

Measure 1 (Initial): Completer effectiveness. (R4.1)

Goal 11 Completer Effectiveness (Part a)

- a. Program completers effectively contribute to P-12 student learning growth

Student Growth Data (2024-2025)

Educator preparation programs are held accountable for student growth through the STAAR progress measures. ASEP Accountability Indicator 3 focuses on improving student achievement in the classrooms of beginning teachers. This indicator uses student data from the STAAR progress measure 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 who have completed the EPP. Once values are determined for beginning teachers, the EPP value is calculated and compared to the performance standard.

All beginner teachers of record are currently employed within a Texas public school. Beginner teachers are defined as teachers of record with three (3) or fewer consecutive years of teaching. These teachers are verified through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). Teachers on standard, intern, and probationary certificates are included. Teachers who are teaching under an emergency permit are excluded. Teachers who received initial teacher certification through a route other than preparation by a Texas EPP are excluded. Teachers who left the teaching workforce before three consecutive years of teaching and subsequently reentered the teaching workforce are excluded. Teachers of students with STAAR progress measures are included. Students' STAAR progress measures are associated with the corresponding teacher as contained in the assessment data. 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 progress measure for individual students, calculated as described in 19 TAC Figure: §97.1001(b). The STAAR progress measure indicates 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 then categorized as Limited, Expected, or Accelerated. If a student's STAAR progress measure is Expected, he or she met growth expectations. If the student's STAAR progress measure is Accelerated, he or she exceeded growth expectations. Currently, STAAR results for grades 4–8, English II, and Algebra I end-of-course (EOC) are utilized. Available data from all students, including those with disabilities, are used to calculate this measure.

Scoring Approach

The scoring approach first determines a value for the teacher based on the student's STAAR progress measures. TEA then compares the teacher's score to the individual standard. The individual teacher performances are then aggregated at the EPP level, and the EPP performance is determined. This EPP value is then compared with the performance standard. Teacher-level aggregation: the value for the individual teacher is generated by first averaging the students' progress measures for each STAAR subject area the teacher teaches, and then multiplying by 100. Next, we find the average of all the subject-level progress measures associated with the teacher. This value is compared to 50, which corresponds to neutral student growth. If the value is 50 or greater, the individual teacher is considered to have met the individual standard. EPP Score Determination: Following the performance standard determination for individual teachers, the EPP score is calculated. The number of teachers associated with the EPP who met the individual standard is divided by the total number of teachers associated with the EPP in the sample, and the result is multiplied by 100 to express it as a percentage.

Analysis

Our program had 39 new teachers to whom the growth model was applied. Of those 30, only 6 did not meet the standard (20%). In the previous year (2023-2024), 26% did not meet the standard. TEA has removed the content indicator for the last two years.

org_name	gender	ethnicity	ind_met_standard
Midwestern State University	F	African American	0
Midwestern State University	F	Hispanic	1
Midwestern State University	F	African American	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	0
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	M	African American	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	M	Other	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	0
Midwestern State University	M	Hispanic	0
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	Hispanic	0
Midwestern State University	M	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	F	White	0
Midwestern State University	F	White	1
Midwestern State University	M	White	0
Midwestern State University	F	Hispanic	1

Goal 11 Completer Effectiveness (Part b)

b. Program completers apply the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions that the preparation experiences were designed to achieve

Each program assesses completer disposition using the final version of the Disposition Assessment. Program analysis is completed through an annual cycle and includes among other items, data related to this goal. Overall, 99% of candidates either meet acceptable or exceed expectations on Final Disposition Assessments.

Candidates in the teacher education program are first evaluated on their dispositions towards the 10 InTASC standards during the block A methods courses. Candidates are evaluated by faculty in those courses at a developing level of competency, as evaluated by the academic committee on program quality. Candidates are evaluated based upon evidence gathered through clinical teaching, unit planning

and impact on student learning.

Criteria	% Unacceptable	% Acceptable	% Exceeds Expectations
Learner Development - candidates respect learners' differing strengths and needs and are committed to using this information to further each learner's development.	1.89%	15.09%	83.02%
Learning Differences - candidates believe that all learners can achieve at high levels and persist in helping each learner reach his/her full potential.	1.89%	20.75%	77.36%
Learning Environment - candidates are committed to working with learners, colleagues, families, and communities to establish positive and supportive learning environments.	0%	15.09%	84.91%
Content Knowledge - candidates realize that content knowledge is not a fixed body of facts but is complex, culturally situated, and ever-evolving. He or she stays up-to-date with new ideas and developments in the field.	0%	22.64%	77.36%
Application of Content - Candidates value flexible learning environments that encourage learners to explore, discover, and express themselves across various content areas.	1.89%	20.75%	77.36%
Assessment - candidates are committed to using multiple types of assessment processes to support, verify, and document learning.	1.89%	16.89%	81.13%
Planning for Instruction - candidates respect learners' diverse strengths and needs and are committed to using this information to plan effective instruction.	1.89%	7.55%	90.57%
Instructional Strategies - Candidates are committed to deepening their awareness and understanding of the strengths and needs of diverse learners when planning and adjusting instruction.	1.89%	16.98%	81.13%
Professional Learning and Ethical Practice - candidates take responsibility for student learning and use ongoing analysis and reflection to improve planning and practice.	1.89%	18.87%	79.25%
Leadership and Collaboration - candidates actively share responsibility for shaping and supporting the mission of their school, advocating for learners and holding themselves accountable for their success.	1.51%	18.87%	79.25%
Total/Percentage	1.51%	16.98%	81.51%