a student handbook, but placing it in a handbook does not supersede the sign requirement. The rules adopted by the SBEC in 19 TAC §228.70 further clarify the complaint procedure requirements.***

37. Response from TEA staff. What length of time is reasonable to expect a response from TEA staff? EX: How long does it take to obtain approval for out of state or international placement of student teachers? How long is reasonable to respond to a request for information from an institution's consultant?

***It is reasonable to expect an initial response from TEA staff, including the staff assigned to support each EPP, within one business day of the request so that the requestor knows that the request has been received. The amount of time for the request to be fully addressed depends on the nature of the request and the other responsibilities and duties required of the staff. Approval for out of state or out of country placements of clinical teachers normally takes several weeks to process but insufficient information in any area of the proposal request may delay the approval.***