

# Texas Tech University Certification Report 2012-2013



Office of Student Services  
Certification Office

Contact Person:  
Donna Brasher  
University Certification Officer

College of Education  
P.O. Box 41071  
Lubbock, TX 79409-1071  
<http://www.educ.ttu.edu/>

January 2014



## Table of Contents

<b>Part I: Certification Data</b>	<b>4</b>
Table 1: Certificates by Type <sup>1</sup>	4
Table 2: Certificates by Type and Level 2012-2013	4
Table 3: Standard Certificates by Level and Degree 2012-2013	5
Table 4: Certificates by Gender, Ethnicity, and Degree 2012-2013	5
Table 5: Certificates by Gender and Ethnicity <sup>1</sup> Five Year Data	5
Table 6: Certificate Type and Level Five Year Data	6
Table 7: Supplemental Certificates 2012-2013	6
Table 8: Professional Certificates	7
Table 9: Certification Candidates by College	7
Table 10: Recommended Certificates by Teaching or Professional Field	8
<b>Part II: Program Finisher Data</b>	<b>9</b>
Table 11: Finishers by Gender, Ethnicity and Level <sup>1</sup>	9
<b>Part III: Certification Test Data</b>	<b>12</b>
Table 13: Certification Tests Passed by Gender and Ethnicity <sup>1</sup>	12
Table 14a: Certification Test Pass Rates	13
2013 (9/1/2012 – 8/31/2013) (date and data need to be updated)	13
Note: State pass rate comparison data is available in the Title II Report, Table 27.	13
Note: State pass rates are no longer categorized as “initial” and “final” (as of 2010)	13
Table 14b: Certification Test Pass Rates	13
(“initial pass rates” prior to 2010)	13
Table 14c: Initial Pass Rate by Certification Field <sup>1</sup>	14
As of 10/15/2012	14
Table 16: ePortfolio Dispositions	20
Table 17a: ePortfolio Data	21
Learning Outcomes for Secondary Programs	21

Table 17b: ePortfolio Data _____	21
Learning Outcomes for Middle Programs _____	21
Table 17c: ePortfolio Data Learning Outcomes for Elementary Programs _____	22
<b>Part IV: NCATE Data</b> _____	<b>25</b>
NCATE Table 4: State and TTU TExES Average Scores _____	25
Paper Based Exams Only 9/1/2012 – 8/31/2013 _____	25
NCATE Table 5: State and TTU TExES Average Scores _____	26
Computer Administered Exams 9/1/2012 – 8/31/2013 _____	26
<b>Part V: Admission and Active Data</b> _____	<b>28</b>
Table 19: Candidates Admitted to Educator Preparation Programs _____	31
Table 20: Candidates ACTIVE in Educator Preparation Programs _____	32
<b>Part VI: Other State Reports</b> _____	<b>36</b>
Table 21: Legislative Budget Board (LBB) Performance Measure _____	36
<b>Part VII: PACE 2011 Relevant Results</b> _____	<b>54</b>
<b>Part VIII: Historical Overview</b> _____	<b>58</b>
<b>Part IX: Glossary of Terms</b> _____	<b>59</b>

## Part I: Certification Data

The following charts reflect information about Texas Tech students who were recommended for certification through the State Board for Education Certification (SBEC) during the period 9/1/12 through 8/31/13. Data from previous years were carried forward from earlier certification reports.

**Table 1: Certificates by Type <sup>1</sup>**

Type	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Initial and Supplemental	508	512	553	581	534
Initial			540	520	405
Supplemental			64	89	129
Professional	60	60	53	53	43
Probationary	38	32	10	12	10
Initial/Supplemental*					
Professional/Supplemental*			18	19	29
Probationary	2	4			
Probationary Extension	12	25	10	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>634</b>	<b>665</b>	<b>616</b>

\*Supplemental only counted with Initials prior to 2010 and with Professionals after 2010

<sup>1</sup> Some candidates received multiple certificates during one year. Individuals receiving more than one certificate are included in each category.

**Table 2: Certificates by Type and Level  
2012-2013**

Certificate Type Certificate Level <sup>1</sup>	Standard	Probationary	Probationary Extension
All Level, EC-12**	98	2	0
Elementary	270	1	0
Middle (4-8)	50	1	0
Secondary	120	6	0
Supplemental*	90	28	0
Professional	43	1	0
Special Education*	26	0	0
Vocational*	32		0
<b>Total</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup> Some data are in multiple categories (i.e., Technology Application is included in both EC-12 and Vocational; Deaf Education is included in both EC-12 and Special Education. Visually Impaired is included in both Supplemental and Special Education. Elementary with ESL and Bilingual Specializations are included in both Elementary and Supplemental.

**Table 3: Standard Certificates by Level and Degree  
2012-2013**

Certificate Level	Bachelor	Post Baccalaureate	Total
All Level <sup>1</sup>	94	4	98
Elementary <sup>1</sup>	259	30	289
Middle (4-8)	49	5	54
Secondary	107	11	118
Additional <sup>2</sup>	89	4	93
<b>Total</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>652</b>

<sup>1</sup> Undergraduate Elementary / EC-12 Special Education are included in both the Elementary and All Level categories,

<sup>2</sup> ELEMENTARY/ESL and ELEMENTARY/Bilingual are included in both ELEMENTARY and Additional categories.

**Table 4: Certificates by Gender, Ethnicity, and Degree  
2012-2013**

	Female	Male	Total
African American	5	5	10
Asian/Pacific Islander	7	2	9
Hispanic	55	23	78
Native American/Alaskan Native	1	0	1
Other/unknown	2	3	5
White	350	81	431
Bachelor	336	105	441
Post Baccalaureate Initial	14	9	23
Additional	88	4	92
<b>Total <sup>1</sup></b>	<b>858</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>1090</b>

<sup>1</sup> Some individuals received multiple certificates

**Table 5: Certificates by Gender and Ethnicity <sup>1</sup>  
Five Year Data**

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Female					
African American	10	8	8	7	5
Hispanic	51	46	59	54	55
White	369	368	397	410	350
Other	15	10	14	11	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>412</b>
Male					
African American	5	7	3	4	5
Hispanic	23	31	16	21	23
White	91	97	107	94	81
Other	4	5	4	5	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>112</b>

<sup>1</sup> Note, 2006-07 and previous data were not disaggregated to include Native American and Asian. To be consistent, Table 5 places these ethnic groups into "other."

**Table 6: Certificate Type and Level  
Five Year Data**

<b>Type and Level</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Probationary</b>					
All Level	7	5	1	0	2
Elementary		1	1	1	1
Middle			2	0	1
Secondary	17	22	1	13	6
Professional	2	3	2	2	1
Supplemental	11	21	6	25	28
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Standard</b>					
Elementary*	219*	195*	207*	250	259
Middle	37	53	72	55	49
Secondary	126	153	157	118	107
All Level*	128*	123*	124*	104	94
Vocational*	30*	34*	42*	32	32
Special Ed.*	50*	51*	42*	31	26
Supplemental**	17	12	64*	87	90
Professional	60	60	53	53	43
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>700</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>634</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>739</b>
<b>Undergraduates</b>	426	351	386	435	505
<b>PostBac Initial</b>	157	139	110	82	29
<b>Additional</b>	66	78	76	64	129

*\*Included in other certificate levels (i.e., Vocational is included in Secondary; Special Education is included in All Level)*

*\*\*Undergraduate Elementary with ESL/Bilingual Specializations are included with Supplementals as well as Elementary beginning in 2011.*

**Table 7: Supplemental Certificates  
2012-2013**

<b>Certificate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Bilingual Education	11
English as a Second Language	79
Generic Special Education	39
Visually Impaired	22

**Table 8: Professional Certificates**

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
School Counselor	8	6	5	2	2
Educational Diagnostician	23	13	19	30	27
Master Reading Teacher		1	0	1	0
Master Technology Teacher			1	1	0
Principal	22	28	18	11	9
Reading Specialist		1	2	4	0
Superintendent	7	11	7	4	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>41</b>

\*Some Received both Master Reading Teacher and Reading Specialist

**Table 9: Certification Candidates by College**

	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Education	85	117	137	149	165
Arts & Sciences	88	113	87	105	156
Agriculture & Natural Resources	11	21	21	13	23
Human Sciences	123	97	97	172	150
Graduate	216	188	209	146	65
Mass Communications	0	0	1	0	2
Visual and Performing Arts	45	36	54	39	77
<b>Total</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>638</b>

**Table 10: Recommended Certificates by Teaching or Professional Field**

<b>Certificate Description</b>	<b>Number Recommend ed in Field, 2009-10</b>	<b>Number Recommend ed in Field, 2010-11</b>	<b>Number Recommend ed in Field, 2011-12</b>	<b>Number Recommend ed in Field, 2012-2013</b>
Agriculture Production / Ag Sciences and Production	24	28	13	19
Art (All level or Secondary)	15	12	6	11
Bilingual Supplemental	8	6	17	15
Chemistry	1	1	2	1
Dance	3	5	3	4
Deaf and Hard of Hearing (EC-12)	10	13	1	2
Educational Diagnostician	13	19	30	27
Elementary Generalist	194	203	250	268
English as a Second Language Supplemental	28	47	58	79
English Language Arts and Reading (4-8)*	25	25	19	3
English Language Arts and Reading (8-12)	36	32	26	24
English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies (4-8)	24	19	19	19
Family and Consumer Science	5	11	16	8
FACS – Hospitality, Nutrition, and Food Sciences	2	3	9	0
FACS - Human Development and Family Studies (8-12)		0	7	0
LOTE – French		2	2	0
LOTE – German	1	1		0
LOTE – Latin	1	0		0
LOTE -- Spanish	8	14	6	2
Health Education (All Level or Secondary)	3	2	1	0
History (8-12)	28	25	27	25
Journalism (8-12)		4	0	1
Life Sciences (8-12)	4	2	5	4
Master Reading Teacher	2	0	1	0
Mather Technology Teacher		1	1	0
Mathematics (4-8)*	21	40	36	1
Mathematics (8-12)	19	18	14	22
Mathematics/Physics (8-12)	1	0	1	2
Mathematics/Science (4-8)	16	27	36	23
Music (All level)	22	37	29	45
Physical Education (EC-12)	39	34	38	33
Physical Science (8-12)		0	0	0
Principal	28	18	11	8
Professional Reading Specialist	1	2	4	0
School Counselor	6	5	2	2
Science (4-8)*	20	31	36	2
Science Composite (8-12)	15	4	9	10
Social Studies (4-8)*	29	33	19	4
Social Studies (8-12)	2	11	9	2
Special Education	30	23	19	40
Speech Communications (Secondary)		1	2	0
Superintendent	11	8	4	3
Technology Applications	1	3	2	0
Theatre Arts (Secondary)	3	3	1	6
Visually Impaired	14	13	11	20
<b>Total (some candidates certified in multiple fields)</b>	<b>572</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>735</b>





## Part II: Program Finisher Data

Program “finishers” are persons who, during the academic year, finished meeting all requirements of a certification program excluding the tests (may or may not have passed some or all the tests). The following data reflects program finishers during 2011-2012, whether or not the candidates completed the certification requirements by passing the exams and applying for a teaching certificate.

**Table 11: Finishers by Gender, Ethnicity and Level <sup>1</sup>**  
**2012-2013**

<b>Ethnicity and Degree</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
African American	7	5	12
Asian	8	4	12
Hispanic	85	31	116
Native American	1	0	1
Other	2	3	5
White	439	113	552
Bachelors	467	145	612
Post Bac	18	20	38
Supplemental	146	7	153
Professional	33	8	41
<b>Total</b>	<b>1206</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>1542</b>

<sup>1</sup>These data represent the total number of persons finishing programs of certification (all but testing).

**Table 12: Program Finishers by Teaching or Professional Field**

<b>Certificate Description</b>	<b>2008-09 Total (U,PB)</b>	<b>2009-10 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>2010-11 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>2011-12 Total (U, PB)</b>
Agriculture Production	22(21, 1)	24 (21, 3)	32 ( 25, 7)	13(10, 3)
Art	14( 12, 2)	10 (8, 2)	13 (11, 2)	6(6,0)
Bilingual Supplemental	4 (3, 1)	10 (7, 3)	9 (8, 1)	17 (17,0)
Chemistry	2(0, 2)	3 (2, 1)	1 (1, 0)	2 (2,0)
Dance	3(3, 0)	4 (3, 1)	4 (4, 0)	3 (3,0)
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	19(0, 19)	12 (0 , 12)	14 (0, 14)	1(0,1)

<b>Certificate Description</b>		<b>2008-09 Total (U,PB)</b>	<b>2009-10 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>2010-11 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>2011-12 Total (U, PB)</b>
Educational Diagnostician	21(0, 21)	18 (0, 18)	19 (0, 19)	30(0,30)	27(0,27)
English (Secondary)	32 (16, 16)	25(18,7)	33 (21, 12)	25 (14,11)	25(23, 2)
English as a Second Language	31 (28, 3)	46 (43, 3)	65 (64, 1)	58 (58,0)	93(93,0)
English Language Arts & Reading (Middle)	22(19, 3)*	59 (50, 9)*	29 (23, 6)*	19 (16,3)	3(0,3)
English Language Arts & Reading/Social Studies(Middle)	18 (16, 2)	23 (23, 0)	23 (23, 0)	19 (16,3)	21(20,1)
Family and Consumer Science – Composite	17 (14, 3)	6 (6, 0)	13 (11, 2)	9 (8,1)	9(8,1)
Family and Consumer Science – Hosp, Nut/ Food Science	0	6 (6, 0)	6( 5, 1)	7 (7,0)	0
Family and Consumer Science - HDFS	0	0	0	0	0
French	2(0, 2)	1 (0, 1)	1 (1, 0)	2 (2,0)	0
Generalist Elementary	228(161, 67)	217 (167, 50)	232 (190, 42)	269 (235, 34)	308(299,9)
German	0	1 (1, 0)	2 (1, 1)	0	0
Health Education	1 (1, 0)	4 (3,1)	1 ( , 1)	1 (0,1)	0
History	24(19, 5)	30 (30, 0)	36 (31, 5)	27 (23,4)	39(37,2)
Journalism	1 (0, 1)	0	3 (1, 2)	0	2(2,0)
Latin	0	1 (1,0)	0	0	0
Life Sciences	5(0, 5)	3 (0, 3)	2 (0, 2)	5 (1,4)	4(3,1)
Master Reading Teacher	0	0	0	1(0,1)	0
Master Technology Teacher	2 (0, 2)	1 (0, 1)	3( 0, 3)	1 (0,1)	0
Mathematics (Middle)	21(21, 0)*	20 (19, 1)	48 (42, 6)	36 (33,3)	2(2,0)
Mathematics (Secondary)	11(7, 4)	22 (10,12)	18 (12, 6)	14 (10,4)	26(24,2)
Mathematics/Physics		1( 1, 0)	0	1 (1,0)	2(1,1)
Mathematics/Science (Middle)	17 (17, 0)	16 (16, 0)	32 (32, 0)	36 (33,3)	26(26,0)
Music	48 (44, 4)	25 (23, 2)	42 (42, 0)	29 (27,2)	51(49,2)
Physical Education	42 (37, 5)	41 (34, 7)	35 (32, 3)	38(34,4)	45(45,0)
Physical Science (Secondary)	1 (0, 1)	0	0	0	0
Principal	22 (0, 22)	23 (0, 23)	20 (0, 20)	11(0,11)	9(0,9)
Reading Specialist	1 (0, 1)	0	1 (0, 1)	4 (0,4)	0
School Counselor	7(0, 7)	7 (0, 7)	6 (0, 6)	2 (0,2)	2(0,2)
Science (Middle)	20 (20, 0)*	20 (17, 3)	39 (37 , 2)	36 (33,3)	2(2,0)
Science Composite (Secondary)	7 (7, 0)	13 (9, 4)	3 ( 2 , 1)	9 (6,3)	10(0,10)
Social Studies (Middle)	21 (20, 1)	6 (6, 0)	42 (39, 3)		4(3,1)
Social Studies Composite (Secondary)	5(4, 1)	4 (3, 1)	12 (5, 7)	9(5,4)	2(2,0)
Spanish (Secondary)	9(5, 4)	9 (4, 5)	16 (8, 8)	19 (16,3)	4(3,1)
Special Education	28 (21, 7)	33 (29,4)	27 ( 21, 6)	19 (18,1)	2(1,1)
Speech Communications	5(3, 2)	1 (1, 0)	0	2(2,0)	0
Superintendent	9(0, 9)	12 (0, 12)	7 (0, 7)	4 (0,4)	3(1,2)
Technology Applications	0	1 (0, 1)	3 (0, 3)	2 (0,2)	0
Theatre Arts	4(2, 2)	6 (5, 1)	6 (6, 0)	1 (1,0)	7(7,0)
Visually Impaired	16 (0, 16)	22 (0, 22)	23 (0, 23)	11(0,11)	22(0,22)
<b>Total <sup>2</sup></b>	<b>631( 398, 233)*</b>	<b>618 (406, 212)*</b>	<b>700 (484, 216)*</b>	<b>746 (583,163)</b>	<b>702(609, 93)</b>

<b>Certificate Description</b>		<b>2008-09 Total (U,PB)</b>	<b>2009-10 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>2010-11 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>2011-12 Total (U, PB)</b>
<b>Total Math/Science (for Closing the Gaps)</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>79 (62, 17)</b>	<b>67 (53, 14)</b>	<b>72(68,4)</b>
<b>Total Elementary (Title II 2011 Report)</b>			<b>(198, 42)</b>		<b>310(300,10)</b>
<b>Total Middle (Title II 2011 Report)</b>			<b>(70, 16)</b>		<b>54(50,4)</b>
<b>Total Secondary (Title II 2011 Report)</b>			<b>(129, 49)</b>		<b>154(139,15)</b>
<b>Total Multiple Levels (Title II 2011 Report)</b>			<b>(110, 31)</b>		<b>145(119,26)</b>

1 The program completer data includes undergraduate count (U), PostBac count (PB), and Total number of completers in each field

2 Some students finished the program with multiple certification areas; i.e. a student may seek a standard certificate in two fields.

3 Some students were counted in multiple fields, for example a middle level math/science candidate was counted in Math (middle), Science (Middle) and Math/Science (Middle) (also true for ELA/SS (middle)



### Part III: Certification Test Data

Information provided includes the number of Texas Tech students who passed the state-required tests for certification during the period 9/1/12 through 8/31/13. The Accountability System for Educator Preparation Programs (ASEP) uses initial pass rates (tests taken through December following the academic year of completion) and final pass rates (tests taken through December of the second year following the academic year of completion) to determine program approval. The source for pass rates information is the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC).

Note: Effective Spring 2007, if the pass rate (initial 70% or final 80%) of the candidates within a certification field (of at least 10 completers) is low performing for three consecutive years, the entity may no longer admit persons for preparation in that field (TAC Rule 229.4). Beginning 2010, Texas no longer had “initial” and “final” pass rates. The pass rate is determined by the cohort who finished/passed test during the September 1 – August 31 time period. Pass rates are required to be 70% for 2010-11, 75% for 2011-12, and 80% for 2012-13.

**Table 13: Certification Tests Passed by Gender and Ethnicity <sup>1</sup>**

<b>Ethnicity and Gender</b>	<b>9/1/08 – 8/31/09</b>	<b>9/1/09 – 8/31/10</b>	<b>9/1/10 – 8/31/11</b>	<b>9/1/11 – 8/31/12</b>	<b>9/1/12- 8/31/13</b>
African American	35	25/37	24 / 53	42	31
Hispanic	214	152/228	210 / 329	375	267
Other/Not Specified	34	46/60	37 / 65	18	13
White	980	1039/ 1303	1160 / 1527	1335	1164
Female	1020	976/1255	1135/ 1550	1416	1235
Male	243	286/373	296 / 424	371	263
<b>Total</b>	<b>1615</b>	<b>1262/1866</b>	<b>1431 / 1974</b>	<b>1787</b>	<b>1475/1498</b>

<sup>1</sup> Duplicated headcounts in Table 14; a candidate (identified in Table 13) may take and pass multiple tests(i.e., both the academic content exam(s) and the pedagogy exam identified in Table 14.

**Table 14a: Certification Test Pass Rates**

**2013 (9/1/2012 – 8/31/2013) (date and data need to be updated)**

**Note: State pass rate comparison data is available in the Title II Report, Table 27.**

**Note: State pass rates are no longer categorized as “initial” and “final” (as of 2010)**

Period	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
9/1/2012-8/31/2013	95% (652)	95% (516)	94% (136)	100% (12)	91% (109)	96% (13)	95% (518)

**Table 14b: Certification Test Pass Rates  
 (“Initial pass rates” prior to 2010)**

Year	Initial Pass Rate	Number of Test Takers
2012-2013	95%	652
2011-2012	95%	584
2010-2011	92%	693
2009-2010	95%	606
2008-2009	97%	598
2007-2008	97%	675
2006-2007	96%	679
2005-2006	96%	621
2004-2005	93%	610
2003-2004	97%	473
2002-2003	95%	397
2001-2002	92%	586
2000-2001	90%	453

**Table 14c: Initial Pass Rate by Certification Field <sup>1</sup>**  
**As of 10/15/2012**

<b>Certification Field</b>	<b>2009 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>20010 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2011 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2012 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2013 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>
Agricultural Sciences and Technology (6-12)	94.12 (17)	91.3(23)	100(32)	84.6 (13)	95(19)
Art EC-12 (TExES)	100 (10)	100(11)	100(13)	100(6)	100(12)
Bilingual Education Spanish Supplemental (Elementary)	100 (4)	100(7)	100(7)	94.1(17)	100(12)
BTLPT		100(1)	50(2)	75 (12)	76.9(10)
Chemistry 8-12	100(2)	50(2)	100(1)	100(2)	100(1)
Dance (8-12)	100(3)	100(4)	100(4)	100(3)	100(7)
Deaf and Hard of Hearing (EC-12)	100(16)	100(13)	100(13)	100(1)	100(3)
ESL Supplemental	100(2)	94.1(34)	81.8(55)	93.6(47)	88.8(79)
Educational Diagnostician (EC-12)	93.3(15)	91.7(12)	85(20)	93.1(29)	100(23)
Eng. Lang. Arts and Reading/Social Studies (4-8)	100(18)	95.7(23)	91.(24)	100(15)	90(18)
English Language Arts and Reading (4-8)	100(3)		100(6)	100(2)	100(2)
English Language Arts and Reading (8-12)	100(30)	100(36)	100(33)	95.8(23)	100(23)
Family and consumer Sciences 6-12					
Generalist (EC-4)	98.23(226)	96.3(27)			
Generalist (EC-6)		91.9(198)	88.6(236)	89.8(255)	93(280)
Health All-Level (EC-12)	100(1)	100(4)			
History (TExES 8-12)	95.24(21)	87.1(31)	75(36)	92.9(28)	70.3(26)
Journalism (8-12)	100(1)		100(3)		100(2)
Life Science (8-12)	100(5)	100(3)	100(2)		
LOTE: French			100(1)	50(2)	
LOTE: German			0(1)		
LOTE: Spanish		33.3(6)	64.3(14)	42.9(7)	50(2)
Master Reading Teacher		100(2)			

<b>Certification Field</b>	<b>2009 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2010 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2011 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2012 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2013 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>
Master Technology Teacher			100(1)	100(1)	
Mathematics (4-8)	100(3)	100(4)	81.2(16)	100(8)	100(2)
Mathematics (8-12)	92.31(13)	86.4(22)	88.9(18)	85.7(14)	88(22)
Mathematics/Science (4-8)	81.25(16)	93.3(15)	87.5(32)	100 (3)	96.2(25)
Music All Level (TExES)	95.35 (43)	100(20)	97.6(41)	100(20)	100(11)
Total Pedagogy Tests <sup>3</sup>		100(31)	95.1(35)	98.6(506)	97.4(554)
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility 4-8		100(48)	98.8(84)	94.9(39)	97.4(552)
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility 8-12		94.5(145)	94.2(154)	90/9(22)	66.7(2)
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility EC-12		97.5(29)	93.4(151)	98.6(440)	
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility EC-4		100(31)	100(4)	100 (2)	
Pedagogy and Professional Responsibility EC-6		98.8(164)	97.6(207)	94.9 (39)	
Physical Education TExES (EC-12)	97.22 (36)	100(39)	97.1(35)	100 (39)	97.7(43)
Physics/Mathematics 8-12		100(1)		100(1)	100(1)
Principal	95.45(22)	100(23)	94.4(18)	90(10)	87.5(7)
Reading Specialist			100(3)	100(4)	
School Counselor	100(5)	100(6)	100(5)	100(1)	100(2)
Science (4-8)	75(3)	75(3)	83.3(6)	50(2)	100(2)
Science (8-12)	71.43(7)	100(11)	100(3)	100(8)	100(10)
Secondary French (ExCET)	50(4)	100(1)	See LOTE	LOTE	
Secondary German (ExCET)	100(1)		See LOTE	LOTE	
Secondary Spanish (ExCET including TOPT)	85.71(14)	100(1)	See LOTE	LOTE	
Social Studies (TExES 4-8)	50(2)	83.3(6)	77.8(18)	75(4)	100(4)
Social Studies (TExES 8-12)	100(5)	75(4)	91.7(12)	85.7(7)	100(2)
Special Education (TExES EC-12)	100(25)	100(32)	91.3(23)	100(4)	97.7(43)
Special Education Supplemental			100(1)		

<b>Certification Field</b>	<b>2009 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>20010 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2011 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2012 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>	<b>2013 Completers Pass Rate (n)</b>
Speech (TExES 8-12)	100(5)	100(2)		100(1)	
Superintendent	100(9)	100(10)	83.3(6)	100(3)	100(3)
Technology Applications (EC-12)		100(3)	100(2)	100(1)	
Theatre (EC-12)	100(4)	75(4)	83.3(6)	100(2)	100(6)
Visually Impaired (includes Braille) (TExES)	100(25)	95(20)	95.5(22)	100(10)	100(22))
Visually Impaired – Braille			94.1(17)	100(8)	94.1(16)
Visually Impaired			85.7(21)	100(8)	95.5(21))

<sup>1</sup> Initial (2008-2009) pass rates of completers, percentage passed (number)

<sup>2</sup> The Texas Oral Proficiency Test (TOPT) is one of the required exams for the Spanish and French certification field.

<sup>3</sup> The PPR exam is one of the required exams for every initial certification field.

**Note: Final pass rates no longer compiled due to SB 174, effective 2009-2010**



**Table 15: Content Area Domain Scores**  
**Addressing Pedagogical Content Knowledge**

Domain scores, as of September 11<sup>th</sup> is no longer available from ETS in terms of scaled scores with 240 as the pass, but in terms of percentage correct)

<b>TExES Content Area Examination</b>	<b>Domain Description</b>	<b>2008-2009 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2009-2010 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2010-2011 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2011-2012 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2012-2013 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>
113: English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies 4-8	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 2: Reading Comprehension, Written Language, Study and Inquiry Domain 4: Social Studies Foundations, Skills, and Instruction	249.03  251.03 (31)	255.70  279.48 (27)	259.26  255.07 (27)	251.6/255.5 74/77%  70/71%	257/254.1 76/77%  72/70%
114: Mathematics/Science 4-8	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 6: Mathematical Learning, Instruction, and Assessment Domain 11: Science Learning, Instruction, and Assessment	236.29  248.69 (35)	240.87  246.49 (45)	240.44  247.36 (61)	240.3/246.6 69/71%  76/79%	242/247 63/71  76/80
115: Mathematics 4-8	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 6: Mathematical Learning, Instruction, and Assessment	241.4 (6)	234.07 (15)	246.36 (22)	241.5/248.4 69/67%	248/247.6 62/67
116: Science 4-8	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 5: Science Learning, Instruction, and Assessment	222.38 (8)	230.42 (12)	249.69 (16)	235.2/243.5 73/73%	235.3/243 69/75
117: English Language Arts and Reading 4-8	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 2: Reading Comprehension, Written Language, Study and Inquiry	260 (2)	271.60 (5)	263.00 (5)	281.5/258.1 88/76%	
118: Social Studies 4-8	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 2: Social Studies Foundations, Skills, and Instruction	252.8 (5)	243.31 (13)	247.64 (25)	237.3/249.6 68/70%	251.4/247.5 75/68
131: English Language Arts and Reading 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 1: Integrated Language Arts, Diverse Learners, and the Study of English	252.90 (41)	251.24 (42)	254.50 (38)		257.3/253.9 77/75
132: Social Studies 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 6: Social Studies Foundations, Skills, Research, and Instruction	234 (5)	231.70 (10)	235.29 (17)		204/241.1 48/70
133: History 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 3: Foundations, Skills, Research, and Instruction	228.21 (33)	239.01 (69)	240.82 (61)	236/235.5 67/66%	236.8/236.1 68/67
135: Math 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 6: Mathematical	232.33 (27)	233.92 (38)	233.13 (24)	239.5/234 67/68%	244.9/234 70/68

<b>TExES Content Area Examination</b>	<b>Domain Description</b>	<b>2008-2009 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2009-2010 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2010-2011 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2011-2012 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2012-2013 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>
	Learning, Instruction, and Assessment					
136: Science 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 10: Science Learning, Instruction, and Assessment	233.44 (16)	238.58 (19)	226.27 (15)	243.8/234.8 78/68%	237.4/234.9 75/69
138: Life Science 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 6: Science Learning, Instruction, and Assessment	237 (6)	248.50 (9)	264.00 (2)	242.8/233.4 85/71%	230.8/234.1 75/70
140: Chemistry	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 4: Science Learning, Instruction and Assessment	264.2 (5)	250 (1)	262.29 (7)	251/257.7 62/77%	246/252 44/73
143: Math/Physics	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 6: Math Learning, Instruction and Assessment Domain 9 Science Learning, Instruction and Assessment			271.00  270.00 (1)		258/250.3 75/80  87/72
142: Technology Applications	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 3: Video Technology and Multimedia (integrates pedagogy) Domain 4: Webmastering (integrates pedagogy)	266.67  285.33 (3)	263.5  253 (2)	257.50  278.00 (2)	252/252.4 75/75%  63/58%	
154: ESL Supplemental	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 2: ESL Instruction and Assessment	261.31 (36)	257.81 (53)	248.79 (70)	248.3/251.2 75/75%	251.5/250.7 76/75
155: Speech 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 3: Speech Education	248.25 (4)	282.50 (2)	282.00 (2)		270/247.1 76/74
156: Journalism	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 4: Journalism in the School Community		244.50 (2)	259.00 (2)		262/249.3 88/80
157: Health Education EC-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 5: The School Health Education Program	245 (1)	256.67 (6)	252.50 (2)		
158: Physical Education	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 3: The Physical Education Program	252.53 (43)	253.85 (54)	248.56 (52)	261.3/254.1 79/78%	256/253 75/78
172 Agriculture Education	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 1: Foundation of Agricultural Education	271.47 (19)	264.06 (35)	267.84 (31)		
177: Music EC-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 5: Music Education	250.57 (42)	248.97 (36)	244.46 (50)	256.5/248.9 77/75%	256.2/248 74/75
178: Art EC-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 4: Art Instruction and Assessment	266.23 (13)	271.27 (15)	269.64 (14)	271.8/263.9 84/81%	267.8/263.2 80/80
179: Dance 8-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 4: Dance Education	228 (1)	244.60 (5)	240.00 (5)		259.4/248.3 88/84
180: Theatre EC-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 5: Theatre Education	259.67 (3)	252.83 (6)	240.14 (7)	248.6/249.6 82/83%	262.7/250.1 88/82

<b>TExES Content Area Examination</b>	<b>Domain Description</b>	<b>2008-2009 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2009-2010 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2010-2011 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2011-2012 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>	<b>2012-2013 All Exams Mean Score (N)</b>
181: Deaf and Hard of Hearing EC-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 4: Understanding the Professional Environment	267.33 (15)	260.87 (15)	260.67 (18)		259.3/254.8 89/84
182: Visually Impaired EC-12	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 4: Professional Knowledge	255.56 (27)	254.96 (27)	247.68 (22)		251.7/251 82/81
ExCET 047: Spanish 6-12 / * 613 LOTE: Spanish	Total Test Avg Program/State Domain 5: Language and Culture / *Domain 1: Instruction and Assessment	80.6 (10)	(19) *228.21	(30) *230.89	222.2/231.9 59/68 70/65	225.4/232.4 59/66 69/64

**Table 16: ePortfolio Dispositions**

<b>Disposition Competency</b>	<b>Spring 2009</b>	<b>Fall 2009</b>	<b>Spring 2010</b>	<b>Fall 2010*</b>	<b>Spring 2011*</b>	<b>Fall 2011*</b>	<b>Spring 2012*</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>
<b>Advocacy for All Students</b>	N=252	N=130	N=257	N=185	N=259	N=156	N=295	N=133
Instructional planning considers student diversity (2)	3.82	3.70	3.77	3.84	3.77	3.69	3.82	3.95
Classroom climate fostering learning, equity and excellence (5)	3.85	3.87	3.92	3.83	3.83	3.67	3.76	3.99
Monitors performance and provides quality feedback for all students (10)	3.87	3.86	3.91	3.87	3.79	3.62	3.81	3.97
<b>Professional Demeanor</b>								
Interacts with professional community and participates in professional activities (12)	3.89	3.81	3.91	96.3	97.6	3.25	3.39	3.98
Adheres to legal and ethical requirements (13)	3.79	3.80	3.93	3.65	3.82	3.62	3.75	3.98
<b>Think Critically and Reflectively</b>								
Reflection	3.98	3.97	3.99	3.87	3.79	3.93	3.77	3.98

<sup>1</sup> 4-point scale

\*Note: Although the domains and competencies remain the same, the assignments and rubrics for the ePortfolio changed as of Fall 2010

**Table 17a: ePortfolio Data  
Learning Outcomes for Secondary Programs**

<b>Outcome Measured</b>	<b>Spring 2009</b>	<b>Fall 2009</b>	<b>Spring 2010</b>	<b>Fall 2010*</b>	<b>Spring 2011*</b>	<b>Fall 2011*</b>	<b>Spring 2012*</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>
	N=88	N=61	N=87	N=73	N=143	N=52	N=125	N=183
2 Domain 1: Plan Instruction and assessment to promote student learning	3.91	3.76	3.98	3.98	3.65	3.81	3.88	3.88
3 Domain 2: Create a positive, safe and productive classroom environment	3.89	3.81	3.96	3.83	3.71	3.89	3.77	3.88
4 Domain 3: Implement effective and responsive instruction and assessment	3.93	3.87	3.88	3.97	3.69	3.91	3.90	3.89
5 Domain 4: Fulfill professional roles and responsibilities	3.93	3.61	4.9	3.57	3.48	3.56	3.88	3.60
6 Competency 2: Instructional planning considers student diversity	3.88	3.76	3.7	3.80	3.73	3.83	3.90	3.88
6 Competency 5: Classroom climate fostering learning, equity and excellence	3.89	3.83	3.99	3.83	3.71	3.89	3.77	3.88
6 Competency 10: Monitors performance and provides quality feedback for all students	3.91	3.85	3.99	3.90	3.72	3.86	3.94	3.89
7Competency 9: Effective use of technology to plan, organize and deliver instruction	3.94	3.93	4	3.75	3.36	3.74	3.88	3.90
Competency 13: Understands and adheres to legal and ethical requirements for educators						3.8	3.83	3.74

\*Note: Although the domains and competencies remain the same, the assignments and rubrics for the ePortfolio changed as of Fall 2010

**Table 17b: ePortfolio Data  
Learning Outcomes for Middle Programs**

<b>Outcome Measured</b>	<b>Spring 2006</b>	<b>Spring 2007</b>	<b>Spring 2008</b>	<b>Spring 2009</b>	<b>Spring 2010*</b>	<b>Spring 2011*</b>	<b>Fall 2011*</b>	<b>Spring 2012*</b>	<b>Fall 2012</b>
	N=38	N=68	N=49	N=40	N=37	N=74	N=14	N=42	N=12
2 Domain 1: Plan Instruction and assessment to promote student learning	3.98	3.85	3.82	3.86	3.87	3.76	3.53	3.75	3.81
3 Domain 2: Create a positive, safe and productive classroom environment	3.82	3.98	3.82	3.67	3.90	3.86	3.55	3.83	3.56
4 Domain 3: Implement effective and responsive instruction and assessment	3.95	3.85	3.81	3.78	3.92	3.83	3.62	3.70	3.85
5 Domain 4: Fulfill professional roles and responsibilities	3.93	3.92	3.84	3.74	3.95	3.62	3.35	3.84	3.73
6 Competency 2: Instructional planning considers student diversity	3.68	3.81	3.80	3.71	3.92	3.73	3.5	3.70	3.78

6 Competency 5: Classroom climate fostering learning, equity and excellence	3.86	3.98	3.83	3.66	3.82	3.86	3.55	3.83	3.56
6 Competency 10: Monitors performance and provides quality feedback for all students	3.64	3.84	3.78	3.68	3.84	3.7	3.6	3.74	3.86
Competency 9: Effective use of technology to plan, organize and deliver instruction	4.0	3.84	3.92	3.88	4.00	3.66	3.31	3.74	3.80
Competency 13: Understands and adheres to legal and ethical requirements for educators							3.57	3.80	3.68

\*Note: Although the domains and competencies remain the same, the assignments and rubrics for the ePortfolio changed as of Fall 2010

**Table 17c: ePortfolio Data  
Learning Outcomes for Elementary Programs**

Outcome Measured	Fall 2008	Spring 2009	Fall 2009	Spring 2010	Fall 2010*	Spring 2011*	Fall 2011*	Spring 2012*	Fall 2012*
	N=64	N=122	N=119	N=129	N=76	N=109	N=91	N=188	N=117
Domain 1: Plan Instruction and assessment to promote student learning	3.86	3.83	3.71	3.82	3.78	3.85	3.71	3.83	3.79
Domain 2: Create a positive, safe and productive classroom environment	3.93	3.89	3.88	3.90	3.87	3.86	3.55	3.73	3.82
Domain 3: Implement effective and responsive instruction and assessment	3.82	3.91	3.88	3.88	3.88	3.93	3.61	3.76	3.86
Domain 4: Fulfill professional roles and responsibilities	3.84	3.84	3.88	3.82	3.73	3.57	3.25	3.77	3.78
Competency 2: Instructional planning considers student diversity	3.88	3.81	3.63	3.80	3.79	3.84	3.65	3.82	3.77
Competency 5: Classroom climate fostering learning, equity and excellence	3.93	3.87	3.88	3.92	3.87	3.86	3.55	3.73	3.82
Competency 10: Monitors performance and provides quality feedback for all students	3.83	3.91	3.87	3.87	3.86	3.86	3.62	3.77	3.87
Competency 9: Effective use of technology to plan, organize and deliver instruction	3.81	3.88	3.80	3.74	3.77	3.73	3.64	3.76	3.78
Competency 13: Understands and adheres to legal and ethical requirements for educators							3.57	3.69	3.54

\*Note: Although the domains and competencies remain the same, the assignments and rubrics for the ePortfolio changed as of Fall 2010

**Table 18. End of Program Survey: Fall 2010 and Spring 2011**

In the past, the “End of Program Surveys” (link on their ePortfolio) included this data in the certification report. This survey was affectionately known as the “William Lan Survey.” It provided some feedback from candidates on how self-assessed their skills (according to PPR standards) and the strengths/weaknesses of our program. Data was also given to program coordinators for analysis/program improvement activities. Doug Hamman did End of Program Survey for 2011-2012.

We are attempting to assess how well our students were prepared in these competencies. Thank you for assisting us with this important process. Please use the scale from 1 (Not Prepared) to 4 (Highly Prepared)	Fall 2010 Results of End of Program Survey				Spring 2011 Results of End of Program Survey			
	Elementary (N=85)	Middle (N=25)	Secondary/AL (N=74)	Total (N=184)	Elementary (N=157)	Middle (N=176)	Secondary/AL (N=103)	Total (N=333)
Selects learner-centered and developmentally appropriate instructional content	3.79	3.92	3.62	3.74	3.69	3.59	3.54	3.62
Uses diversity in the classroom and the community to enrich all students' learning experiences	3.56	3.60	3.53	3.55	3.53	3.37	3.36	3.44
Plans and adapts lessons to address students' varied backgrounds, skills interests, and learning needs including the needs of English language learners and students with disabilities	3.78	3.76	3.57	3.69	3.66	3.49	3.38	3.54
Exhibits strong working knowledge of subject matter and central themes/concepts of the discipline	3.72	3.88	3.81	3.78	3.71	3.74	3.70	3.71
Plans instruction so that activities progress in a logical sequence and support instructional goals (TEKS/TAKS)	3.81	3.84	3.85	3.83	3.76	3.77	3.61	3.72
Stimulates reflection, critical thinking and inquiry among students	3.79	3.72	3.62	3.71	3.66	3.58	3.40	3.56
Establishes a classroom environment of courtesy and respect that is safe, nurturing, inclusive and productive	3.91	3.88	3.86	3.89	3.83	3.85	3.69	3.79
Organizes activities, applies procedures, and manages time in ways that promote student learning, appropriate behavior and ethical work habits in the classroom	3.81	3.88	3.73	3.79	3.73	3.78	3.54	3.68
Establishes and maintains positive rapport with students	3.89	3.88	3.91	3.90	3.87	3.84	3.67	3.80
Demonstrates clear and accurate oral and written communication in the teaching and learning processes and uses language that is appropriate to students ages, interests, and backgrounds	3.85	3.80	3.82	3.83	3.71	3.64	3.55	3.65
Exhibits effective communication and interpersonal skills to enhance student understanding	3.80	3.84	3.88	3.84	3.80	3.81	3.59	3.74
Applies instructional strategies to successfully and actively engage students in the learning process and to promote critical thinking and problem solving	3.75	3.76	3.61	3.70	3.69	3.63	3.48	3.61
Remediates or enriches as a result of ongoing	3.73	3.84	3.55	3.67	3.50	3.55	3.50	3.51

assessment and reflection								
Incorporates the effective use of technology to plan, organize, deliver and evaluate instruction	3.74	3.96	3.76	3.78	3.68	3.70	3.58	3.65
Monitors student performance and achievement with appropriate and varied assessments	3.80	3.92	3.73	3.79	3.66	3.63	3.52	3.61
Develops positive, productive relationships with students, parents, staff and other professionals	3.85	3.88	3.86	3.86	3.89	3.78	3.75	3.82
Engages in reflection/self-assessment to identify strengths and challenges, improve teaching performance, and achieve professional goals	3.85	3.88	3.77	3.82	3.77	3.70	3.66	3.72
Complies with school and university policies, operating procedures, and legal requirements	3.92	4.00	3.89	3.92	3.90	3.89	3.69	3.83
Models ethical behavior and professionalism on a daily basis with staff, students and colleagues	3.91	4.00	3.92	3.92	3.92	3.93	3.76	3.87
Average Rating					3.74	3.70	3.58	3.68



## Part IV: NCATE Data

**NCATE Table 4: State and TTU TExES Average Scores  
Paper Based Exams Only  
9/1/2012 – 8/31/2013**

<b>Certification Description</b>	<b>Number of TTU Test Takers</b>	<b>Average TTU Test Score</b>	<b>State Average and Number of Testers</b>
Agricultural Science & Technology 6-12	29	252.3	256.7/352
Art EC-12 TExES			
Bilingual Supplemental			
Braille	31	261.6	258.2/66
Chemistry 8-12			
Dance 8-12			
Deaf and Hard of Hearing EC-12			
Educational Diagnostician			
English as a 2 <sup>nd</sup> Language Supplemental	1	188	248.1/864
English Language Arts and Reading 4-8			
English Language Arts and Reading 8-12			
English Lang. Arts and Reading/Social Studies 4-8			
Generalist EC-4			
Generalist EC-6	46	249.9	234.3/1491
Health Education EC-12			
History 8-12	3	208.7	230/64
Journalism 8-12			
Latin ExCET			
Life Science 8-12			
Master Reading Teacher ExCET			
Mathematics 4-8	1	272	233.7/153
Mathematics 8-12	3	249	230.2/237
Mathematics/Physics 8-12			
Mathematics/Science 4-8			
Music EC-12	6	246.7	239/62
PPR EC-4			
PPR EC-6			
PPR 4-8			
PPR 8-12			
PPR EC-12	31	247.4	252.7/1239
Physical Education EC-12	7	269.7	247.6/169
Principal ExCET 68	2	254	237.4/665
Reading Specialist			
Science 4-8			
Science 8-12	2	245	230.2/121
School Counselor			
Social Studies 4-8	1	252.6	268/49
Social Studies 8-12	1	236.1	245/214
Special Education EC-12	1	269	
Special Education Supplemental			
Speech 8-12			
Superintendent Parts I and II ExCET 64			
Superintendent TExES 195			

<b>Certification Description</b>	<b>Number of TTU Test Takers</b>	<b>Average TTU Test Score</b>	<b>State Average and Number of Testers</b>
Technology Applications EC-12			
Theatre EC-12			
Visually Impaired 182			

<sup>1</sup> State Board for Educator Certification Summary Statistics for Total Scores

<sup>2</sup> All examinations are TExES unless specified as earlier ExCET and Family and Consumer Sciences

<sup>3</sup>FACS 8-12 is administered through the American Assoc. of Family and Consumer Sciences (AFCS)

**NCATE Table 5: State and TTU TExES Average Scores  
Computer Administered Exams  
9/1/2012 – 8/31/2013**

<b>Certification Description</b>	<b>Number of TTU Test Takers</b>	<b>Average TTU Test Score</b>	<b>State Average and Number of Testers</b>
Art	10	267.8	263.2/957
Bilingual Supplemental 1164	18	253.8	244.8/2274
BTLPT-Spanish			
Chemistry	1	246	252/138
Dance	8	259.4	248.3/252
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	14	259.3	254.8/145
Educational Diagnostician 1153	41	250.7	252.4/523
English as a 2 <sup>nd</sup> Language Supplemental	109	251.5	250.7/14284
English Language Arts and Reading 4-8 1117			
English Lang Art & Reading/Soc Studies 4-8 1113	20	257	254.1/468
English Lang Art & Reading 8-12 1131	27	257.3	253.9/2640
Generalist EC-6			
Health Education EC-12			
History 8-12	68	236.8	236.1/1156
Journalism 8-12	1	262	249.3/198
Life Science 8-12	5	230.8	234.1/1095
LOTE-French			
LOTE-German			
LOTE-Latin			
LOTE-Spanish	13	225.4	232.4/1755
Master Technology Teacher EC-12 TExES 1086			
Mathematics 4-8 1115	7	248	247.6/1969
Mathematics 8-12	36	244.9	234/2916
Mathematics/Science 4-8 1114	39	242	247/462
Mathematics/Physics 1143	1	258	250.3/100
Music	45	256.2	248/1300
PPR EC-6			
PPR 4-8			
PPR 8-12			
PPR EC-12	613	260.8	260.6/26785
Physical Education EC-12	38	256	253/3080
Principal TExES 1068	22	238.7	244.2/5125
School Counselor	1	258	250.3/100

<b>Certification Description</b>	<b>Number of TTU Test Takers</b>	<b>Average TTU Test Score</b>	<b>State Average and Number of Testers</b>
Art	10	267.8	263.2/957
Science 4-8 1116	4	235.3	243/1151
Science 8-12	11	237.4	234.9/1951
Social Studies 4-8	7	251.4	247.5/890
Social Studies 8-12	1	204	241.1/3566
Special Education EC-12 1161	40	260.5	251.4/6566
Special Education Supplemental	2	263	251/756
Superintendent	8	244.1	254.6/495
Technology Applications EC-12			
Theatre	3	262.7	250.1/440
Visually Impaired	26	251.7	251/69

<sup>1</sup> State Board for Educator Certification Summary Statistics for Total Scores

<sup>2</sup> All examinations are TExES unless specified as earlier ExCET and Family and Consumer Sciences

<sup>3</sup>FACS 8-12 is administered through the American Assoc. of Family and Consumer Sciences (AFCS)

## Part V: Admission and Active Data

**Table 18: Admission Data**  
**GPA and Test ASEP Report Summary**  
**September 2011**

SB 174 and the new Accountability System for Educator Preparation programs require that programs report the GPA (cumulative and content area) basic skills test results of candidates admitted to the initial teaching program (at the time of admission). This data will be summarized for the TEA consumer website (forthcoming).

<i>Individual Overall GPA</i>	<i>Certification Field for Admission</i>	<i>Content Area GPA</i>

3.284	Bil/ESL/SpEd UG EC-6	See next chart
3.32	Early Childhood/PB EC-6	See next chart
3.10	Middle Level	See next chart
3.24	Secondary/AL	

### Content Area GPAs

	For any Generalist field or Spec Ed EC-12							
	<i>Math</i>		<i>Science</i>		<i>Social Studies</i>		<i>English</i>	
	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>
Bil/ESL/SpEd UG	8.92	3.0	10.53	3.08	19.37	2.96	8.88	2.98
Early Childhood/PB EC-6	8.29	3.02	10.19	3.15	17.4	2.94	8.28	2.82
Middle Level	14.9	3.12	23.1	3.12	13	2.93	13.85	3.0
Secondary/AL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	For Generalist EC-6									
	<i>Physical Ed.</i>		<i>Music</i>		<i>Health</i>		<i>Art</i>		<i>Theater</i>	
	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>
Bil/ESL/SpEd UG	2.17	3.70	3.00	3.84	3.00	3.23	3.00	3.65	3.00	3.53
Early Childhood/PB EC-6	2.25	3.57	3.20	3.91	.58	3.26	3.61	3.67	.30	3.7
Middle Level	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Secondary/AL	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	For Science 8-12 Only							
	<i>Bio/Life Science</i>		<i>Chemistry</i>		<i>Earth/Space Sci</i>		<i>Physics/Physics Sci</i>	
	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>
Secondary/AL	23	3.13	15	2.95	6.8	3.07	4	2.90

	For Social Studies 8-12 Only							
	<i>History</i>		<i>Economics</i>		<i>Geography</i>		<i>Civics/Govt</i>	
	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>	<i>hrs</i>	<i>GPA</i>
Secondary/AL	21	2.88	3.0	3.25	2.5	2	12.37	2.84

## Basic Skills Test Scores

### GRE Exam

		<i>GRE Overall Score</i>	<i>Reading</i>	<i>Writing</i>	<i>Analytical</i>
Elementary Post Bac	Average GRE Scores		384.44	3.1.44	429.57
Secondary AL PostBac	Average GRE Scores		390	4.0	500

### SAT Exam

		Ind Overall SAT Scores	SAT Verbal	SAT Math	SAT Writing
SpEd/Bil/ESL EC-6	Average SAT	1068.3	529.1	540	523.3
EC/PB EC-6	Average SAT	1068.5	529.24	540	523.4
Secondary/AL	Average SAT	1135.79	561.44	570.63	551.07
Middle level	Average SAT	1157.22	559.52	586.67	560.00

### ACT Exam

		Ind Overall ACT Score	ACT Reading	ACT Writing	ACT Math
SpEd/Bil/ESL EC-6	Average ACT	22.62	23.83	22.14	22.38
EC/PB EC-6	Average ACT		24.44	23.88	22.25
Middle level	Average ACT	24.05	25.32	22.84	23.83
Secondary/AL	Average ACT	23.75	24.61	23.35	23.29

### THEA/Accuplacer/Other Test

		TASP/THEA/TSI Reading	TASP/THEA/TSI Writing	TASP/THEA/TSI Math
SpEd/Bil/ESL EC-6	Accuplacer average	95.71	94.66	83.78
EC/PB EC-6	Accuplacer average	91.50	96.57	81.83
Secondary/AL	Accuplacer Average	91.69	90.41	75.48
Middle Level	Accuplacer Average	90.92	102.56	104.33
SpEd/Bil/ESL EC-6	THEA Average	254.43	243.08	246.80
EC/PB EC-6	THEA Average	249.20	243.18	228.76
Secondary/AL	THEA Average	250.15	236.30	243.74
Middle level	THEA Average	263.11	243.00	261.10



TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

## Office for Educator Certification™

**Table 19: Candidates Admitted to Educator Preparation Programs**

SBEC Annual Performance Report, Initial Certification Only, 9/15/2011

(This report is also due to TEA by September 15<sup>th</sup>. For the Sept 1 – August 31 period preceding. For the retained, I count all the actives and program finishers. This is not “by cohort,” so the candidates counted in the Applied category are not necessarily the ones in the retained category) From TEP application (applied, accepted) File Index (started,retained)

	Applied 12-13	Accepted 12-13	Started* 12-13	Retained (of those applying in 12-13 *
Female	589	462	462	754
Male	188	150	150	194
Total	777	613	613	948
Hispanic	78	57	Not available	84
Black	24	18	Not available	28
White	430	349	Not available	574
Other/NoAnswer	254	200	Not available	662

\* NOT asked/reported to the state

Note: 4 inactive, others never started

	Active/Retained Total 12-13	Finished Total 12-13
Female	754	481
Male	194	108
Total	948	589
Hispanic	84	81
Black	28	15
White	574	441
Other/NoAnswer	662	52

### TEA Annual Performance Report for Texas Tech University

Year	Applicants	Admitted	Retained	Completers	2 year Employment	5 Year Employment
2009	726	697	573	701	575	369
2010	Data not available					
2011	1042	878	1698	635	Finish 2009: 635 (68%)	Finish 2006: 647 (66.2%)
2012	699	699	810	894		

Data Source: TEA Consumer Information:

[http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147485421&menu\\_id=2147483671](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=2147485421&menu_id=2147483671)

**Table 20: Candidates ACTIVE in Educator Preparation Programs****by Teaching or Professional Field <sup>1</sup>**

<b>Certificate Description</b>	<b>Fall 2008 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2012 Total (U, PB)</b>
Agriculture Production	30 (27, 3)	37 (32, 5)	44 (34, 10)	25 (18, 7)	16(14, 2)
Art (All level or Secondary)	21 (19, 2)	22( 18, 4)	29 (25, 4)	19 (16, 3)	13(13,0)
Bilingual Supplemental (Spanish)	15 (14, 1)	28 (26, 2)	61 (60, 1)	57 (56, 1)	11(11,0)
Chemistry		8 (6, 2)	7 (5, 2)	6 (4, 2)	2(2,0)
Computer Science (Secondary)	1 (0, 1)	1 (1, 1)	0	0	0
Dance (Secondary)	4 (3, 1)	4( 3, 1)	3 (3, 0)	6 (6, 0)	1(1,0)
Deaf Education	23 (0, 23)	33 (0, 33)	28 (0, 28)	29 (0, 29)	8(0,8)
Educational Diagnostician	38	39	71	85	45
English (Secondary)	63 (35, 28)	65(42, 23)	60 (41, 19)	51 (29, 22)	9(9,0)
English as a Second Language	119 (97, 22)	154( 134, 20)	209 (188, 21)	229 (214, 15)	127(125,2)
English Language Arts and Reading (Middle)*	4 (3, 1)	5(1, 4)	11 (0, 11)	40 (40, 0)	25(25,0)
English Language Arts /R/Soc St (Middle)	57 (54, 3)	56 (56, 0)	45 (44, 1)	40 (40, 0)	23(23,0)
Family and Consumer Science --Composite	20 (14, 6)	17 (12, 5)	23 (19, 4)	17 (14, 3)	8(8,0)
Family and Consumer Science – Hosp/Nutrition/Food Science	6 (6, 0)	8 (8, 0)	13 (12, 1)	8(8, 0)	3(3,0)
Family and Consumer Science – Human Dev and Family Studies	0	0	1 (0, 1)	3 (0, 3)	0
French	1 ( 0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	3 (3, 0)	2 (2, 0)	0
Generalist Elementary	520 (406, 114)	539 (436, 103)	677 (580, 97)	685 (620, 65)	382(379,3)
German	0	3(2, 1)	2 (1, 1)	0	0
Health Education (all level)	2 (2, 0)	6 (4, 2)	2 (0, 2)	1 (0, 1)	0
History (Secondary)	46 ( 35, 11)	60 (54, 6)	74 (60, 14)	76 (69, 7)	28(28,0)
Journalism (Secondary)	2 (1, 1)	4(2, 2)	8(3, 5)	4 (3, 1)	0
Latin	0	1 (1, 0)	0	0	0
Life Sciences (Secondary)	8 (0, 8)	7 (1, 6)	10 (6, 4)	9 (5, 4)	0
Master Reading Teacher	3 (0, 3)	2 (0, 2)		1 (0, 1)	0
Master Technology Teacher	4 (0, 4)	4 (0, 4)	4 (0, 4)	2 (0, 2)	1(0,1)
Mathematics (Middle)*	66 (62, 4)	81( 74, 7)	93 (81, 12)	68 (64, 4)	38(38,0)
Mathematics (Secondary)*	30 (21, 9)	46 (38, 18)	53 (34 , 19)	43 (35, 8 )	12(12,0)
Mathematics/Physics (Secondary)	1 (1, 0)	2 (2, 0)	2 (1, 1)	3(2, 1)	0
Math/Physical Science/Engineering				1(1, 0)	0
Mathematics/Science (Middle)	43 (43, 0)	56( 56, 0)	65 (65, 0)	55 (55, 0)	26(26,0)
Music (All level)	78 (71, 7)	57 (54, 3)	66 (64, 2)	59 (55, 4)	40(40,0)
Orientation and Mobility (national cert)	14 (0, 14)	11(0, 11)	11 (0, 11)	11 (0, 11)	0
Physical Education (All level)	64 ( 57, 7)	65(52, 13)	65 (57, 8)	71 (66, 5)	5(5,0)



<b>Certificate Description</b>	<b>Fall 2008 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2009 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2010 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2011 Total (U, PB)</b>	<b>Fall 2012 Total (U, PB)</b>
or Secondary)					
Physical Science (Secondary)*	1 (0, 1)	0	0	1	0
Principal	43	55	42	31	7
Reading Specialist	3	3	4	4	0
School Counselor	23	14	10	9	14
Science (Middle)*	51 (49, 2)	69 (66, 7)	76 (72, 4)	61 (59, 2)	26(26,0)
Science Composite (Secondary)	20 (17, 3)	22(14, 6)	16 (10, 6)	32 (25, 7)	8(8,0)
Social Studies (Middle)	15 (14, 1)	31 (29, 2)	31 (23, 8)	55 (52,3)	23(23,0)
Social Studies Composite (Secondary)	13 (10, 3)	10 (7, 3)	26 (12, 14)	17 (8, 9)	0
Spanish	14 (9, 5)	22(14, 8)	31 (16, 15)	21 (11, 10)	2(2,0)
Special Education	67 (61, 6)	85(63, 22)	83 (63, 20)	98 (85, 13)	78(78,0)
Speech Communications (Secondary)	5 (4, 1)	4(2, 2)	4 (2, 2)	3 (3, 0)	0
Superintendent	7	12	9	8	1
Technology Applications	5 (0, 5)	8(0,8)	8 (0, 8)	5 (0, 5)	0
Theatre Arts	8 (6, 2)	8 (8, 0)	6 (6, 0)	7 (7, 0)	4(4,0)
Visually Impaired	60 (0, 60)	69 (0, 69)	59 (0, 59)	52 (0, 52)	37(0,37)
<b>Subtotal Elementary Initial</b>	<b>532 (418,114)</b>	<b>539 (437, 102)</b>	<b>671 (574, 97)</b>	<b>680 (616, 64)</b>	<b>598(593,5)</b>
<b>Subtotal Middle Level Initial</b>	<b>150 (139,11)</b>	<b>162 (138, 24)</b>	<b>164 (133, 31)</b>	<b>122 (108, 14)</b>	<b>151(151,0)</b>
<b>Subtotal Secondary Initial</b>	<b>270 (185, 85)</b>	<b>309 (224, 85)</b>	<b>362 (254, 108)</b>	<b>301 (227, 74)</b>	<b>78(75,2)</b>
<b>Subtotal All Level Initial</b>	<b>328 (216,112)</b>	<b>274 (198, 76)</b>	<b>281 (214, 67)</b>	<b>286 (219, 67)</b>	<b>71(71,0)</b>
<b>Subtotal Supplemental</b>	<b>122 (99, 23)</b>	<b>246 (157, 89)</b>	<b>333 (244, 89)</b>	<b>362 ( 309, 53)</b>	<b>180(178,2)</b>
<b>Subtotal Professional</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>Total Certification Areas</b>	<b>1520 (1057, 463)</b>	<b>1443 (951, 492)</b>	<b>1641 (1122, 519)</b>	<b>1531 (1110, 411)</b>	<b>1073(1064,9)</b>

<sup>1</sup> Note: Some candidates are active in more than one program

<sup>2</sup> T: Total, U: undergraduate, PB: post-baccalaureate

\*Includes Math/Science or English/Language Arts/Reading/Social Studies

### HECB Closing the Gaps Goal: Mathematics and Science Teacher Needs (State of Texas Data)

	<b>Actual 2000</b>	<b>Actual 2005</b>	<b>Target 2010</b>	<b>Target 2015</b>	<b>Target 2020</b>
Statewide Certifications	2,156	2,737	5,400	6,500	N/A
Texas Tech Certifications (TTU Records)	0	195 (56)	200 (92)	225	250

Continually identified as a high needs teaching fields, the math and science teaching areas have become even more strategic with the State Board of Education's changing the high school graduation requirements to include four years of mathematics and four years of science.

**Key Strategies:**

1. New certification specialties in elementary Math/Science and secondary Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering.
2. Offering more options for the middle level certificate in math and science areas.
3. Continued and new scholarships through the Howard Hughes science education scholar program and the Texas Tech Noyce Scholars Program.
4. Advertising and promoting the federal funded TEACH grant and signing bonuses offered by school districts for teachers of math and science.

**College of Education  
Candidate Enrollment in High Demand  
Teaching Fields<sup>1&2</sup>**

Teaching Field	Fall 2008 Total (U, PB)	Fall 2009 Total (U, PB)	Fall 2010 Total (U, PB)	Fall 2011 Total (U, PB)	Fall 2012 Total (U, PB)
<b>Bilingual/ESL</b>	<b>134 (111, 23)</b>	<b>182 (160, 22)</b>	<b>270 (248, 22)</b>		
Bilingual Supplemental (Spanish)	3 (2, 1)	28 (26, 2)	61 (60, 1)	57 (56, 1)	11(11,0)
English as a Second Language	119 (97, 22)	154 (134, 20)	209 (188, 21)	229 (214, 15)	127(127,0)
<b>Language Other Than English</b>	<b>15 (9, 6)</b>	<b>27 (17, 10)</b>	<b>36 (20, 16)</b>	<b>23 (13, 10)</b>	<b>2(2,0)</b>
French (Secondary)	1 (0, 1)	1 (0, 1)	3 (3, 0)	2 (2, 0)	0
German (Secondary)	0	3 (2, 1)	2 (1, 1)	0	0
Latin (Secondary)	0	1 (1, 0)	0	0	0
Spanish (Secondary)	14 (9, 5)	22 (14, 8)	31 (16, 15)	21 (11, 10)	2
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>97 (84, 13)</b>	<b>129 (114, 25)</b>	<b>148 (116, 32)</b>	<b>110 (98, 12)</b>	<b>50(50,0)</b>
Mathematics (Middle)*	23 (19, 4)	25(18, 7)	93 (81, 12)	68 (64, 4)	38(38,0)
Mathematics (Secondary)	30 (21, 9)	46 (38, 18)	53 (34, 19)	43 (35, 8)	12(12,0)
Mathematics/Physics (Secondary) <sup>4</sup>	1 (1, 0)	2 (2, 0)	2 (1, 1)	3 (2, 1)	0
Math/Physical Science/Engineering)				1 (1, 0)	0
Mathematics/Science (Middle) <sup>*4</sup>	43 (43, 0)	56(56, 0)	65 (65, 0)	55 (55, 0)	26(26,0)
<b>Science</b>	<b>81 (67, 14)</b>	<b>108 (86, 21)</b>	<b>111 (94, 17)</b>	<b>112 (95, 17)</b>	<b>34(34,0)</b>
Chemistry		8 (6, 2)	7 (5, 2)	6 (4, 2)	0
Life Sciences (Secondary)	8 (0, 8)	7 (1, 6)	10 (6, 4)	9 (5, 4)	0
Physical Science (Secondary)	1 (0, 1)	0	0	1 (1, 0)	26(26,0)
Science (Middle)*	51 (49, 2)	69 (66, 7)	76 (72, 4)	61, (59, 2)	26(26,0)
Science Composite (Secondary)	20 (17, 3)	22 (14, 6)	16 (10, 6)	32 (25, 7)	8(8,0)
Mathematics/Physics (Secondary) <sup>4</sup>	1 (1, 0)	2 (2, 0)	2 (1, 1)	3 (2, 1)	0
Math/Physical Science/Engineering)				1 (1, 0)	0

Mathematics/Science (Middle)* <sup>4</sup>	43 (43, 0)	56( 56, 0)	65 (65, 0)	55 (55, 0)	26(26,0)
<b>Special Education</b>	<b>202( 61, 141)</b>	<b>237 (63, 174)</b>	<b>252 (63, 189)</b>	<b>264 (76, 188)</b>	<b>129(38, 81)</b>
Deaf Education	23 (0, 23)	33 (0, 33)	28 (0, 28)	29 (0, 29)	8(0,8)
Educational Diagnostician	38 (0, 38)	39 (0, 39)	71 (0, 71)	85 (0, 85)	45
Orientation and Mobility (national cert)	14 (0, 14)	11 (0, 11)	11 (0, 11)	11 (0, 11)	0
Special Education	67 (61, 6)	85 (63, 22)	83 (63 , 20)	98 (85, 13)	38(38,0)
Teacher of the Visually Impaired	60 (0, 60)	69 (0, 69)	59 (0, 59)	52 (0, 52)	37(0,37)

<sup>1</sup> Data from the Certification Office

<sup>2</sup> Note: Some candidates are active in more than one program

<sup>3</sup> U: Undergraduate PB: Post-baccalaureate

<sup>4</sup> Double counted as both mathematics and science

<sup>5</sup> NA: Data Not Available

\*Middle level math/science is counted as middle level math, middle level science, and middle level math/science

## Part VI: Other State Reports

**Table 21: Legislative Budget Board (LBB) Performance Measure**

Educator preparation programs at public colleges and universities are required to report certification rates of teacher education graduates to the Legislative Budget Board (LBB). The certification rate required by the LBB is based upon the percentage of an institution's **undergraduate teacher education program graduates who become certified to teach no later than the end of the fiscal year following the year of graduation from the program**. This measure is used to provide an indicator of the effectiveness of an undergraduate teacher-education program's production of certified educators.

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Number of Teacher Education Graduates	416	434	395	405	521	636
Number of Graduates Certified At the End of the Next Fiscal Year	369	389	353	353	432	537
LBB Certification Rate	88.7%	89.6%	89.4%	87.2%	82.9%	84.4%
Not certified, but recommended:	9 (2.2%)	6 (1.4%)	2 (0.5%)	4 (1.0%)	17 (3.3%)	10(1.6)
Not recommended, but tested	28 (6.7%)	30 (6.9%)	25 (6.3%)	39 (9.6%)	69 (13.2%)	86(13.5)
Not recommended or tested	10 (2.4%)	9 (2.1%)	15 (3.8%)	9 (2.2%)	3 (0.6%)	3(0.5)

**Table 22: ASEP Principal Survey of Beginning Teachers  
May, 2011**

(Pilot Year Data) No updates to this data since 2011

4 -Well prepared All or almost all of the time, the beginning teacher was able to demonstrate a thorough understanding and had the required knowledge and skills.

3- Sufficiently prepared Most of the time, the beginning teacher was able to demonstrate a general understanding and had the required knowledge and skills.

2- Not sufficiently prepared The beginning teacher demonstrated limited understanding and had partial required knowledge and skills.

1-Not at all prepared The beginning teacher demonstrated little to no understanding and had minimal required knowledge and skills.

Question	Texas Tech Candidates	All Candidates	Texas State	University of Houston	University of Texas
Section I Teacher Background					
Was this beginning teacher employed in the certification area in which he/she was trained by the educator preparation program?					
Did this beginning teacher teach at this campus for five or more months of the academic year?					
<b>Section II: Classroom Environment (average)</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.43</b>
4. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to effectively implement discipline/management procedures?	3.23	3.18	3.28	3.22	3.28
5. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to communicate clear expectations for achievement and behavior that promote and encourage self-discipline and self-directed learning?	3.30	3.24	3.33	3.28	3.38
6. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide support to achieve a positive, equitable, and engaging learning environment?	3.40	3.36	3.45	3.38	3.48
7. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to build and maintain positive rapport with students?	3.50	3.45	3.54	3.47	3.54
8. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to build and maintain positive rapport and two-way communication with students' families?	3.35	3.33	3.39	3.33	3.48
<b>Section III: Instruction</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>3.40</b>
9. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to implement varied instruction that integrates critical thinking, inquiry, and problem solving?	3.27	3.18	3.27	3.23	3.34
10. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to respond to the needs of students	3.27	3.24	3.35	3.30	3.40

by being flexible in instructional approach and differentiating instruction?					
11. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use the results of formative assessment data to guide instruction?	3.17	3.14	3.18	3.19	3.29
12. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to engage and motivate students through learner-centered instruction?	3.36	3.29	3.40	3.40	3.45
13. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to integrate effective modeling, questioning, and self-reflection (self-assessment) strategies into instruction?	3.29	3.20	3.33	3.30	3.37
14. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to assume various roles in the instructional process (e.g. instructor, facilitator, audience)?	3.34	3.24	3.34	3.27	3.40
15. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to set clear learning goals and align instruction with standards-based content?	3.31	3.26	3.36	3.29	3.47
16. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide quality and timely feedback to students?	3.35	3.31	3.40	3.34	3.48
<b>Section IV: Students With Disabilities</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.29</b>
17. Does this teacher have students with disabilities in his/her classroom, as determined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) 29.003? A child is considered a student with disabilities if he or she has a physical, cognitive, behavioral, or other related impairment.	0.83	0.79	0.78	0.69	0.72
18. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students with disabilities?	3.22	3.16	3.24	3.21	3.29
19. To what extent was this	3.15	3.13	3.19	3.10	3.23

beginning teacher prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the behavioral needs of students with disabilities?					
20. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide appropriate ways for students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning?	3.22	3.19	3.27	3.23	3.30
21. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to understand and adhere to the federal and state laws that govern special education services?	3.24	3.23	3.29	3.26	3.33
22. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to make appropriate decisions (e.g., when and how to make accommodations and/or modifications to instruction, assessment, materials, delivery, and classroom procedures) to meet the learning needs of student who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP)?	3.25	3.18	3.24	3.17	3.26
23. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to develop and/or implement formal and informal assessments that track students' progress toward IEP goals and objectives?	3.15	3.11	3.13	3.08	3.25
24. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to collaborate with others, such as paraeducators and other teachers, in meeting the academic, developmental, and behavioral needs of students with disabilities?	3.30	3.29	3.39	3.26	3.39
<b>Section V: English Language Learners</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.33</b>
25. Does this teacher have Limited English Proficient (LEPELL) students in their classroom, as determined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) 29.052? A student is considered LEPELL if she or he comes from a home in which a language other than English is his/her primary language and who is identified as	0.61	0.70	0.61	0.72	0.68



limited English proficient.					
26. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide appropriate ways for LEPELL students to demonstrate their learning?	3.17	3.18	3.20	3.31	3.27
27. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to understand and adhere to federal and state laws that govern education services for LEPELL students?	3.20	3.20	3.21	3.27	3.33
28. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to comply with district and campus policies and procedures regarding LEPELL students?	3.27	3.28	3.30	3.30	3.38
29. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to support LEPELL students in mastering the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), including the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)?	3.18	3.19	3.20	3.24	3.33
30. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to model and teaches the forms and functions of academic English in content areas?	3.19	3.21	3.24	3.30	3.32
<b>Section VI: Technology Integration</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3.38</b>
31. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use technology available on the campus to integrate curriculum TEKS and Technology Applications TEKS to support student learning?	3.46	3.34	3.36	3.33	3.45
32. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to provide technology-based classroom learning opportunities that allow students to interact with real-time and/or online content?	3.40	3.28	3.32	3.25	3.37
33. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to teach students developmentally appropriate technology skills?	3.36	3.26	3.33	3.23	3.36
34. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use	3.43	3.32	3.37	3.29	3.42

technology to make learning more active and engaging for students?					
<b>Section VII: Use of Technology with Data</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>3.37</b>
35. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use available technology to collect, manage, and analyze student data using software programs (such as Excel or an electronic gradebook)?	3.27	3.22	3.26	3.17	3.35
36. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use available technology to collect, manage, and analyze data from multiple sources in order to interpret learning results for students?	3.28	3.24	3.27	3.21	3.34
37. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use available technology to document student learning to determine when an intervention is necessary and appropriate?	3.27	3.22	3.24	3.17	3.35
38. To what extent was this beginning teacher prepared to use available technology to collect and manage formative assessment data to guide instruction?	3.26	3.22	3.26	3.17	3.36
<b>Section VIII: Overall Evaluation of the Educator Preparation Program</b>					
39. What is your overall evaluation of how well the educator preparation program prepared this teacher? Select the one statement that most closely matches your current overall perspective on the program.	3.36	3.31	3.39	3.39	3.47
<b>Section IX: Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement</b>					
40. How would you rate this teacher's influence on student achievement? Select your answer from the following 10 point scale.	7.57	7.38	7.59	7.56	7.72

Local Comparisons by Broad Fields

	Texas Tech	Wayland	WTA&M	LCU	All
Section II: Classroom Environment	3.36	3.38	3.31	3.32	3.31
Section III: Instruction	3.30	3.31	3.21	3.20	3.23
Section IV: Students With Disabilities	3.22	3.25	3.14	3.26	3.18

Section V: English Language Learners	3.20	3.31	3.09	3.06	3.21
Section VI: Technology Integration	3.35	3.33	3.22	3.27	3.27
Section VII: Use of Technology with Data	3.36	3.36	3.25	3.24	3.31
Section VIII: Overall Evaluation of the Educator Preparation Program					
39. What is your overall evaluation of how well the educator preparation program prepared this teacher? Select the one statement that most closely matches your current overall perspective on the program.	3.36	3.38	3.28	3.32	3.31
Section IX: Teacher Effectiveness and Student Achievement					
40. How would you rate this teacher's influence on student achievement? Select your answer from the following 10 point scale.	7.57	7.57	7.45	7.53	7.38

#### Definitions:

##### Section II: Classroom Environment

Equitable: Fair or just to everyone, giving everyone the same opportunities.

Rapport: A close relationship between the teacher and students that is characterized by polite, respectful, warm and caring interactions that reflect an understanding of students' cultural and developmental differences.

##### Section III: Instruction

Formative assessment: Assessment that is embedded in the instruction, designed to increase feedback to students and teachers, and support data driven decisions about instruction for students.

Learner centered Instruction: The practice of giving students the opportunity to interact with other students to answer questions, problem solve, work in pairs or groups, select some learning topics, and evaluate their own learning. The focus is on the students' construction of knowledge.

##### Section IV: Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities: These students are defined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.003 as children who have a physical, cognitive, behavioral or other related impairment.

Differentiated instruction: Instruction tailored to individual learning styles, needs, background, and level of understanding.

Individualized Education Program (IEP): For a child with a disability, a written statement of services that includes the child's present levels of performance, measurable annual goals, accommodations and progress measures.

Formal Assessments: These include standardized tests and may also encompass alternative assessments. Informal Assessments: These pertain to performance based activities, observations of students, teacher created assessments, student portfolios, and content learning logs, etc.; they may also include alternative assessments.

##### Section V: Limited English Proficient Students

Limited English Proficient and English Language Learners (LEPELL) students: These students are defined by Texas Education Code (TEC) §29.052. A student of "Limited English Proficiency" means a student whose primary language is other

than English and whose English language skills are such that the student has difficulty performing ordinary class work in English.

Academic English: Academic language proficiency is used to define academic English. Academic language proficiency is the ability to understand the English terms that make the learning of academic concepts and skills fully accessible. Language proficiency encompasses both social language proficiency and academic language proficiency.

#### Section VI: Technology Integration

Real-time content: Synchronous; Content that is continuously updated and immediately available to the public.

Developmentally appropriate: Appropriate for the sensory motor skills based on the growth and development of the student at a particular time. The age and level of exposure the student has to the available technology is part of that definition.

#### Section VII: Use of Technology with Data

Formative Assessment Data: Formative assessment data assists teachers with integrating assessment into their daily teaching practice and utilizing data-driven decision making to support instruction; the data should provide the basis for modification of instructional practice.

**ASEP Candidate's Survey of Teacher Preparation**  
**May, 2011**  
(Pilot Year Data)

3 -Well prepared All or almost all of the time, the beginning teacher was able to demonstrate a thorough understanding and had the required knowledge and skills.

2- Sufficiently prepared Most of the time, the beginning teacher was able to demonstrate a general understanding and had the required knowledge and skills.

1- Not sufficiently prepared The beginning teacher demonstrated limited understanding and had partial required knowledge and skills.

0-Not at all prepared The beginning teacher demonstrated little to no understanding and had minimal required knowledge and skills.

Question	Texas Tech Candidates % of students feeling well prepared	All Candidates in State of Texas EPP
<b>Section 3: Classroom Environment and Instruction</b>		
4. To what extent were you prepared to effectively implement discipline/management procedures?	64	71
5. To what extent were you prepared to communicate clear expectations for achievement and behavior that promote and encourage self-discipline and self-directed learning?	73	75
6. To what extent were you prepared to provide support to achieve a positive, equitable, and engaging learning environment?	85	80
7. To what extent were you prepared to build and maintain positive rapport with students?	86	83
8. To what extent were you prepared to build and maintain positive rapport and two-way communication with students' families?	61	69
9. To what extent were you prepared to implement varied instruction that integrates critical thinking, inquiry, and problem solving?	67	70
10. To what extent were you r prepared to respond to the needs of students by being flexible in instructional approach and differentiating instruction?	73	73
11. To what extent were you prepared to use the results of formative assessment data to guide instruction?	54	62
12. To what extent were you prepared to engage and motivate students through learner-centered instruction?	75	75
13. To what extent were you prepared to integrate effective modeling, questioning, and self-reflection (self-assessment) strategies into instruction?	76	74
14. To what extent were you prepared to assume various roles in the instructional process (e.g. instructor, facilitator, audience)?	73	73
15. To what extent were you prepared to set clear learning goals and align instruction with standards-based content?	75	75
16. To what extent were you prepared to provide quality and timely feedback to students?	77	75
<b>Section IV: Students With Disabilities</b>		
17. Do you have students with disabilities in his/her classroom, as determined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) 29.003? A child is considered a student with disabilities if he or she has a physical, cognitive, behavioral, or other related impairment.	85	82
18. To what extent were you prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the academic needs of students with disabilities?	51	55
19. To what extent were you prepared to differentiate instruction to meet the behavioral needs of students with disabilities?	50	56
20. To what extent were you prepared to provide appropriate	52	57

ways for students with disabilities to demonstrate their learning?		
21. To what extent were you prepared to understand and adhere to the federal and state laws that govern special education services?	58	63
22. To what extent were you prepared to make appropriate decisions (e.g., when and how to make accommodations and/or modifications to instruction, assessment, materials, delivery, and classroom procedures) to meet the learning needs of student who have an Individualized Education Program (IEP)?	53	59
23. To what extent were you prepared to develop and/or implement formal and informal assessments that track students' progress toward IEP goals and objectives?	55	56
24. To what extent were you teacher prepared to collaborate with others, such as paraeducators and other teachers, in meeting the academic, developmental, and behavioral needs of students with disabilities?	68	68
<b>Section V: English Language Learners</b>		
25. Do you have Limited English Proficient (LEPELL) students in their classroom, as determined by the Texas Education Code (TEC) 29.052? A student is considered LEPELL if she or he comes from a home in which a language other than English is his/her primary language and who is identified as limited English proficient.	54	69
26. To what extent were you prepared to provide appropriate ways for LEPELL students to demonstrate their learning?	58	59
27. To what extent were you prepared to understand and adhere to federal and state laws that govern education services for LEPELL students?	56	60
28. To what extent were you prepared to comply with district and campus policies and procedures regarding LEPELL students?	63	63
29. To what extent were you prepared to support LEPELL students in mastering the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), including the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS)?	53	60
30. To what extent were you prepared to model and teaches the forms and functions of academic English in content areas?	60	62
<b>Section VI: Technology Integration</b>		
31. To what extent were you prepared to use technology available on the campus to integrate curriculum TEKS and Technology Applications TEKS to support student learning?	78	70
32. To what extent were you prepared to provide technology-based classroom learning opportunities that allow students to interact with real-time and/or online content?	70	65
33. To what extent were you to teach students developmentally appropriate technology skills?	67	64
34. To what extent were you prepared to use technology to make learning more active and engaging for students?	76	72
<b>Section VII: Use of Technology with Data</b>		

35. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to collect, manage, and analyze student data using software programs (such as Excel or an electronic gradebook)?	59	60
36. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to collect, manage, and analyze data from multiple sources in order to interpret learning results for students?	55	57
37. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to document student learning to determine when an intervention is necessary and appropriate?	54	56
38. To what extent were you prepared to use available technology to collect and manage formative assessment data to guide instruction?	57	58
39. To what extent did your Field Supervisor share with you the expectations for your performance in the classroom before each observation?	71	73
40. To what extent did your Field Supervisor base observation feedback on the expectations for your performance in the classroom?	78	80
41. To what extent did your Field Supervisor provide you with a written report or checklist of his/her observation of your performance in the classroom?	81	83
42. To what extent did your Field Supervisor offer feedback on your performance in the classroom within one week of each observation?	86	85
43. To what extent did your Field Supervisor include specific strategies that address your strengths and weaknesses in his/her feedback about your performance in the classroom?	79	79
44. To what extent did your Field Supervisor hold an interactive conference with you after each observation?	82	78
45. To what extent did your Field Supervisor help you solve problems, make specific recommendations for improvement or act as your advocate?	73	75
46. Did you ever communicate with your Field Supervisor by email, text, or telephone call?	100	98
47. To what extent did your Field Supervisor respond to your communications, for example email, text, or telephone call, within two school/business days?	85	84
48. To what extent did your Field Supervisor offer you opportunities to reflect on your performance in the classroom?	80	78
49. To what extent did your Field Supervisor provide multiple means for you to communicate with him/her, such as email, telephone, texting, videoconferencing, or face-to-face interaction?	89	84
50. To what extent did your Field supervisor ask you for ways he/she can support you	79	77
51. The Field Supervisor FORMALLY observed me teaching a minimum of three times.	100	98
52. The Field Supervisor observed me teaching for a minimum of 45 minutes during at least three of my FORMAL observations.	100	98



53. What is your overall evaluation of how well the educator preparation program prepared you? Select the one statement that most closely matches your current overall perspective on the program.	77	73
--	----	----

**Table 23. Data Required for Title II Report**

**Section 1b: Enrollment**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Traditional (Undergraduate), Alternative (PostBac) 2009-2010</b>	<b>Traditional (Undergraduate), Alternative (PostBac) 2010-2011</b>	<b>Traditional (Undergraduate), Alternative (PostBac) 2011-2012</b>	<b>Traditional (Undergraduate), Alternative (PostBac) 2012-2013</b>
<b>Total candidates enrolled</b>	986, 295	1123, 308	1112 , 221	
Males	206, 87	226, 84	228, 49	
Females	780, 208	897, 224	884, 172	
Hispanic	135, 47	199, 51	200, 42	
Am Indian /Alaska Native	8, 2	8, 0	5, 2	
Asian	4, 5	5, 9	11, 5	
Black	17, 25	22, 19	24 , 11	
Nat Hawaiian/Pac Islander				
White	815, 201	855, 217	849, 157	
Two or more races	7, 15	34, 12	4, 0	
Other/unknown			17, 6	

**Section 1d: Teachers Prepared by Academic Major**

<b>Item</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>
Agricultural Education, Ag Science and Natural Resources		15	
Biology		5	
Chemistry		1	
Dance, Visual and Performing Arts	3	8	
Early Childhood, Human Sciences	54	110	
English, Arts and Sciences	18	49	
Exercise and Sports Sciences, Arts and Sciences	16	40	
Family and Consumer Sciences Applied and Professional Studies, Human Sciences	4	78	
French, Arts and Sciences		1	
German, Arts and Sciences	1	3	
Health, Arts and Sciences	2	2	
History, Arts and Sciences	23	44	

Journalism, Mass Communications	1	1	
Mathematics, Arts and Sciences	6	27	
Multidisciplinary Sciences, Education	9	8	
Multidisciplinary Studies, Education	93	229	
Music, Visual and Performing Arts	8	21	
Spanish, Arts and Sciences	2	14	
Theatre Arts, Visual and Performing Arts	3	6	
Visual Studies, Visual and Performing Arts	7	2	
Total	272		

## Title II Annual Goals (in High Needs Areas)

### Traditional, Undergraduate Program

Teacher Shortage Area	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Math	Goal: 10% increase (77) Goal Met: Y 18% increase (84)	Goal: 10% increase (92) Goal Met: Y 35% increase (114)	Goal: 10% increase (125) Goal Met: n 2% increase (116)	
Science	Goal: 10% increase (66) Goal Met: Y 12% increase (67)	Goal: 10% increase (74) Goal Met: Y 28% increase (86)	Goal: 10% increase (94) Goal Met: Y 10% increase (94)	
Special Education	Goal: 10% increase (41) Goal Met: Y 65% increase (61)	Goal: 10% increase (73) Goal Met: N 3% increase (63) *Note the 65% increase for 2008	Goal: 10% increase (69) Goal Met: y 0% increase (63)	
Instruction of limited English proficient students (Bilingual and ESL)	Goal: 10% increase (63) Goal Met: Y 88% increase (111)	Goal: 10% increase (122) Goal Met: Y 44% increase (160)	Goal: 10% increase (176) Goal Met: y 55% increase (248)	
LOTE	Goal: 10% increase (9) Goal Met: Y 12% increase (9)	Goal: 10% increase (10) Goal Met: Y 70% increase (17)	Goal: 10% increase (19) Goal Met: Y 18% increase (20)	

### Alternative, PostBac Program (Based on Fall Program Enrollment, Table 20)

Teacher Shortage Area	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Math	Goal: 10% increase (16) Goal Met: Y 20% increase (18)	Goal: 10% increase (14) Goal Met: Y 92% increase (25)	Goal: 10% increase (28) Goal Met: Y 28% increase (32)	
Science	Goal: 10% increase (27) Goal Met: n	Goal: 10% increase (16) Goal Met: Y 50% increase (21)	Goal: 10% increase (23) Goal Met: n 20% decrease (17)	
Special Education	Goal: 10% increase (141) Goal Met: Y 11% increase (174)	Goal: 10% increase (155) Goal Met: y 16% increase (174)	Goal: 10% increase (191) Goal Met: n 20% increase (139)	
Instruction of limited English proficient students (Bilingual and ESL)	Goal: 10% increase (13) Goal Met: Y 92% increase (23)	Goal: 10% increase (24) Goal Met: n decrease of 1 candidate (22) **Note last year's	Goal: 10% increase (24) Goal Met: n 0% increase (22)	

		increase of 92%		
LOTE	Goal: 10% increase (14) Goal Met: N	Goal: 10% increase (7) Goal Met: Y 66% increase (10)	Goal: 10% increase (11) Goal Met: Y 60% increase (16)	

**Key Strategies (Math and Science):**

1. New certification specialties in elementary Math/Science and secondary Mathematics, Physical Science, and Engineering.
2. Offering more options for the middle level certificate in math and science areas.
3. Continued and new scholarships through the Howard Hughes science education scholar program and the Texas Tech Noyce Scholars Program.
4. Advertising and promoting the federal funded TEACH grant and signing bonuses offered by school districts for teachers of math and science.

**Description of steps to improve performance in meeting goal or lessons learned in meeting goal:**

Lessons learned: Scholarships are critical to increasing enrollment in this high need area. Collaboration with the content-area faculty across the university is important.

**Key Strategies (ESL/Bilingual):**

- 1) Initiated certification programs in the Hill Country and Dallas (effective Fall 2009)
- 2) Established close partnerships with community college transfer
- 3) TTU faculty have developed content-specific strategies to work with ESL students, grounded in discipline.
- 4) Advertising and promoting the federal funded TEACH grant and signing bonuses offered by school districts.

**Lessons learned:**

Scholarships are critical to increasing enrollment in this high need area. Collaboration with the content-area faculty across the university is important.

Appropriate advisement about the high-needs teaching fields makes a difference. Many districts are requiring ESL certification of their teachers.



## Part VII: PACE 2011 Relevant Results

### Implications of PACE 2011 Report for TechTeach

---

#### Summary of Trends

- The population of students in PZPI schools has increased about 1% over the last five years
- Historically, TTU supplies about 70% of teachers in the PZPI
- About 60% of TTU certification graduates teach outside of the PZPI
- Many of TTU certification graduates teach in schools:
  - That are predominantly Hispanic, while an overwhelming percentage of graduates are White
  - Where a majority of students are classified as economically disadvantaged
  - Where 5 to 10% of the students have language and learning needs, while our proportion of graduates prepared to meet those needs is low
  - Where achievement in math and ELAR is consistently below the state average. Any areas where growth is evident, this change is modest, at best
- ACPs produce about 12 times more certified teachers than does TTU
- Attrition rates of TTU graduates is higher than comparable institutions, and only slightly lower than ACPs

#### Broad Program Implications

- TTU-COE is largely accountable for the performance of students in the PZPI
- We need to know information about the district to which our graduates go upon completion of their program at TTU
- For our graduates who remain in the PZPI, they must be prepared to work with students who are largely from ethnic/racial groups, and economic circumstances that are different from their own
- Although a variety of reasons exist for attrition, TTU should take steps to increase the rates at which certification graduates are able to remain in the teaching field

**Part VII: Relevant Statistics from PACE 2011 Report  
Summarized by Doug Hammon, Ph.D.**

***Demographics***

- Within the Proximal Zone of Professional Impact (75-mile radius around TTU), there are 61 traditional school districts, and 2 charter districts totaling 80K students (2009-2010)
- Student demographics of PZPI include
  - 66% minority (57% Hispanic; 9% African-American)
  - 62% economically disadvantaged
    - At the elementary level, 69% are economically disadvantaged
    - At middle level and secondary, about 57% are economically disadvantaged
  - 10% receive special education services across all levels
  - 5% are classified as LEP, about the same (5%) in Bilingual
    - At secondary level, this figure drops to 3% either due to transitions out of programs ... or drop out
- Within the PZPI, overall student growth within the region was 1.5% from 2007 to 2010
- The groups exhibiting the greatest increase in numbers include:
  - Asian students (increased 12%)
  - Students in Bilingual programs (increased 7.7%)
  - Students who are economically disadvantaged (increased 5.7%)
  - Hispanic students (increased 5.1%)
- The groups exhibiting the least growth in numbers (or decline) include:
  - Students receiving SPED services (decreased by 14%)
  - White students (decreased 4%)
  - Native-American students (decreased 2%)

***Achievement Trends***

- From 2007 to 2010, changes in achievement in **Mathematics** among students in the TTU PZPI were:
  - Greatest among African-American students (passing rates on TAKS) at all levels (elementary = 4.6%; middle-level = 8%; secondary = 13.3%)
  - Below state averages for all sub-populations
- From 2007 to 2010, changes in achievement in **ELAR** among students in the TTU PZPI were:
  - Greatest among all sub-populations of students at the secondary level
  - Also well below state averages
  - Negative among most sub-populations of students at the elementary and middle level
  - Hispanic students exhibited the least amount growth at all levels
- From 2007 to 2010, rates of “commended” performance in **Mathematics**
  - Remained near steady across all levels for all ethnic/racial subgroups
  - Was greatest among White students at all levels
  - Was least among African-American students at all levels
- From 2007 to 2010, rates of “commended” performance in **ELAR**
  - Remained mostly steady from 2008 to 2010
- From 2007 to 2010, **gaps in student “commended” performance**
  - In Mathematics, hovered between 15% and 22% between White and African-American students, with the largest gaps occurring in 2009, but only slightly less in 2010.
  - In ELAR, hovered between 15% and 24% between White and African-American students, with the largest gaps occurring in 2008.
- In 2010, the highest and lowest achieving schools in **Mathematics** were:
  - Secondary: Sundown HS (94%) / PEP Alternative School (Sudan ISD) (0%)
  - Middle: School for Young Women Leaders (Lubbock ISD) (98%) / Dunbar MS (Lubbock ISD) (58%)
  - Elementary: Sundown Elementary (100%) / Lorenzo Elementary (55%)
- In 2010, the highest and lowest achieving schools in **ELAR** were:

- Secondary: Choices Alternative HS (Seagraves ISD) (100%) / PEP Alternative HS (Sundown ISD) (40%)
- Middle: School for Young Women Leaders (99%) / Dunbar MS (72%)
- Elementary: Crestview Elementary (Frenship ISD) (100%) / Parkway Elementary (Lubbock ISD) (70%)

### ***Teacher Production***

- About 8% of TTU graduates become certified as public-school teachers (approximately 500 each year)
- Frequency of post-bac certification decreased by 40% from 2006 to 2010
- Frequency of undergraduate certification increased by 14% from 2006 to 2010
- Between 2006 and 2010, few teachers from “minority” groups were graduated (White = 83%; Hispanic = 12%; African-American = 2%) despite racial/ethnic composition of the PZPI
- Consistent with 5-year trends, in 2010, the greatest number of teachers who graduated from TTU were Elementary Level – Generalists (n = 206).
- From 2000 to 2010, Texas Tech graduated 73% (n = 5,649) of the certified teachers in the PZPI
- During SY2010, the percentage of TTU certification graduates hired in PZPI districts was approximately
  - Secondary = 28% (highest in English and Science)
  - Middle-level = 27% (highest in English and Mathematics)
  - Elementary = 26% (highest in “generalist” category)
- Approximately 60% of TTU graduates with teacher certification are hired OUTSIDE of the PZPI. This ratio has remained steady since 2009.
- For SY2010, approximately 40% of new hires in Lubbock ISD were from TTU
- This trend is consistent since 1995

### ***Production by Level and Content***

- At the K-12 and secondary level, TTU graduated more Fine Arts (36) and P.E. (46) teachers than
  - English (35),
  - Social Studies (34),
  - Special Education (33),
  - Science (19),
  - Mathematics (18).
- On average (2001 to 2010), TTU graduates (Secondary and K-12 certification students):
  - 12 teachers who earn an ESL supplemental certification;
  - .20 teachers who earn a Special Education supplemental certification; and
  - .40 who earn a Bilingual supplemental certification
  - Yes, the decimal point is in the right place
- On average (2001 to 2010), TTU graduates (Elementary)
  - 237 Generalists
  - Counts of ESL and SPED supplements are problematic to track
- On average (2001 to 2010), TTU graduates (Middle-level)
  - 60 teachers evenly split between English & Science
  - Counts of secondary areas (SocSt & Math) are also difficult to count

### ***Teachers Hired by Lubbock ISD***

- Although 60% of our graduates leave the Lubbock area, approximately 40% of the teacher work-force in the Lubbock ISD graduates from Texas Tech
- In the Lubbock ISD high schools (2009-2010), between 19% (Estacado) and 38% (Coronado) of staff are TTU graduates. Rates of Economically Disadvantaged students ranges from 87% (Estacado) to 30% (Coronado)
- In the Lubbock ISD middle schools (2009-2010), between 34% (O.L. Slaton) and 57% (SFYWL) of staff are TTU graduates. Rates of Economically Disadvantaged students ranges from 92% (Alderson) to 18% (Irons)
- In the Lubbock ISD elementary schools (2009-2010), between 35% (Parkway) to 52% (Arnett) of staff are TTU graduates. Rates of Economically Disadvantaged Students ranges from 98% (Bozeman Elementary) to 55% (Williams Elementary).



### ***Teacher Attrition Rates***

- Overall, from 2007, Texas Tech prepared teachers exhibit a higher attrition rate (24%) compared with UTEP (12%) and UNT (19%)
- For teachers certified in 2006, by 2011, attrition rates of TTU certification graduates in PZPI schools (24%) is greater than comparison CREATE public universities in Texas (19%), and only slightly lower than for-profit and non-profit ACPs (28%)
- Attrition rates of teachers in secondary and middle level were higher among ACP-prepared than TTU prepared (23% vs. 30%)
- Attrition rates of teachers in elementary level were highest among TTU-prepared compared with ACP-prepared (26% vs. 24%)
- ACPs in Texas prepare about 12 times the number of teachers than does Texas Tech University
- Across the 43 CREATE-consortium universities, proportion of teacher production (certifications / baccalaureate degrees) is declining at 86% of these institutions. Texas Tech is among those declining in production.

## Part VIII: Historical Overview

• Texas Technological College created by legislation (Education coursework was housed in Liberal Arts)	1923
• Teacher education program initiated	1958
• NCATE accreditation received	1963
• College of Education formed	1967
• Education restructured as a college as Texas Tech becomes a university	1969
• GPA for program admission raised from 2.25 to 2.50	1980
• State basic skills examination required	1981
• State certification examination required	1985
• Alternative certification initiated (Individuals allowed to be certified outside a university-based program.)	1986
• GPA for program admission raised from 2.50 To 2.70 for elementary and early childhood programs	1990
• House Bill 2185 in effect (Allowed certified individuals to add endorsements, teaching fields, specializations, or change levels without going through a university.)	1990
• Undergraduate enrollment management initiated	1992
• District Permits Authorized	1995
• Revised Rules Authorizing Candidates to take Examinations	2001 <sup>1</sup>
• Educator preparation standards changed by the state	1955
	1972
	1984
	1987
	1995
	2000
	2002 <sup>2</sup>
	2007 <sup>3</sup>
	2009
• Largest Number Recommended for Certification (1972-73)	1467
• Smallest Number Recommended for Certification (1987-88)	538
• Current Year Recommended for Certification (2010-2011)	606

<sup>1</sup> SBEC TAC 230.5c specifying that program “completers” must be authorized by their program to take the certification test(s). Rule into effect 9/1/01. Teacher preparation programs were then held accountable (through the ASEP report) for certification results of their program completers.

<sup>2</sup> SBEC implemented standards-based certification programs in lieu of credit-hour based programs; TExES exams replaced ExCET exams (phased in over several years)

<sup>3</sup> EC-4 program changed to EC-6

## Part IX: Glossary of Terms

**Accreditation:** Official recognition that an entity or institution meets required standards. Texas Tech University's teacher preparation program is accredited by both the Texas State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

**ASEP:** Texas has a legislated Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) system that rates educator preparation programs as Accredited, Accredited-Not Rated, Accredited-Warning, Accredited-Probation, and Not Accredited-Revoked, revised in 2010 in response to SB174 and HEA, under Texas Administrative Code 229. The ASEP ratings are based on how program completers in seven demographic groups (All students, Female, Male, African American, Hispanic, Other and White), with small group exception (<10), perform on four standards. The four standards are (1) the Pass Rate on certification exams, (2) the results of appraisals of beginning teachers by school administrations, (3) the improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers for the first three years (expected in 2013), and (4) the results of data collections on the frequency, duration and quality of field supervision of beginning teachers during the first year in the classroom.

**Basic Skills:** "the ability to read, write and speak in English, and to use mathematics at a level necessary to function at work and in society in general" -- *The Basic Skills Agency*

**Bilingual Education:** The use of two or more languages for instruction. In the United States, students in most bilingual classes or programs are those who have not acquired full use of the English language, so they are taught academic content in their native language (usually Spanish) while continuing to learn English.

**Candidate:** a participant in an educator preparation program

**Cohort:** a group of candidates with the expectation of beginning and completing their program on the same timeline

**Critical Shortage Areas:** Certification fields that are difficult to fill including math, science, bilingual, special education, English as a Second Language, foreign languages and technology (as defined by TEA)

**EPP:** Educator Preparation Programs

**English as a Second Language (ESL):** Teaching English to non-English-speaking or limited-English-proficient (LEP) students to help them learn and succeed in Schools. ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) has generally the same meaning as ESL

**Field-based experiences:** experiences in which the primary activity of a candidate for certification is the performance of professional educator activities while interacting with pre-kindergarten-Grade 12 students and teachers and university faculty/staff members in a school-related setting. The professional activities include more than observation within a classroom. The interaction with students, teachers, and university personnel must be ongoing and relevant.

**Intern:** a candidate with a bachelor's degree, formally accepted into an educator preparation program that is employed in a supervised educational experience leading to standard certification. At Texas Tech, the intern must have completed all courses except for Internship and Capstone and have passed the content area certification exam.

**Pedagogy:** The art and science of teaching; especially the conscious use of particular instructional methods.

**Post baccalaureate (Post Bac):** Individuals with a bachelor's degree who are taking additional hours for teacher certification but not enrolled in a degree seeking program

**Probationary Certificate:** a type of credential, valid for one calendar year, issued to an individual who is enrolled in an educator preparation program, employed as an educator, and is serving in a supervised internship to satisfy the field experience requirements of the certificate. The holder of a Probationary Certificate must be employed by an accredited Texas public or private school in a position appropriate for the certificate sought.

**Professional:** A certification program that requires or leads to a master's degree; e.g., superintendent, principal, school counselor, educational diagnostician, reading specialist

**Standard Certificate:** The official educator license issued by the Texas State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC); must be renewed every five years to remain valid. The Standard Certificate replaced the lifetime Provisional and Professional Certificates in 1999.

**SCH:** University semester credit hour; 1 semester hour = 15 clock hours

**TEKS:** Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills; the state curriculum in Texas

**TE<sub>x</sub>ES:** Texas Examination of Educator Standards. TAC 230.5(b) requires every person seeking educator certification in Texas to perform satisfactorily on comprehensive examinations. The purpose of these examinations is to ensure that each educator has the prerequisite content and professional knowledge necessary for an entry-level position in Texas public schools

**THEA:** Texas Higher Education Assessment, used to assess basic skills in math, reading and writing

**Undergraduate:** a student enrolled in a college or university seeking a baccalaureate degree