



AAQEP Annual Report for AY2022-2023

Provider/Program Name:	University of Houston
End Date of Current AAQEP Accreditation Term (or “n/a” if not yet accredited):	April 2029

PART I: Publicly Available Program Performance and Candidate Achievement Data

1. Overview and Context

This overview describes the mission and context of the educator preparation provider and the programs included in its AAQEP review.

Located in the metropolis of Houston, the University of Houston provides students with cutting-edge programs including undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, distance, and continuing education studies. The University of Houston's heritage of academic excellence dates back to its establishment in 1927. The University of Houston is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award baccalaureate, master's, professional, and doctoral degrees. The [UH System](#) includes four universities and six multi-institution regional instructional sites that offer degrees in partnership with the universities. The University of Houston is the largest institution of the UH System.

Each year we educate more than 40,000 students in more than 300 [undergraduate](#) and [graduate](#) academic programs on campus and online. The University of Houston is a Carnegie-designated Tier One public research university, recognized by The Princeton Review as one of the nation's best colleges for undergraduate education. The University of Houston is the second most ethnically diverse major research university in the United States, as students come to UH from more than 137 nations. Of note, the University of Houston is designated as a [Hispanic-Serving Institution \(HSI\)](#) by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Postsecondary Education. Additionally, UH is designated a Tier One research university.

According to data from the Greater Houston Partnership Research Department, Houston is one of the most racially and ethnically diverse metropolitan areas in the country and more diverse than the nation. The greater Houston metropolitan area is home to 1.2 million school-aged children.

Students in the College of Education largely come from Texas and the greater Houston region; over 95% of our students are from Texas, and over 85% from Harris and surrounding counties. More than 50% of our undergraduates are first generation college students, over 65% are transfer students, and over 75% are students of color. Thus, our students are from communities around the University of Houston, and upon graduation are returning to serve these communities. Over 96% of our students teach within 75 miles of the University of Houston. As such, we are an urban-serving institution and are deeply committed to the communities in the Greater Houston area.

On the College of Education's website at the University of Houston, you will find the following words: *Growing Leaders, Advancing Equity. Transforming Lives.* Put simply, we strive daily to eradicate inequities in educational and health outcomes in Houston and beyond. The mission of the College of Education is to lead and inspire generative transformations of learning, health, leadership, and well-being by developing new knowledge for an increasingly diverse world.

Public Posting URL

Part I of this report is posted at the following web address (accredited members filing this report must post at least Part I):

<https://uh.edu/education/about/ed-accredit/>

2. Enrollment and Completion Data

Table 1 shows current enrollment and recent completion data for each program included in the AAQEP review.

Table 1. Program Specification: Enrollment and Completers for Academic Year 2022-2023

Degree or Certificate granted by the institution or organization	State Certificate, License, Endorsement, or Other Credential	Number of Candidates enrolled in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/31/2023)	Number of Completers in most recently completed academic year (12 months ending 08/31/2023)
<i>Programs that lead to initial teaching credentials</i>			
Art, BA Curriculum & Instruction, MED Curriculum & Instruction, PhD Painting, BFA Sculpture, BFA	Art (EC-12)	27	11
Teaching and Learning, BS	Bilingual Education Supplemental-Spanish (NA)	142	55
Chemistry, BS	Chemistry (7-12)	<5	<5
Curriculum & Instruction MED Hum Dev & Fam Studies, BS Hum Dev & Fam Studies, BA Teaching & Learning, NDO UN PB Teaching and Learning, BS Teaching and Learning, BS PB	Core Subjects with STR (EC-6)	716	237

Dance, BA Dance, BFA	Dance (6-12)	6	0
Teaching and Learning, BS	English as a Second Language Supplemental	20	5
Curriculum & Instruction, MED English, BA Teaching and Learning, BS PB	English Language Arts and Reading (7-12)	48	13
Teaching and Learning, BS	English Language Arts and Reading with STR (4-8)	41	13
History, BA	History (7-12)	34	9
Journalism, BA	Journalism (7-12)	<5	0
History, BA PB Spanish, BA	Languages Other Than English - Spanish (EC-12)	8	2
Biology, BS Earth Science, BA	Life Science (7-12)	10	6
Teaching and Learning, BS Teaching and Learning, BS PB	Mathematics (4-8)	95	26
Chemistry, BS PB Computer Science, BS Curriculum & Instruction, MED Mathematics, BA Mathematics, BS Mathematics, NDO UN PB NSM Unspecified, DEG UN PB Org Leadership & Supervision, BS Teaching and Learning, BS PB Visiting Student, NDO UN	Mathematics (7-12)	51	24
Physics, BS Visiting Student, NDO UN PB	Physics/Mathematics (7-12)	<5	<5
Teaching and Learning, BS	Science (4-8)	28	9
Bchs/Bphy Sci, BS Biology, BS Biotechnology, BS	Science (7-12)	56	19

Chemistry, BS Chemistry, BS PB Curriculum & Instruction, MED Education Unspecif, DEG UN PB Environmental Sciences, BS NSM Unspecified, DEG UN PB Physics, BS Pre-Psychology, DEG UN PB Tech Leadership Innov Mgmt, BS Visiting Student			
Curriculum & Instruction, MED Teaching and Learning, BS History, BA	Social Studies (4-8)	24	8
Curriculum & Instruction, MED Teaching and Learning, BS History, BA Teaching and Learning, NDO UN PB	Social Studies (7-12)	14	8
Special Populations, MED Teaching and Learning, BS	Special Education (EC-12)	19	7
Teaching and Learning, BS	Special Education Supplemental (NA)	26	7
Interpersonal Communication, BA	Speech (7-12)	0	0
Total for programs that lead to initial credentials		1368	461
<i>Programs that lead to additional or advanced credentials for already-licensed educators</i>			
Diagnostician, CERTGRAD Professional Leadership, EDD Special Populations, MED	Educational Diagnostician (EC-12)	48	11
Adm & Supervision, MED Curriculum & Instruction, MED Principal, CERTGRADE Professional Leadership, EDD Special Populations, MED	Principal as Instructional Leader (EC-12)	175	38
Curriculum & Instruction, MED	Reading Specialist (EC-12)	13	5

Professional Leadership, EDD	Superintendent (EC-12)	104	13
Total for programs that lead to advanced credentials		340	67
<i>Programs that lead to credentials for other school professionals or to no specific credential</i>			
Total for additional programs		0	0
TOTAL enrollment and productivity for all programs		1708	528
Unduplicated total of all program candidates and completers		1507	455

Added or Discontinued Programs

Any programs within the AAQEP review that have been added or discontinued within the past year are listed below. (This list is required only from providers with accredited programs.)

A hold has been put on the Reading Specialist Certification for 2-3 years.

3. Program Performance Indicators

The program performance information in Table 2 applies to the academic year indicated in Table 1.

Table 2. Program Performance Indicators

A. Total enrollment in the educator preparation programs shown in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals earning more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
1507
B. Total number of unique completers (across all programs) included in Table 1. This figure is an unduplicated count, i.e., individuals who earned more than one credential may be counted in more than one line above but only once here.
455

C. Number of recommendations for certificate, license, or endorsement included in Table 1.

434

This is the number of recommendations during AY 2022-23.

D. Cohort completion rates for candidates who completed the various programs within their respective program’s expected timeframe **and** in 1.5 times the expected timeframe.

The two- year completion rate measures the percentage of teacher candidates who were admitted to the Educator Preparation Program during AY 2019-2020 and completed certification program by the summer 2022. These data also show the completion rate in 1.5 times the expected time frame completed by Summer 2022. The overall two-year completion rate for the AY 2019-2020 initial certificate cohort is 94%.

Initial Program	2-Year Completion Rate*				
	Total # of Cohort	# of Completed	Completion %	# of Completed in 1.5 times expected timeframe	Completion % in 1.5 times expected timeframe
Art (EC-12)	19	18	95%	18	95%
Bilingual Education Supplemental-Spanish (NA)	44	42	95%	42	95%
Core Subjects (EC-6)	258	254	98%	254	98%
Dance (6-12)	1	1	100%	1	100%
English Language Arts and Reading (4-8)	11	11	100%	11	100%
English Language Arts and Reading (7-12)	27	25	93%	25	93%
English as a Second Language Supplemental	13	13	100%	13	100%
History (7-12)	27	26	96%	26	96%
Languages Other Than English - Spanish (EC-12)	7	7	100%	7	100%

Life Science (7-12)	4	4	100%	4	100%
Mathematics (4-8)	39	36	92%	36	92%
Mathematics (7-12)	41	41	100%	41	100%
Physics/Mathematics (7-12)	7	7	100%	7	100%
Science (4-8)	13	13	100%	13	100%
Science (7-12)	16	16	100%	16	100%
Social Studies (4-8)	11	11	100%	11	100%
Social Studies (7-12)	1	1	100%	1	100%
Special Education (EC-12)	4	1	25%	1	25%
Special Education Supplemental	13	13	100%	13	100%
Total	556	542	94%	542	94%

* Two-year completion rate measures the percentage of teacher candidates who were admitted to the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) during AY 2019-2020 completed by the summer 2022.

The advanced programs at UH also measure 2-year completion rate, with the exception of the Superintendent program. The 4-year completion rate applies to the Superintendent program as it is associated with a doctoral program, Professional Leadership, EDD. The 4-year completion rate measures the percentage of Superintendent candidates who were admitted to the Educator Preparation Program (EPP) during AY 2016-2017 completed certification program by the summer 2022. Additionally, these data show the completion rate in 1.5 times the expected time frame completed by Summer 2022 (shown in the table below). By summer 2022, over 95% of Educational Diagnosticians and Reading Specialists completed their certification program within 1.5 times the expected timeframe. Over 85% of Principal certification program cohort completed within 1.5 times the expected timeframe because most of those who haven't completed are also seeking Professional Leadership, EDD degree at UH, which usually takes four years on average.

Advanced Program	2-Year or 4-Year Completion Rate
------------------	----------------------------------

	Total # of Cohort	# of Completed	Completion %	# of Completed in 1.5 times expected timeframe	Completion % in 1.5 times expected timeframe
Educational Diagnostician (EC-12)	27	26	96%	26	96%
Principal as Instructional Leader (EC-12)	67	57	85%	57	85%
Reading Specialist (EC-12)	6	6	100%	6	100%
Superintendent (EC-12)*	32	5	16%	10	44%
Total	132	94	71%	99	31%

* Four-year completion rate applies for the Superintendent program as it is associated with a doctoral program, Professional Leadership, EDD.

E. Summary of state license examination results, including teacher performance assessments, and specification of any examinations on which the pass rate (cumulative at time of reporting) was below 80%.

For candidates who took TExES exams during AY 2022-23, the overall pass rate of the first two attempts is 95% for PPR exam and 90% for non-PPR exams. One certification area has below 80% pass rate: Science 7-12 (N = 18, 72.2%).

Certification Area	Tests taken	Tests Passed	Pass Rate
Art EC-12	10	10	100%
Bilingual Education Supplemental	39	36	92.3%
Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT)-Spanish	39	34	87.2%
Chemistry	1	1	100%
Core Subjects EC-6	178	149	83.7%
Educational Diagnostician EC-12	11	11	100%
English Language Arts and Reading 4-8	9	9	100%
English Language Arts and Reading 7-12	14	14	100%

English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental	8	8	100%
History 7-12	10	8	80%
LOTE: Spanish EC-12	3	3	100%
Life Science 7-12	3	3	100%
Mathematics 4-8	28	27	96.4%
Mathematics 7-12	17	16	94.1%
Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)	39	39	100%
Physics/Mathematics 7-12	1	1	100%
Principal as Instructional Leader	47	42	89.4%
Professional Pedagogy and Responsibilities	392	372	94.9%
Reading Specialist EC-12	3	3	100%
Science 4-8	7	6	85.7%
Science 7-12	18	13	72.2%
Science of Teaching Reading	162	150	92.6%
Social Studies 4-8	6	5	83.3%
Social Studies 7-12	7	6	85.5%
Special Education EC-12	3	3	100%
Special Education Supplemental	5	5	100%
Superintendent EC-12	13	11	84.6%

F. Narrative explanation of **evidence available from program completers**, with a characterization of findings.

Initial Certification: The Texas Education Agency (TEA) requires every teacher certification program completer to complete a Perception Survey once they become a practicing teacher. The survey focuses on new teacher perceptions about preparedness related to six categories of practices: Planning, Instruction, Learning Environment, Professional Practices and Responsibilities (PPR), Student with Disabilities, and Emergent Bilingual Students., Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners. The scale is as follows: “Well-Prepared;” “Sufficiently Prepared;” “Not Sufficiently;” “Not at All Prepared.”

The table below shows the results of the Perceptions Survey for AY 2022. The percentages in each area provide evidence that initial program completers of AY 2022 felt they were **well-prepared or sufficiently prepared** across most areas as compared to state-wide percentages. Of note, principals rated the first-year teachers higher in all areas as compared to how the teachers rated themselves (See G).

	UH % N=284	State-wide (TX) % N=13200
	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared
Planning	89.52%	86.25%
Instruction	89.19%	84.59%
Learning Environment	90.58%	86.42%
Professional Practices and Responsibilities	91.79%	90.80%
Students with Disabilities	66.80%	73.62%
English Language Learners	75.67%	82.97%

Advanced Certification: The Advanced Certification programs created a Completer Perceptions Survey. As can be seen in the table below, Principal Certification Completers (N=5) felt “well-prepared” or “sufficiently prepared” in most areas of the survey. Educational Diagnostician Completers (N=2) felt “well-prepared” or “sufficiently prepared” prepared in most areas of the survey. There were no responses from either Superintendent Completers or Reading Specialist Completers.

	Principal N=5	Superintendent N=0	Educational Diagnostician N=2	Reading Specialist N=0
	Well-Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared
Content and Pedagogy	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Theory and Application	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Culturally Responsive Practices	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Assessment and Data Literacy	80%	No responses	100%	No responses
Creating and Developing a Positive Environment	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Dispositions	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Ability to Engage in the Community	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Ability to Engage in Culturally Responsive Practices	80%	No responses	100%	No responses
Ability to Create Positive Environments	100%	No responses	100%	No responses

Ability to Lead in the Growth of International/Global Perspectives	80%	No responses	100%	No responses
Establishing Goals for Professional Growth	100%	No responses	100%	No responses
Collaborate with Colleagues	100%	No responses	100%	No responses

G. Narrative explanation of evidence available from employers of program completers, with a characterization of findings.

Initial Certification: The Texas Education Agency (TEA) collects data regarding the preparation of first-year teachers to help understand and provide resources and supports to educator preparation programs (EPPs) in preparing first-year teachers to succeed in the classroom. In this survey, principals complete surveys for first-year teachers who graduated at any time during the 5 years prior to the reporting period and who taught in the Texas public school system for a minimum of 5 months during the reporting period. Principals or their designees rated the preparation of teachers in six categories of practices: Planning, Instruction, Learning Environment, Professional Practices and Responsibilities (PPR), Student with Disabilities, and Emergent Bilingual Students.

In AY 2021-22, the most recent data available, 254 first-year teachers completed from UH were evaluated by their principals. In the table below, at least 90% of UH first- year teachers were rated as “well-prepared” or “sufficiently prepared” prepared in every area. All areas were above the state percentages. Of note, principals rated the first-year teachers higher in all areas than the teachers rated themselves (See F).

In addition, for the overall evaluation of how well the EPP prepared teachers for the realities of the classroom, 92.5% of UH teachers were rated felt “well-prepared” or “sufficiently prepared,” compared to 91.5% in the same category level of state-level average.

	UH % N=254	State-wide (TX) % N=9021
	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared
Planning	95.23%	91.01%
Instruction	93.34%	90.25%
Learning Environment	90.69%	89.38%
Professional Practices and Responsibilities	95.46%	84.16%
Students with Disabilities	90.36%	89.64%
English Language Learners	95.26%	90.77%

Advanced Certification: We are in the process of developing an employer survey for Advanced Completers.

H. Narrative explanation of how the program investigates **employment rates for program completers**, with a characterization of findings. This section may also indicate rates of completers' ongoing education, e.g., graduate study.

The Responsibility database held at the Texas Education Agency provided the most recent employment status of the completers. Below is the table showing the employment rate of completers of the AY 2021-22 who were hired during the AY 2021-2022 in Texas state public schools. It should be noted that because not all the teacher completers got certified at their completion, the employment rate over certified teachers was also calculated in the table: On average, 89% of the initial certified completers (N = 375) got hired in Texas one year after graduation. The average employment rate was over 94% for the advanced completers of AY 2020-21 (N=71)

Initial Program	Total # of Finishers in AY 2022-23	# of Certified out of Finishers	# of Hired in TX District AY 2022-23	Employment % over Finishers	Employment % over Certified
Art (EC-12)	9	≤5	≤5	44.4%	80.0%
Bilingual Education Supplemental-Spanish (NA)	43	38	38	88.4%	100.0%
Core Subjects (EC-6)	182	156	133	73.1%	85.3%
Dance	≤5	≤5	≤5	100.0%	100.0%
English Language Arts and Reading (4-8)	12	12	10	83.3%	83.3%
English Language Arts and Reading (7-12)	21	18	16	76.2%	88.9%
History (7-12)	25	19	18	72.0%	94.7%
Languages Other Than English - Spanish (EC-12)	6	≤5	≤5	66.7%	100.0%
Life Science (7-12)	≤5	≤5	0	0.0%	0.0%
Mathematics (4-8)	39	31	29	74.4%	93.5%
Mathematics (7-12)	38	34	31	81.6%	91.2%
Physics/Mathematics (7-12)	6	≤5	≤5	83.3%	100.0%

Science (4-8)	11	10	10	90.9%	100.0%
Science (7-12)	21	20	16	76.2%	80.0%
Social Studies (4-8)	7	6	6	85.7%	100.0%
Social Studies (7-12)	≤5	≤5	0	0.0%	0.0%
Special Education Supplemental (NA)	13	13	13	100.0%	100.0%
Total	438	375	335	76.5%	89.3%

Advanced Program	Total # of Finishers in AY 2022-23	# of Hired in TX District AY 2022-23	%
Superintendent (EC-12)	8	6	75.0%
Reading Specialist (EC-12)	≤5	≤5	100.0%
Principal as Instructional Leader (EC-12)	48	48	100.0%
Educational Diagnostician (EC-12)	10	8	80.0%
Total	71	67	94.4%

4. Candidate Academic Performance Indicators

Tables 3 and 4 report on select measures of candidate/completer performance related to AAQEP Standards 1 and 2, including the program's expectations for successful performance and indicators of the degree to which those expectations are met.

Table 3. Expectations and Performance on Standard 1: Candidate and Completer Performance

Initial Program: Teaching and Learning and <i>teach</i>Houston

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation																																																																																																	
Certification Exam	<p>The Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities Exam taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the PPR Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.</p>	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the PPR Exam were 74.25 and above on each domain except for Domain 3.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="953 331 1873 492"> <thead> <tr> <th>PPR Certification Exam Domains</th> <th>N</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Domain 1</td> <td>493</td> <td>76.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 2</td> <td>493</td> <td>74.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 3</td> <td>493</td> <td>68.99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 4</td> <td>493</td> <td>75.55</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PPR Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	493	76.25	Domain 2	493	74.25	Domain 3	493	68.99	Domain 4	493	75.55																																																																																		
PPR Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean																																																																																																	
Domain 1	493	76.25																																																																																																	
Domain 2	493	74.25																																																																																																	
Domain 3	493	68.99																																																																																																	
Domain 4	493	75.55																																																																																																	
Performance Assessment	<p>Teaching and Learning Candidates are formally evaluated four times during the Student Teaching Residency using the T-TESS Rubric. They must score at the “Developing” level in each domain of the T-TESS by the end of Student Teaching 1. Then, they must score at the “Proficient” level in each domain of the T-TESS by the end of Student Teaching 2. The scale is as follows: “1” is Needs Improvement; “2” is Developing; “3” is Proficient; “4” is Accomplished, and “5” is Distinguished.</p> <p>teachHouston Candidates are formally evaluated three times each semester</p>	<p>In AY 2022-23, out of 326 teacher candidates, more than 98% were rated at “Developing” or above in each dimension of the T-TESS by the end of the Student Teaching 1. Of note, 100% were rated “Developing” in T-TESS dimensions 1.1 (Standards and Alignment), 2.2 (Content Knowledge and Expertise), and 3.1 (Learning Environment).</p> <p>By the end of the Student Teaching 2, over 99% of 335 teacher candidates were scored at “Proficient” or above in each T-TESS Dimension, as can be seen in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="953 669 1894 1372"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="3">Student Teaching 1 (AY 2022-2023)</th> <th colspan="3">Student Teaching 2 (AY 2022-2023)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N</th> <th># of Developing</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th># of Proficient</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dimension 1.1: Standards and Alignment</td> <td>326</td> <td>326</td> <td>100%</td> <td>335</td> <td>334</td> <td>99.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 1.2 Data and Assessment</td> <td>326</td> <td>323</td> <td>99.08%</td> <td>335</td> <td>335</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 1.3 Knowledge of Students</td> <td>326</td> <td>325</td> <td>99.69%</td> <td>335</td> <td>334</td> <td>99.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 1.4 Differentiation</td> <td>326</td> <td>325</td> <td>99.69%</td> <td>335</td> <td>335</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 2.1 Achieving Expectations</td> <td>326</td> <td>324</td> <td>99.39%</td> <td>335</td> <td>333</td> <td>99.40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 2.2 Content Knowledge and Expertise</td> <td>326</td> <td>326</td> <td>100%</td> <td>335</td> <td>334</td> <td>99.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 2.3 Communication</td> <td>326</td> <td>323</td> <td>99.08%</td> <td>335</td> <td>333</td> <td>99.405%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 2.4 Differentiation</td> <td>326</td> <td>323</td> <td>99.08%</td> <td>335</td> <td>334</td> <td>99.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 2.5 Monitor and Adjust</td> <td>326</td> <td>322</td> <td>98.77%</td> <td>335</td> <td>334</td> <td>99.70%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dimension 3.1 Learning Environment</td> <td>326</td> <td>326</td> <td>100%</td> <td>335</td> <td>335</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.2 Managing Student Behavior</td> <td>326</td> <td>325</td> <td>99.69%</td> <td>335</td> <td>335</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.2 Goal Setting</td> <td>326</td> <td>325</td> <td>99.69%</td> <td>335</td> <td>334</td> <td>99.70%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In Fall 2022, the average scores in each domain of the <i>teachHouston</i> evaluation rubric showed growth across the three POP Cycles with the average score on the final POP Cycle at above</p>		Student Teaching 1 (AY 2022-2023)			Student Teaching 2 (AY 2022-2023)			N	# of Developing	%	N	# of Proficient	%	Dimension 1.1: Standards and Alignment	326	326	100%	335	334	99.70%	Dimension 1.2 Data and Assessment	326	323	99.08%	335	335	100%	Dimension 1.3 Knowledge of Students	326	325	99.69%	335	334	99.70%	Dimension 1.4 Differentiation	326	325	99.69%	335	335	100%	Dimension 2.1 Achieving Expectations	326	324	99.39%	335	333	99.40%	Dimension 2.2 Content Knowledge and Expertise	326	326	100%	335	334	99.70%	Dimension 2.3 Communication	326	323	99.08%	335	333	99.405%	Dimension 2.4 Differentiation	326	323	99.08%	335	334	99.70%	Dimension 2.5 Monitor and Adjust	326	322	98.77%	335	334	99.70%	Dimension 3.1 Learning Environment	326	326	100%	335	335	100%	3.2 Managing Student Behavior	326	325	99.69%	335	335	100%	4.2 Goal Setting	326	325	99.69%	335	334	99.70%
	Student Teaching 1 (AY 2022-2023)			Student Teaching 2 (AY 2022-2023)																																																																																															
	N	# of Developing	%	N	# of Proficient	%																																																																																													
Dimension 1.1: Standards and Alignment	326	326	100%	335	334	99.70%																																																																																													
Dimension 1.2 Data and Assessment	326	323	99.08%	335	335	100%																																																																																													
Dimension 1.3 Knowledge of Students	326	325	99.69%	335	334	99.70%																																																																																													
Dimension 1.4 Differentiation	326	325	99.69%	335	335	100%																																																																																													
Dimension 2.1 Achieving Expectations	326	324	99.39%	335	333	99.40%																																																																																													
Dimension 2.2 Content Knowledge and Expertise	326	326	100%	335	334	99.70%																																																																																													
Dimension 2.3 Communication	326	323	99.08%	335	333	99.405%																																																																																													
Dimension 2.4 Differentiation	326	323	99.08%	335	334	99.70%																																																																																													
Dimension 2.5 Monitor and Adjust	326	322	98.77%	335	334	99.70%																																																																																													
Dimension 3.1 Learning Environment	326	326	100%	335	335	100%																																																																																													
3.2 Managing Student Behavior	326	325	99.69%	335	335	100%																																																																																													
4.2 Goal Setting	326	325	99.69%	335	334	99.70%																																																																																													

	<p>during the Student Teaching Residency using the <i>teach</i>Houston Evaluation Rubric. They must score at the “Developing” or “Proficient” level in each domain of the T-TESS by the end of Student Teaching. The scale is as follows: “1” is Needs Improvement; “2” is Developing; “3” is Proficient; “4” is Accomplished, and “5” is Distinguished.</p>	<p>4.00. In Spring 2023, the same caliber of growth can be seen in the data with the average score on the third POP Cycle well above 4.00 in all four domains.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="953 264 1894 553"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">Fall 2022</th> <th colspan="4">Spring 2023</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>N</th> <th>POP 1</th> <th>POP 2</th> <th>POP 3</th> <th>N</th> <th>POP 1</th> <th>POP 2</th> <th>POP 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Classroom Management</td> <td>18</td> <td>2.68</td> <td>3.55</td> <td>4.41</td> <td>34</td> <td>2.93</td> <td>3.65</td> <td>4.48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Content</td> <td>18</td> <td>2.65</td> <td>3.56</td> <td>4.40</td> <td>34</td> <td>3.15</td> <td>3.72</td> <td>4.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Classroom Interaction</td> <td>18</td> <td>2.42</td> <td>3.36</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>34</td> <td>2.73</td> <td>3.48</td> <td>4.32</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lesson Design</td> <td>18</td> <td>2.65</td> <td>3.38</td> <td>4.14</td> <td>34</td> <td>2.83</td> <td>3.59</td> <td>4.38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Fall 2022				Spring 2023					N	POP 1	POP 2	POP 3	N	POP 1	POP 2	POP 3	Classroom Management	18	2.68	3.55	4.41	34	2.93	3.65	4.48	Content	18	2.65	3.56	4.40	34	3.15	3.72	4.57	Classroom Interaction	18	2.42	3.36	4.20	34	2.73	3.48	4.32	Lesson Design	18	2.65	3.38	4.14	34	2.83	3.59	4.38										
	Fall 2022				Spring 2023																																																													
	N	POP 1	POP 2	POP 3	N	POP 1	POP 2	POP 3																																																										
Classroom Management	18	2.68	3.55	4.41	34	2.93	3.65	4.48																																																										
Content	18	2.65	3.56	4.40	34	3.15	3.72	4.57																																																										
Classroom Interaction	18	2.42	3.36	4.20	34	2.73	3.48	4.32																																																										
Lesson Design	18	2.65	3.38	4.14	34	2.83	3.59	4.38																																																										
<p>Professionalism</p>	<p>Teaching and Learning Candidates are evaluated using the Professional Ethics, Demeanor, and Development Rubric (PEDD). Site Supervisors score candidates from “0” to “1” on each domain. The scale is as follows: “1” is Proficient; “5” is Developing; and “0” is Improvement Needed. Candidates who obtain 0’s in any area are placed on a Growth Plan.</p>	<p>In AY 2022-23, 99% of Teacher Candidates were rated at “Developing” or above in each area of the PEDD in both Student Teaching 1 and 2. The areas with higher “Developing” scores included (1) Attendance, Punctuality, and Preparation (ST 1: 20.12%; ST 2: 12.84%) (2) Organization and Responsibility (ST 1: 25.08%; ST2: 16.42%) There were very few candidates who scored “Improvement Needed” in Student Teaching 1 or Student Teaching 2: Attendance, Punctuality, and Preparation (ST1: .31%; ST 2: .3%); Adherence to Legal and Ethical Practices (ST1: .31%); Rapport with Others and Awareness of Individual Differences (ST1: .62%); Organization and Responsibility (ST1: .31%); Oral and Written Communication (ST1: .31%).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="953 862 1894 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">PEDD Items</th> <th rowspan="2">Rating</th> <th colspan="2">Student Teaching 1 N = 323</th> <th colspan="2">Student Teaching 2 N = 335</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Appearance and Dress</td> <td>Improvement Needed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Developing</td> <td>1</td> <td>.31%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proficient</td> <td>322</td> <td>99.69%</td> <td>335</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Cooperation, Flexibility, Patience, and Tactfulness</td> <td>Improvement Needed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Developing</td> <td>4</td> <td>1.24%</td> <td>5</td> <td>1.49%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proficient</td> <td>319</td> <td>98.76%</td> <td>330</td> <td>98.51%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="3">Initiative, Risk-Taking, Motivation, Demeanor, and Enthusiasm</td> <td>Improvement Needed</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Developing</td> <td>36</td> <td>11.15%</td> <td>17</td> <td>5.07%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Proficient</td> <td>287</td> <td>88.85%</td> <td>318</td> <td>94.93%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Improvement Needed</td> <td>1</td> <td>.31%</td> <td>1</td> <td>.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PEDD Items	Rating	Student Teaching 1 N = 323		Student Teaching 2 N = 335		N	%	N	%	Appearance and Dress	Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%	Developing	1	.31%	0	0%	Proficient	322	99.69%	335	100%	Cooperation, Flexibility, Patience, and Tactfulness	Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%	Developing	4	1.24%	5	1.49%	Proficient	319	98.76%	330	98.51%	Initiative, Risk-Taking, Motivation, Demeanor, and Enthusiasm	Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%	Developing	36	11.15%	17	5.07%	Proficient	287	88.85%	318	94.93%		Improvement Needed	1	.31%	1	.3%
PEDD Items	Rating	Student Teaching 1 N = 323			Student Teaching 2 N = 335																																																													
		N	%	N	%																																																													
Appearance and Dress	Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%																																																													
	Developing	1	.31%	0	0%																																																													
	Proficient	322	99.69%	335	100%																																																													
Cooperation, Flexibility, Patience, and Tactfulness	Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%																																																													
	Developing	4	1.24%	5	1.49%																																																													
	Proficient	319	98.76%	330	98.51%																																																													
Initiative, Risk-Taking, Motivation, Demeanor, and Enthusiasm	Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%																																																													
	Developing	36	11.15%	17	5.07%																																																													
	Proficient	287	88.85%	318	94.93%																																																													
	Improvement Needed	1	.31%	1	.3%																																																													

	<p>Attendance, Punctuality, and Preparation</p> <p>Adherence to Legal and Ethical Practices</p> <p>Participation</p> <p>Rapport with Others and Awareness of Individual Differences</p> <p>Organization and Responsibility</p> <p>Oral and Written Communication</p> <p>Withitness and Reflectivity</p>	Developing	65	20.12%	43	12.84%														
		Proficient	257	79.57%	309	86.57%														
Improvement Needed		1	.31%	0	0%															
		Developing	14	4.33%	4	1.19%														
		Proficient	308	95.36%	331	98.81%														
Improvement Needed		0	0%	0	0%															
		Developing	38	11.76%	20	5.97%														
		Proficient	285	88.24%	315	94.03%														
Improvement Needed		2	.62%	0	0%															
		Developing	3	.93%	1	.3%														
		Proficient	318	98.45%	334	99.7%														
Improvement Needed		1	.31%	0	0%															
		Developing	81	25.08%	55	16.42%														
	Proficient	241	74.61%	280	83.58%															
Improvement Needed	1	.31%	0	0%																
	Developing	14	4.33%	20	5.97%															
	Proficient	308	95.36%	315	94.03%															
Improvement Needed	0	0%	0	0%																
	Developing	25	7.74%	9	2.69%															
	Proficient	298	92.26%	326	97.31%															
<p>TeachHosuton Candidates are evaluated using the Professional Ethics, Demeanor, and Development Rubric (PEDD). Site Supervisors score candidates from “0” to “1” on each domain. The scale is as follows: “1” is Proficient; “5” is Developing; and “0” is Improvement Needed. Candidates who obtain 0’s in any area are placed on a Growth Plan. Candidates receive a grade on their professionalism rubric. They can make up to a 100 as their grade.</p>	<p>In AY 2022-23, The average on both the midterm professionalism rubric and the final professionalism rubric were above 96%.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Professional Attributes</th> <th colspan="2">Midterm Professionalism Rubric</th> <th colspan="2">Final Professionalism Rubric</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N</th> <th>Average</th> <th>N</th> <th>Average</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Fall 2022</td> <td>18</td> <td>96.67</td> <td>18</td> <td>97.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Spring 2023</td> <td>34</td> <td>96.54</td> <td>34</td> <td>98.38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Professional Attributes	Midterm Professionalism Rubric		Final Professionalism Rubric		N	Average	N	Average	Fall 2022	18	96.67	18	97.5	Spring 2023	34	96.54	34	98.38
Professional Attributes	Midterm Professionalism Rubric		Final Professionalism Rubric																	
	N	Average	N	Average																
Fall 2022	18	96.67	18	97.5																
Spring 2023	34	96.54	34	98.38																

GPA at Completion	Candidates, initial certificate must maintain a 3.0 GPA at completion as a cohort.	Initial certification candidates' mean GPA for AY 2022-2023 was over the 3.0 GPA requirement.		
			N	Mean
		Overall Initial GPA	461	3.63

Advanced Program: Principal Certification									
Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation							
Certification Exam	The Principal Certification Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Principal Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	The mean scores on each domain of the Principal Certification Exam were above 70% on each domain except for Domain 5 and 7.							
		Principal Certification Exam Domains		N		Mean			
		Domain 1		61		75			
		Domain 2		61		72			
		Domain 3		61		72			
		Domain 4		61		77			
		Domain 5		61		67			
		Domain 6		61		75			
Domain 7		61		54					
Performance Assessment	Principal Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Principal competencies or State Standards. They must score at the "Good" level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: "1" is Poor; "2" is Fair; "3" is Good; "4" is Very Good" and "5" is Excellent. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marks "NA" for "Not Applicable."	Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of Principal. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored "Good," "Very Good" or "Excellent" on each of the Competencies.							
		Standard	Rating	Observation 1 N=31		Observation 1 N=23		Observation 3 N=8	
				#	%	#	%	#	%
		Competency 1: Shared Vision and Culture	Excellent	13	42%	11	48%	5	63%
			Very Good	9	29%	6	26%	2	25%
			Good	8	26%	6	26%	1	13%
			Fair	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
NA	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%		
	Excellent	16	52%	9	39%	3	38%		

		Competency 2: Partnerships for Student Outcomes	Very Good	9	29%	9	39%	4	50%
			Good	5	16%	4	17%	1	13%
			Fair	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
		Competency 3: High Quality Instruction	Excellent	17	55%	12	52%	5	63%
			Very Good	10	32%	7	30%	1	13%
			Good	4	13%	4	17%	2	25%
			Fair	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 4: Assessment	Excellent	15	48%	10	43%	5	63%
			Very Good	8	26%	9	39%	1	13%
			Good	7	23%	4	17%	2	25%
			Fair	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 5: Feedback and Reflectivity	Excellent	13	42%	11	48%	5	63%
			Very Good	9	29%	8	35%	1	13%
			Good	6	19%	4	17%	2	25%
			Fair	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 6: Selection, Placement, and Retention	Excellent	9	29%	8	35%	3	38%
			Very Good	8	26%	10	43%	4	50%
			Good	12	39%	5	22%	1	13%
			Fair	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Poor	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%		
NA	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%		
Standard 7 Relationships	Excellent	17	55%	9	39%	4	50%		

			Very Good	9	29%	8	35%	4	50%
			Good	3	10%	4	17%	0	0%
			Fair	2	6%	2	9%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 8 Improvement of Student Outcomes	Excellent	12	39%	11	48%	5	63%
			Very Good	10	32%	5	22%	1	13%
			Good	9	29%	6	26%	2	25%
			Fair	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 9: Campus Goals and Vision	Excellent	15	48%	11	48%	4	50%
			Very Good	10	32%	7	30%	2	25%
			Good	5	16%	5	22%	2	25%
			Fair	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 10: Administrative Leadership	Excellent	10	32%	6	26%	4	50%
			Very Good	7	23%	10	43%	2	25%
			Good	10	32%	7	30%	2	25%
			Fair	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Professionalism	<p>Principal Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on the Principal competency or State Standard that focuses on professionalism. They must score at the “Good” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Poor; “2” is Fair; “3” is Good; “4” is Very Good” and “5” is Excellent. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marks “NA” for “Not Applicable.”</p>	<p>Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of Principal. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored “Good,” “Very Good” or “Excellent” on this Competency.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="810 261 1890 509"> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Competency 11: Ethics, Equity, and Diversity</td> <td>Excellent</td> <td>18</td> <td>58%</td> <td>11</td> <td>48%</td> <td>5</td> <td>63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Very Good</td> <td>8</td> <td>26%</td> <td>10</td> <td>43%</td> <td>2</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good</td> <td>5</td> <td>16%</td> <td>2</td> <td>9%</td> <td>1</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fair</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> </table>	Competency 11: Ethics, Equity, and Diversity	Excellent	18	58%	11	48%	5	63%	Very Good	8	26%	10	43%	2	25%	Good	5	16%	2	9%	1	13%	Fair	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Competency 11: Ethics, Equity, and Diversity	Excellent	18		58%	11	48%	5	63%																																					
	Very Good	8		26%	10	43%	2	25%																																					
	Good	5		16%	2	9%	1	13%																																					
	Fair	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%																																					
	Poor	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%																																					
	NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%																																						
GPA at Completion	<p>Candidates, initial certificate, or advanced certificate, must maintain a 3.0 GPA at completion as a cohort.</p>	<p>Principal certification candidates’ mean GPA for AY 2022-2023 was well over the 3.0 GPA requirement.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="810 711 1890 773"> <tr> <td></td> <td>N</td> <td>Mean</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall GPA</td> <td>39</td> <td>3.96</td> </tr> </table>		N	Mean	Overall GPA	39	3.96																																					
	N	Mean																																											
Overall GPA	39	3.96																																											

Advanced Program: Superintendent Certification														
Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation												
Certification Exam	<p>The Superintendent Certification Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Superintendent Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.</p>	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the Superintendent Certification Exam were at 73 and above on each domain.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="900 1122 1890 1256"> <tr> <td>Superintendent Certification Exam Domains</td> <td>N</td> <td>Mean</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 1</td> <td>15</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 2</td> <td>15</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 3</td> <td>15</td> <td>73</td> </tr> </table>	Superintendent Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	15	76	Domain 2	15	76	Domain 3	15	73
Superintendent Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean												
Domain 1	15	76												
Domain 2	15	76												
Domain 3	15	73												

Performance Assessment

Superintendent Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Superintendent competencies or State Standards. They must score at the “Good” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Poor; “2” is Fair; “3” is Good; “4” is Very Good” and “5” is Excellent. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marked “NO” for “Not Observed.”

Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of Superintendent. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored “Good” or “Very Good” on each of the Standards when the standard could be observed during the Performance Assessment. Each standard was not observed during some candidates’ observations.

Texas Administrative Code Standard	Rating	Evaluation 1 N =18		Evaluation 2 N = 11		Evaluation 3 N=4	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Learner Centered Leadership and School District Culture	Very Good (4)	14	78%	2	18%	2	50%
	Good (3)	1	5%	6	55%	0	0%
	Not Observed	3	17%	2	18%	2	50%
Learner Centered Human Resources Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	14	78%	3	27%	2	50%
	Good (3)	0	0%	3	27%	0	0%
	Not Observed	4	22%	5	46%	2	50%
Learner Centered Policy and Governance	Very Good (4)	13	72%	1	9%	0	12%
	Good (3)	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%
	Not Observed	5	28%	9	82%	4	100%
Learner Centered Communications and Community Relationships	Very Good (4)	12	67%	3	27%	2	50%
	Good (3)	4	22%	3	27%	0	0%
	Not Observed	2	11%	5	46%	2	50%
Learner Centered Organizational Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	15	83%	2	18%	1	25%
	Good (3)	2	11%	4	36%	1	25%
	Not Observed	1	5%	5	46%	2	50%
Learner Centered Curriculum Planning and Development	Very Good (4)	13	72%	3	17%	2	50%
	Good (3)	3	17%	2	18%	0	0%
	Not Observed	2	11%	2	18%	2	50%
Learner Centered Instructional Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	13	72%	2	18%	2	50%
	Good (3)	2	11%	4	36%	1	25%
	Not Observed	3	17%	6	55%	1	25%

Professionalism	<p>Superintendent Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on the Superintendent Competency that focuses on professionalism. They must score at the “Good” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Poor; “2” is Fair; “3” is Good; “4” is Very Good” and “5” is Excellent. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marked “NO” for “Not Observed.”</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="898 207 1171 293" rowspan="2">Texas Administrative Code Standard</th> <th data-bbox="1171 207 1339 293" rowspan="2">Rating</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1339 207 1507 256">Evaluation 1 N =18</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1507 207 1661 256">Evaluation 2 N = 11</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1661 207 1829 256">Evaluation 3 N=4</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1339 256 1423 293">N</th> <th data-bbox="1423 256 1507 293">%</th> <th data-bbox="1507 256 1591 293">N</th> <th data-bbox="1591 256 1661 293">%</th> <th data-bbox="1661 256 1745 293">N</th> <th data-bbox="1745 256 1829 293">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="898 293 1171 418" rowspan="3">Learner Centered Values and Ethics of Leadership</td> <td data-bbox="1171 293 1339 331">Very Good (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 293 1423 331">14</td> <td data-bbox="1423 293 1507 331">78%</td> <td data-bbox="1507 293 1591 331">2</td> <td data-bbox="1591 293 1661 331">18%</td> <td data-bbox="1661 293 1745 331">2</td> <td data-bbox="1745 293 1829 331">50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1171 331 1339 368">Good (3)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 331 1423 368">1</td> <td data-bbox="1423 331 1507 368">5%</td> <td data-bbox="1507 331 1591 368">3</td> <td data-bbox="1591 331 1661 368">27%</td> <td data-bbox="1661 331 1745 368">0</td> <td data-bbox="1745 331 1829 368">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1171 368 1339 418">Not Observed</td> <td data-bbox="1339 368 1423 418">3</td> <td data-bbox="1423 368 1507 418">17%</td> <td data-bbox="1507 368 1591 418">6</td> <td data-bbox="1591 368 1661 418">55%</td> <td data-bbox="1661 368 1745 418">2</td> <td data-bbox="1745 368 1829 418">50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Texas Administrative Code Standard	Rating	Evaluation 1 N =18		Evaluation 2 N = 11		Evaluation 3 N=4		N	%	N	%	N	%	Learner Centered Values and Ethics of Leadership	Very Good (4)	14	78%	2	18%	2	50%	Good (3)	1	5%	3	27%	0	0%	Not Observed	3	17%	6	55%	2	50%
Texas Administrative Code Standard	Rating	Evaluation 1 N =18			Evaluation 2 N = 11		Evaluation 3 N=4																															
		N	%	N	%	N	%																															
Learner Centered Values and Ethics of Leadership	Very Good (4)	14	78%	2	18%	2	50%																															
	Good (3)	1	5%	3	27%	0	0%																															
	Not Observed	3	17%	6	55%	2	50%																															
GPA at Completion	Candidates, initial certificate or advanced certificate, must maintain a 3.0 GPA at completion as a cohort.	<p>Superintendent certification candidates’ mean GPA for AY 2022-2023 was well over the 3.0 GPA requirement.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="898 699 1230 737"></th> <th data-bbox="1230 699 1560 737">N</th> <th data-bbox="1560 699 1892 737">Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="898 737 1230 776">Overall GPA</td> <td data-bbox="1230 737 1560 776">13</td> <td data-bbox="1560 737 1892 776">3.90</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		N	Mean	Overall GPA	13	3.90																														
	N	Mean																																				
Overall GPA	13	3.90																																				

Advanced Program: Education Diagnostician Certification N=11																	
Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation															
Certification Exam	The Education Diagnostician Certification Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Education Diagnostician Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the Education Diagnostician Certification Exam were above 70.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="787 1114 1314 1175">Education Diagnostician Certification Exam Domains</th> <th data-bbox="1314 1114 1587 1175">N</th> <th data-bbox="1587 1114 1860 1175">Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="787 1175 1314 1203">Domain 1</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1175 1587 1203">13</td> <td data-bbox="1587 1175 1860 1203">80</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="787 1203 1314 1230">Domain 2</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1203 1587 1230">13</td> <td data-bbox="1587 1203 1860 1230">76</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="787 1230 1314 1258">Domain 3</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1230 1587 1258">13</td> <td data-bbox="1587 1230 1860 1258">80</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="787 1258 1314 1286">Domain 4</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1258 1587 1286">13</td> <td data-bbox="1587 1258 1860 1286">73</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Education Diagnostician Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	13	80	Domain 2	13	76	Domain 3	13	80	Domain 4	13	73
Education Diagnostician Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean															
Domain 1	13	80															
Domain 2	13	76															
Domain 3	13	80															
Domain 4	13	73															

<p>Performance Assessment</p>	<p>Education Diagnostician Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Education Diagnostician state standards. They must score at the “Average” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Poor; “2” is Needs Improvement; “3” is Average; “4” is Above Average, and “5” is Outstanding. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marked “NA” for “Not Applicable.”</p>	<p>Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of an Educational Diagnostician. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored “Average,” “Above Average,” or “Outstanding” on each of the Standards when the standard could be observed during the Performance Assessment. Each standard was not observed during some candidates’ observations. Standard 11 was not observed in most candidates’ formal observations.</p>																																																																																																																																																																																										
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Standard</th> <th rowspan="2">Rating</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 1</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 1</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> <th>#</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Standard I. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of the purpose, philosophy, and legal foundations of evaluation and special education.</td> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.18</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.09</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.27</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needs Improvement</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.45</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Standard IV. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of student assessment and evaluation, program planning, and instructional decision making.</td> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.36</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>6</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.18</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.18</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> <td>1</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needs Improvement</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.27</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Standard V. The educational diagnostician knows eligibility criteria and procedures for identifying students with disabilities and determining the presence of an educational need.</td> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.27</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.36</td> <td>1</td> <td>10</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needs Improvement</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.36</td> <td>7</td> <td>70</td> <td>6</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Standard VI. The educational diagnostician selects, administers, and interprets appropriate formal and informal assessments and evaluations.</td> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.27</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>5</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.09</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.18</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needs Improvement</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.45</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Standard	Rating	Observation 1		Observation 1		Observation 3		#	%	#	%	#	%	Standard I. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of the purpose, philosophy, and legal foundations of evaluation and special education.	Outstanding	2	18.18	4	40	3	30	Above Average	1	9.09	1	0	1	0	Average	3	27.27	4	40	2	20	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	5	45.45	4	40	4	40	Standard IV. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of student assessment and evaluation, program planning, and instructional decision making.	Outstanding	4	36.36	4	40	6	60	Above Average	2	18.18	1	0	0	0	Average	2	18.18	3	30	1	10	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	3	27.27	2	20	3	30	Standard V. The educational diagnostician knows eligibility criteria and procedures for identifying students with disabilities and determining the presence of an educational need.	Outstanding	3	27.27	2	20	2	20	Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	Average	4	36.36	1	10	2	20	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	4	36.36	7	70	6	60	Standard VI. The educational diagnostician selects, administers, and interprets appropriate formal and informal assessments and evaluations.	Outstanding	3	27.27	4	40	5	50	Above Average	1	9.09	0	0	0	0	Average	2	18.18	2	20	2	20	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	5	45.45	4	40	3	30
Standard	Rating	Observation 1			Observation 1		Observation 3																																																																																																																																																																																					
		#	%	#	%	#	%																																																																																																																																																																																					
Standard I. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of the purpose, philosophy, and legal foundations of evaluation and special education.	Outstanding	2	18.18	4	40	3	30																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Above Average	1	9.09	1	0	1	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Average	3	27.27	4	40	2	20																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	NA	5	45.45	4	40	4	40																																																																																																																																																																																					
Standard IV. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of student assessment and evaluation, program planning, and instructional decision making.	Outstanding	4	36.36	4	40	6	60																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Above Average	2	18.18	1	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Average	2	18.18	3	30	1	10																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	NA	3	27.27	2	20	3	30																																																																																																																																																																																					
Standard V. The educational diagnostician knows eligibility criteria and procedures for identifying students with disabilities and determining the presence of an educational need.	Outstanding	3	27.27	2	20	2	20																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Average	4	36.36	1	10	2	20																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	NA	4	36.36	7	70	6	60																																																																																																																																																																																					
Standard VI. The educational diagnostician selects, administers, and interprets appropriate formal and informal assessments and evaluations.	Outstanding	3	27.27	4	40	5	50																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Above Average	1	9.09	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Average	2	18.18	2	20	2	20																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																																																																																																																					
	NA	5	45.45	4	40	3	30																																																																																																																																																																																					

		Standard VII. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic diversity and the significance of student diversity for evaluation, planning, and Instruction.	Outstanding	5	45.45	2	20	2	20
			Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Average	1	9.09	1	10	1	10
			Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
			NA	5	45.45	7	70	7	70
		Standard VIII. The educational diagnostician knows and demonstrates skills necessary for scheduling, time management, and organization.	Outstanding	5	45.45	2	20	2	20
			Above Average	0	0	1	0	0	0
			Average	1	9.09	1	10	3	30
			Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
			NA	5	45.45	6	60	5	50
		Standard IX. The educational diagnostician addresses students' behavioral and social interaction skills through appropriate assessment, evaluation, planning, and instructional strategies.	Outstanding	0	0	1	10	1	10
			Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Average	0	0	1	10	1	10
			Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
			NA	11	100	8	80	8	80
		Standard X. The educational diagnostician knows and understands appropriate curricula and instructional strategies for individuals with disabilities.	Outstanding	3	27.27	3	30	1	10
			Above Average	1	9.09	0	0	1	0
			Average	2	18.18	1	10	1	10
Needs Improvement	0		0	0	0	0	0		
Poor	0		0	0	0	0	0		
NA	5		45.45	6	60	7	70		

Professionalism	<p>Education Diagnostician Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Education Diagnostician state standards that focus on professionalism. They must score at the “Average” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Poor; “2” is Needs Improvement; “3” is Average; “4” is Above Average, and “5” is Outstanding. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marked “NA” for “Not Applicable.”</p>	<p>Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of an Educational Diagnostician. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored “Average,” “Above Average,” or “Outstanding” on each of the professionalism standards when the standard could be observed during the Performance Assessment. Each standard was not observed during some candidates’ observations. Standard III was not observed in most candidates’ first formal observation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="779 347 1892 917"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Standard</th> <th rowspan="2">Score Level</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 1</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 1</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 1</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Standard II. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of ethical and professional practices, roles, and responsibilities</td> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.45</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.09</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.18</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needs Improvement</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.45</td> <td>4</td> <td>40</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="6">Standard III. The educational diagnostician develops collaborative relationships with families, educators, the school, the community, outside agencies, and related service personnel.</td> <td>Outstanding</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.09</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Above Average</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Average</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>20</td> <td>3</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Needs Improvement</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NA</td> <td>10</td> <td>90.91</td> <td>5</td> <td>50</td> <td>5</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Standard	Score Level	Observation 1		Observation 1		Observation 1		N	%	N	%	N	%	Standard II. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of ethical and professional practices, roles, and responsibilities	Outstanding	5	45.45	3	30	2	20	Above Average	1	9.09	0	0	2	20	Average	2	18.18	3	30	3	30	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	5	45.45	4	40	3	30	Standard III. The educational diagnostician develops collaborative relationships with families, educators, the school, the community, outside agencies, and related service personnel.	Outstanding	1	9.09	3	30	2	20	Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0	Average	0	0	2	20	3	30	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	NA	10	90.91	5	50	5	50
Standard	Score Level	Observation 1			Observation 1		Observation 1																																																																																															
		N	%	N	%	N	%																																																																																															
Standard II. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of ethical and professional practices, roles, and responsibilities	Outstanding	5	45.45	3	30	2	20																																																																																															
	Above Average	1	9.09	0	0	2	20																																																																																															
	Average	2	18.18	3	30	3	30																																																																																															
	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																															
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																															
	NA	5	45.45	4	40	3	30																																																																																															
Standard III. The educational diagnostician develops collaborative relationships with families, educators, the school, the community, outside agencies, and related service personnel.	Outstanding	1	9.09	3	30	2	20																																																																																															
	Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																															
	Average	0	0	2	20	3	30																																																																																															
	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																															
	Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																															
	NA	10	90.91	5	50	5	50																																																																																															
GPA at Completion	Candidates, initial certificate or advanced certificate, must maintain a 3.0 GPA at completion as a cohort.	<p>Education Diagnostician certification candidates’ mean GPA for AY 2022-2023 was well over the 3.0 GPA requirement.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="779 1016 1892 1089"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>N</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall GPA</td> <td>11</td> <td>3.85</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		N	Mean	Overall GPA	11	3.85																																																																																														
	N	Mean																																																																																																				
Overall GPA	11	3.85																																																																																																				

Advanced Program: Reading Specialist Certification
N=5

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation																																																											
Certification Exam	The Reading Specialist Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Reading Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the Reading Specialist Exam were 72 and above on each domain.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="804 354 1887 516"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="804 354 1335 412">Reading Specialist Certification Exam Domains</th> <th data-bbox="1335 354 1612 412">N</th> <th data-bbox="1612 354 1887 412">Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 412 1335 440">Domain 1</td> <td data-bbox="1335 412 1612 440">3</td> <td data-bbox="1612 412 1887 440">72</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 440 1335 467">Domain 2</td> <td data-bbox="1335 440 1612 467">3</td> <td data-bbox="1612 440 1887 467">75</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 467 1335 495">Domain 3</td> <td data-bbox="1335 467 1612 495">3</td> <td data-bbox="1612 467 1887 495">85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 495 1335 516">Domain 4</td> <td data-bbox="1335 495 1612 516">3</td> <td data-bbox="1612 495 1887 516">76</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Reading Specialist Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	3	72	Domain 2	3	75	Domain 3	3	85	Domain 4	3	76																																												
Reading Specialist Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean																																																											
Domain 1	3	72																																																											
Domain 2	3	75																																																											
Domain 3	3	85																																																											
Domain 4	3	76																																																											
Performance Assessment	<p>Reading Specialist Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Reading Specialist state standard domains. They must score at the “Average” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Does Not Meet; “2” is Meets; “3” is “Exceeds.”</p> <p>NOTE: For Observation 2 and 3, only four candidates were observed.</p>	<p>Apart from Observation 3, the scoring of Domains 1, 2, and 3 was evenly distributed between “meets” and “exceeds.” No candidate scored “Does not meet” on any of the performance assessments.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="804 613 1896 1351"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="804 613 1205 695" rowspan="2">Standard</th> <th data-bbox="1205 613 1335 695" rowspan="2">Score Level</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1335 613 1520 654">Observation 1</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1520 613 1705 654">Observation 2</th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1705 613 1896 654">Observation 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="1335 654 1423 695">N</th> <th data-bbox="1423 654 1520 695">%</th> <th data-bbox="1520 654 1608 695">N</th> <th data-bbox="1608 654 1705 695">%</th> <th data-bbox="1705 654 1793 695">N</th> <th data-bbox="1793 654 1896 695">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 695 1205 894" rowspan="2">Domain 1: Components of Reading: The Reading Specialist applies knowledge of the interrelated components of reading across all developmental stages of oral and written language and has expertise in reading instruction at the levels of early childhood through grade 12.</td> <td data-bbox="1205 695 1335 735">Exceeds</td> <td data-bbox="1335 695 1423 735">3</td> <td data-bbox="1423 695 1520 735">60</td> <td data-bbox="1520 695 1608 735">2</td> <td data-bbox="1608 695 1705 735">50</td> <td data-bbox="1705 695 1793 735">4</td> <td data-bbox="1793 695 1896 735">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1205 735 1335 894">Meets</td> <td data-bbox="1335 735 1423 894">2</td> <td data-bbox="1423 735 1520 894">40</td> <td data-bbox="1520 735 1608 894">2</td> <td data-bbox="1608 735 1705 894">50</td> <td data-bbox="1705 735 1793 894">0</td> <td data-bbox="1793 735 1896 894">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 894 1205 1094" rowspan="2">Domain 2: Assessment and Instruction: The Reading Specialist uses expertise in implementing, modeling, and providing integrated literacy assessment and instruction by utilizing appropriate methods and resources to address the varied learning needs of all students.</td> <td data-bbox="1205 894 1335 935">Exceeds</td> <td data-bbox="1335 894 1423 935">2</td> <td data-bbox="1423 894 1520 935">40</td> <td data-bbox="1520 894 1608 935">2</td> <td data-bbox="1608 894 1705 935">50</td> <td data-bbox="1705 894 1793 935">2</td> <td data-bbox="1793 894 1896 935">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1205 935 1335 1094">Meets</td> <td data-bbox="1335 935 1423 1094">3</td> <td data-bbox="1423 935 1520 1094">60</td> <td data-bbox="1520 935 1608 1094">2</td> <td data-bbox="1608 935 1705 1094">50</td> <td data-bbox="1705 935 1793 1094">2</td> <td data-bbox="1793 935 1896 1094">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="804 1094 1205 1351" rowspan="2">Domain 3: Strengths and Needs of Individual Students: The Reading Specialist recognizes how the differing strengths and needs of individual students influence their literacy development, applies knowledge of primary and second language acquisition to promote literacy, and applies knowledge of reading difficulties, dyslexia, and reading disabilities to promote literacy.</td> <td data-bbox="1205 1094 1335 1135">Exceeds</td> <td data-bbox="1335 1094 1423 1135">2</td> <td data-bbox="1423 1094 1520 1135">40</td> <td data-bbox="1520 1094 1608 1135">2</td> <td data-bbox="1608 1094 1705 1135">50</td> <td data-bbox="1705 1094 1793 1135">2</td> <td data-bbox="1793 1094 1896 1135">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1205 1135 1335 1351">Meets</td> <td data-bbox="1335 1135 1423 1351">3</td> <td data-bbox="1423 1135 1520 1351">60</td> <td data-bbox="1520 1135 1608 1351">2</td> <td data-bbox="1608 1135 1705 1351">50</td> <td data-bbox="1705 1135 1793 1351">2</td> <td data-bbox="1793 1135 1896 1351">50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Standard	Score Level	Observation 1		Observation 2		Observation 3		N	%	N	%	N	%	Domain 1: Components of Reading: The Reading Specialist applies knowledge of the interrelated components of reading across all developmental stages of oral and written language and has expertise in reading instruction at the levels of early childhood through grade 12.	Exceeds	3	60	2	50	4	100	Meets	2	40	2	50	0	0	Domain 2: Assessment and Instruction: The Reading Specialist uses expertise in implementing, modeling, and providing integrated literacy assessment and instruction by utilizing appropriate methods and resources to address the varied learning needs of all students.	Exceeds	2	40	2	50	2	50	Meets	3	60	2	50	2	50	Domain 3: Strengths and Needs of Individual Students: The Reading Specialist recognizes how the differing strengths and needs of individual students influence their literacy development, applies knowledge of primary and second language acquisition to promote literacy, and applies knowledge of reading difficulties, dyslexia, and reading disabilities to promote literacy.	Exceeds	2	40	2	50	2	50	Meets	3	60	2	50	2	50
Standard	Score Level	Observation 1			Observation 2		Observation 3																																																						
		N	%	N	%	N	%																																																						
Domain 1: Components of Reading: The Reading Specialist applies knowledge of the interrelated components of reading across all developmental stages of oral and written language and has expertise in reading instruction at the levels of early childhood through grade 12.	Exceeds	3	60	2	50	4	100																																																						
	Meets	2	40	2	50	0	0																																																						
Domain 2: Assessment and Instruction: The Reading Specialist uses expertise in implementing, modeling, and providing integrated literacy assessment and instruction by utilizing appropriate methods and resources to address the varied learning needs of all students.	Exceeds	2	40	2	50	2	50																																																						
	Meets	3	60	2	50	2	50																																																						
Domain 3: Strengths and Needs of Individual Students: The Reading Specialist recognizes how the differing strengths and needs of individual students influence their literacy development, applies knowledge of primary and second language acquisition to promote literacy, and applies knowledge of reading difficulties, dyslexia, and reading disabilities to promote literacy.	Exceeds	2	40	2	50	2	50																																																						
	Meets	3	60	2	50	2	50																																																						

Professionalism	<p>Reading Specialist Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Reading Specialist state standard domains. They must score at the “Average” level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: “1” is Does Not Meet; “2” is Meets; “3” is “Exceeds.”</p> <p>NOTE: For Observation 2 and 3, only four candidates were observed.</p>	The scoring for Domain 4 on each of the observations was evenly distributed between “meets” and “exceeds.” No candidate scored “Does not meet” on any of the performance assessments.																																	
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Standard</th> <th rowspan="2">Score Level</th> <th colspan="2">Oservation1</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 2</th> <th colspan="2">Observation 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Domain 4: Professional Knowledge and Leadership: The Reading Specialist understands the theoretical foundations of literacy; plans and implements a developmentally appropriate, research-based reading/literacy curriculum for all students; collaborates and communicates with educational stakeholders; and participates and takes a leadership role in designing, implementing, and evaluating professional development programs</td> <td>Exceeds</td> <td>2</td> <td>40</td> <td>1</td> <td>25</td> <td>2</td> <td>50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meets</td> <td>3</td> <td>60</td> <td>3</td> <td>75</td> <td>2</td> <td>50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Standard	Score Level	Oservation1		Observation 2		Observation 3		N	%	N	%	N	%	Domain 4: Professional Knowledge and Leadership: The Reading Specialist understands the theoretical foundations of literacy; plans and implements a developmentally appropriate, research-based reading/literacy curriculum for all students; collaborates and communicates with educational stakeholders; and participates and takes a leadership role in designing, implementing, and evaluating professional development programs	Exceeds	2	40	1	25	2	50	Meets	3	60	3	75	2	50				
Standard	Score Level	Oservation1			Observation 2		Observation 3																												
		N	%	N	%	N	%																												
Domain 4: Professional Knowledge and Leadership: The Reading Specialist understands the theoretical foundations of literacy; plans and implements a developmentally appropriate, research-based reading/literacy curriculum for all students; collaborates and communicates with educational stakeholders; and participates and takes a leadership role in designing, implementing, and evaluating professional development programs	Exceeds	2	40	1	25	2	50																												
	Meets	3	60	3	75	2	50																												
GPA at Completion	Candidates, initial certificate or advanced certificate, must maintain a 3.0 GPA at completion as a cohort.	Reading certification candidates’ mean GPA for AY 2022-2023 was well over the 3.0 GPA requirement.																																	
		Overall GPA		N		Mean																													
		5		3.98																															

Table 4. Expectations and Performance on Standard 2: Completer Professional Competence and Growth

Initial Program: Teaching and Learning and <i>teachHouston</i>																	
Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation															
Certification Exam	Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities Exam: Taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the PPR Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the PPR Exam were at 74 and above on each domain except for Domain 3.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>PPR Certification Exam Domains</th> <th>N</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Domain 1</td> <td>493</td> <td>76.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 2</td> <td>493</td> <td>74.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 3</td> <td>493</td> <td>68.99</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 4</td> <td>493</td> <td>75.55</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PPR Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	493	76.25	Domain 2	493	74.25	Domain 3	493	68.99	Domain 4	493	75.55
PPR Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean															
Domain 1	493	76.25															
Domain 2	493	74.25															
Domain 3	493	68.99															
Domain 4	493	75.55															
Performance Assessment	Teaching and Learning Candidates are formally evaluated four times during the Student Teaching Residency using the T-TESS Rubric. They must score at the “Developing” level in each domain of the T-TESS by	In AY 2022-23, out of 326 teacher candidates, more than 98% were rated at “Developing” or above in each dimension of the T-TESS by the end of the Student Teaching 1. Of note, 100% were rated “Developing” in T-TESS dimensions 1.1 (Standards and Alignment), 2.2 (Content Knowledge and Expertise), and 3.1 (Learning Environment).															

the end of Student Teaching 1. Then, they must score at the “Proficient” level in each domain of the T-TESS by the end of Student Teaching 2. The scale is as follows: “1” is Needs Improvement; “2” is Developing; “3” is Proficient; “4” is Accomplished, and “5” is Distinguished.

By the end of the Student Teaching 2, over 99% of 335 teacher candidates were scored at “Proficient” or above in each T-TESS Dimension, as can be seen in the table below.

	Student Teaching 1 (AY 2022-2023)			Student Teaching 2 (AY 2022-2023)		
	N	# of Developing	%	N	# of Proficient	%
Dimension 1.1: Standards and Alignment	326	326	100%	335	334	99.70 %
Dimension 1.2 Data and Assessment	326	323	99.08%	335	335	100%
Dimension 1.3 Knowledge of Students	326	325	99.69%	335	334	99.70 %
Dimension 1.4 Differentiation	326	325	99.69%	335	335	100%
Dimension 2.1 Achieving Expectations	326	324	99.39%	335	333	99.40 %
Dimension 2.2 Content Knowledge and Expertise	326	326	100%	335	334	99.70 %
Dimension 2.3 Communication	326	323	99.08%	335	333	99.40 %
Dimension 2.4 Differentiation	326	323	99.08%	335	334	99.70 %
Dimension 2.5 Monitor and Adjust	326	322	98.77%	335	334	99.70 %
Dimension 3.1 Learning Environment	326	326	100%	335	335	100%
3.2 Managing Student Behavior	326	325	99.69%	335	335	100%
4.2 Goal Setting	326	325	99.69%	335	334	99.70 %

teachHouston Candidates are formally evaluated three times each semester during the Student Teaching Residency using the *teachHouston* Evaluation Rubric. They must score at the “Developing” or “Proficient” level in each domain of the T-TESS by the end of Student Teaching. The scale is as follows: “1” is Needs Improvement; “2” is Developing; “3” is Proficient; “4” is Accomplished, and “5” is Distinguished

In Fall 2022, the average scores in each domain of the *teachHouston* evaluation rubric showed growth across the three POP Cycles with the average score on the final POP Cycle at above 4.00. In Spring 2023, the same caliber of growth can be seen in the data with the average score on the third POP Cycle well above 4.00 in all four domains.

	Fall 2022				Spring 2023			
	N	POP 1	POP 2	POP 3	N	POP 1	POP 2	POP 3
Classroom Management	18	2.68	3.55	4.41	34	2.93	3.65	4.48
Content	18	2.65	3.56	4.40	34	3.15	3.72	4.57
Classroom Interaction	18	2.42	3.36	4.20	34	2.73	3.48	4.32

		Lesson Design	18	2.65	3.38	4.14	34	2.83	3.59	4.38																								
Completer Satisfaction Surveys	Under the current State Board for Educator Certification (SBE) rules, new teachers under a standard certificate must respond to a survey at the end of the first year of teaching regarding the effectiveness of educator programs in preparing them to succeed in the classroom. These satisfaction surveys are sent out by the state. The results from this survey are used for monitoring and understanding the effectiveness of EPPs. The survey indicated “0” as Not at all prepared, “1” as Not Sufficiently prepared, “2” as Sufficiently Prepare, and “3” as Well Prepared.	<p>The Completer survey consists of 50 questionnaires focusing on how EPP prepares new teachers in terms of Planning (Q1-12), Instruction (Q13-25), Learning Environment (Q26-32), Professional Practices and Responsibilities (Q33-38), Student with Disabilities (Q39-45), and Emergent Bilingual Students (Q46-50), and an overall evaluation question (Q51). The UH EPP compared the data results between AY 2022-2023 (sample size = 284) and the state-wide scores (N=13200) as shown in the following table. Most respondents felt well or sufficiently prepared by EPP in the areas of Planning, Instruction, Learning Environment, and Professional Practices and Students with Disabilities, and were above state percentages in these four areas. The final two areas saw lower percentages of students who felt they were well-prepared or sufficiently prepared in those areas; however, it was also the trend of the entire state situation.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1041 667 1881 1000"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>UH % N=284</th> <th>State-wide (TX) % N=13200</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared</th> <th>Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>89.52%</td> <td>86.25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Instruction</td> <td>89.19%</td> <td>84.59%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Learning Environment</td> <td>90.58%</td> <td>86.42%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Professional Practices and Responsibilities</td> <td>91.79%</td> <td>90.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Students with Disabilities</td> <td>66.80%</td> <td>73.62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>English Language Learners</td> <td>75.67%</td> <td>82.97%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>										UH % N=284	State-wide (TX) % N=13200		Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Planning	89.52%	86.25%	Instruction	89.19%	84.59%	Learning Environment	90.58%	86.42%	Professional Practices and Responsibilities	91.79%	90.80%	Students with Disabilities	66.80%	73.62%	English Language Learners	75.67%	82.97%
	UH % N=284	State-wide (TX) % N=13200																																
	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared																																
Planning	89.52%	86.25%																																
Instruction	89.19%	84.59%																																
Learning Environment	90.58%	86.42%																																
Professional Practices and Responsibilities	91.79%	90.80%																																
Students with Disabilities	66.80%	73.62%																																
English Language Learners	75.67%	82.97%																																
Employer Satisfaction Surveys	The Texas Education Agency (TEA) collects data regarding the preparation of first-year teachers to help understand and provide resources and supports to educator preparation programs (EPPs) in preparing first-year teachers to succeed in the classroom. In this survey, principals complete surveys for first-year teachers who graduated at any time during the 5 years prior to the reporting period and who taught in the Texas public school system for a minimum of 5 months during the reporting period. Principals or their designees rated the preparation of teachers in six categories of practices: Planning, Instruction, Learning Environment, Professional Practices and Responsibilities (PPR), Student with Disabilities, and Emergent Bilingual Students. The scale is as follows:	<p>In AY 2022-2023, 254 first-year teachers who completed from UH were evaluated by their principals. As shown in the table below, principals overwhelmingly felt completers from the EPP were prepared in the six areas were disaggregated by the teaching certification grade level, along with the comparison to the state-level average. Most first-year teachers were rated well or sufficiently prepared by EPP. Additionally, the UH percentages of endorsement of Sufficiently (2) and well (3) levels on all categories are higher than the state-level average.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1041 1284 1881 1421"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>UH % N=254</th> <th>State-wide (TX) % N=9021</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared</th> <th>Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> </tbody> </table>										UH % N=254	State-wide (TX) % N=9021		Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared																		
	UH % N=254	State-wide (TX) % N=9021																																
	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared																																

"3" is Well Prepared; "2" is Sufficiently Prepared; "1" is Not Sufficiently Prepared; "0" is Not at all Prepared.	Planning	95.23%	91.01%
	Instruction	93.34%	90.25%
	Learning Environment	90.69%	89.38%
	Professional Practices and Responsibilities	95.46%	84.16%
	Students with Disabilities	90.36%	89.64%
	English Language Learners	95.26%	90.77%

Advanced Program: Principal Certification

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation																																																																		
Certification Exam	The Principal Certification Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Principal Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the Principal Certification Exam were above 70% on each domain except for Domain 5 and 7.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Principal Certification Exam Domains</th> <th style="text-align: center;">N</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Domain 1</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">75</td></tr> <tr><td>Domain 2</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">72</td></tr> <tr><td>Domain 3</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">72</td></tr> <tr><td>Domain 4</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">77</td></tr> <tr><td>Domain 5</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">67</td></tr> <tr><td>Domain 6</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">75</td></tr> <tr><td>Domain 7</td><td style="text-align: center;">61</td><td style="text-align: center;">54</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Principal Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	61	75	Domain 2	61	72	Domain 3	61	72	Domain 4	61	77	Domain 5	61	67	Domain 6	61	75	Domain 7	61	54																																										
Principal Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean																																																																		
Domain 1	61	75																																																																		
Domain 2	61	72																																																																		
Domain 3	61	72																																																																		
Domain 4	61	77																																																																		
Domain 5	61	67																																																																		
Domain 6	61	75																																																																		
Domain 7	61	54																																																																		
Performance Assessment	Principal Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Principal competencies or State Standards. They must score at the "Good" level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: "1" is Poor; "2" is Fair; "3" is Good; "4" is Very Good and "5" is Excellent. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marks "NA" for "Not Applicable."	<p>Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of Principal. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored "Good," "Very Good" or "Excellent" on each of the Competencies.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Standard</th> <th rowspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Rating</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Observation 1 N=31</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Observation 1 N=23</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Observation 3 N=8</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">#</th> <th style="text-align: center;">%</th> <th style="text-align: center;">#</th> <th style="text-align: center;">%</th> <th style="text-align: center;">#</th> <th style="text-align: center;">%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="5" style="text-align: left;">Competency 1: Shared Vision and Culture</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="text-align: center;">42%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">63%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Very Good</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">29%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Good</td> <td style="text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="text-align: center;">26%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Fair</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Poor</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">NA</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Excellent</td> <td style="text-align: center;">16</td> <td style="text-align: center;">52%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">39%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">38%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Standard	Rating	Observation 1 N=31		Observation 1 N=23		Observation 3 N=8		#	%	#	%	#	%	Competency 1: Shared Vision and Culture	Excellent	13	42%	11	48%	5	63%	Very Good	9	29%	6	26%	2	25%	Good	8	26%	6	26%	1	13%	Fair	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%		Excellent	16	52%	9	39%	3	38%
Standard	Rating	Observation 1 N=31			Observation 1 N=23		Observation 3 N=8																																																													
		#	%	#	%	#	%																																																													
Competency 1: Shared Vision and Culture	Excellent	13	42%	11	48%	5	63%																																																													
	Very Good	9	29%	6	26%	2	25%																																																													
	Good	8	26%	6	26%	1	13%																																																													
	Fair	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%																																																													
	Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%																																																													
	NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%																																																													
	Excellent	16	52%	9	39%	3	38%																																																													

		Competency 2: Partnerships for Student Outcomes	Very Good	9	29%	9	39%	4	50%
			Good	5	16%	4	17%	1	13%
			Fair	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
		Competency 3: High Quality Instruction	Excellent	17	55%	12	52%	5	63%
			Very Good	10	32%	7	30%	1	13%
			Good	4	13%	4	17%	2	25%
			Fair	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 4: Assessment	Excellent	15	48%	10	43%	5	63%
			Very Good	8	26%	9	39%	1	13%
			Good	7	23%	4	17%	2	25%
			Fair	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 5: Feedback and Reflectivity	Excellent	13	42%	11	48%	5	63%
			Very Good	9	29%	8	35%	1	13%
			Good	6	19%	4	17%	2	25%
			Fair	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 6: Selection, Placement, and Retention	Excellent	9	29%	8	35%	3	38%
			Very Good	8	26%	10	43%	4	50%
			Good	12	39%	5	22%	1	13%
			Fair	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%
Poor	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%		
NA	0		0%	0	0%	0	0%		
Standard 7 Relationships	Excellent	17	55%	9	39%	4	50%		

			Very Good	9	29%	8	35%	4	50%
			Good	3	10%	4	17%	0	0%
			Fair	2	6%	2	9%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
			NA	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 8 Improvement of Student Outcomes	Excellent	12	39%	11	48%	5	63%
			Very Good	10	32%	5	22%	1	13%
			Good	9	29%	6	26%	2	25%
			Fair	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 9: Campus Goals and Vision	Excellent	15	48%	11	48%	4	50%
			Very Good	10	32%	7	30%	2	25%
			Good	5	16%	5	22%	2	25%
			Fair	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Competency 10: Administrative Leadership	Excellent	10	32%	6	26%	4	50%
			Very Good	7	23%	10	43%	2	25%
			Good	10	32%	7	30%	2	25%
			Fair	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%
			Poor	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
		Completer Satisfaction Surveys	Advanced candidates seeking certification complete satisfaction surveys upon graduation. The college is responsible for collecting completer satisfaction data for advanced certification.	Five Principal Completers from AY 2022-2023 responded to the survey request. They reported that they felt well-prepared or sufficiently-prepared in each of the targeted areas on the survey except for one area.80% of the completers felt well-prepared or sufficiently prepared in their ability to engage in culturally responsive practices.					
						Principal N=5			

			Well-Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	
		Ability to Engage in the Community	100%	
		Ability to Engage in Culturally Responsive Practices	80%	
		Ability to Create Positive Environments	100%	
		Ability to Lead in the Growth of International/Global Perspectives	80%	
		Establishing Goals for Professional Growth	100%	
		Collaborate with Colleagues	100%	

Advanced Program: Superintendent Certification

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation																						
Certification Exam	The Superintendent Certification Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Superintendent Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	<p>The mean scores on each domain of the Superintendent Certification Exam were at 73 and above on each domain.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Superintendent Certification Exam Domains</th> <th>N</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Domain 1</td> <td>15</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 2</td> <td>15</td> <td>76</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Domain 3</td> <td>15</td> <td>73</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Superintendent Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean	Domain 1	15	76	Domain 2	15	76	Domain 3	15	73										
Superintendent Certification Exam Domains	N	Mean																						
Domain 1	15	76																						
Domain 2	15	76																						
Domain 3	15	73																						
Performance Assessment	Superintendent Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Superintendent competencies or State Standards. They must score at the "Good" level by the end of their practicum. The	<p>Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of Superintendent. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored "Good" or "Very Good" on each of the Standards when the standard could be observed during the Performance Assessment. Each standard was not observed during some candidates' observations.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Texas Administrative Code Standard</th> <th rowspan="2">Rating</th> <th colspan="2">Evaluation 1 N = 18</th> <th colspan="2">Evaluation 2 N = 11</th> <th colspan="2">Evaluation 3 N = 4</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> <th>N</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>14</td> <td>78%</td> <td>2</td> <td>18%</td> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Texas Administrative Code Standard	Rating	Evaluation 1 N = 18		Evaluation 2 N = 11		Evaluation 3 N = 4		N	%	N	%	N	%		Very Good (4)	14	78%	2	18%	2	50%
Texas Administrative Code Standard	Rating	Evaluation 1 N = 18			Evaluation 2 N = 11		Evaluation 3 N = 4																	
		N	%	N	%	N	%																	
	Very Good (4)	14	78%	2	18%	2	50%																	

	<p>scale is as follows: “1” is Poor; “2” is Fair; “3” is Good; “4” is Very Good” and “5” is Excellent. If the standard was not observed, the Site Supervisor marked “NO” for “Not Observed.”</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Leadership and School District Culture</td> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>1</td> <td>5%</td> <td>6</td> <td>55%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Observed</td> <td>3</td> <td>17%</td> <td>2</td> <td>18%</td> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Human Resources Leadership and Management</td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>14</td> <td>78%</td> <td>3</td> <td>27%</td> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>3</td> <td>27%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Policy and Governance</td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>13</td> <td>72%</td> <td>1</td> <td>9%</td> <td>0</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>1</td> <td>9%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Communications and Community Relationships</td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>12</td> <td>67%</td> <td>3</td> <td>27%</td> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>4</td> <td>22%</td> <td>3</td> <td>27%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Organizational Leadership and Management</td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>15</td> <td>83%</td> <td>2</td> <td>18%</td> <td>1</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>2</td> <td>11%</td> <td>4</td> <td>36%</td> <td>1</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Curriculum Planning and Development</td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>13</td> <td>72%</td> <td>3</td> <td>17%</td> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>3</td> <td>17%</td> <td>2</td> <td>18%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Learner Centered Instructional Leadership and Management</td> <td>Very Good (4)</td> <td>13</td> <td>72%</td> <td>2</td> <td>18%</td> <td>2</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Good (3)</td> <td>2</td> <td>11%</td> <td>4</td> <td>36%</td> <td>1</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2"></td> <td>Not Observed</td> <td>3</td> <td>17%</td> <td>6</td> <td>55%</td> <td>1</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </table>	Learner Centered Leadership and School District Culture	Good (3)	1	5%	6	55%	0	0%	Not Observed	3	17%	2	18%	2	50%	Learner Centered Human Resources Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	14	78%	3	27%	2	50%	Good (3)	0	0%	3	27%	0	0%	Learner Centered Policy and Governance	Very Good (4)	13	72%	1	9%	0	12%	Good (3)	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	Learner Centered Communications and Community Relationships	Very Good (4)	12	67%	3	27%	2	50%	Good (3)	4	22%	3	27%	0	0%	Learner Centered Organizational Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	15	83%	2	18%	1	25%	Good (3)	2	11%	4	36%	1	25%	Learner Centered Curriculum Planning and Development	Very Good (4)	13	72%	3	17%	2	50%	Good (3)	3	17%	2	18%	0	0%	Learner Centered Instructional Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	13	72%	2	18%	2	50%	Good (3)	2	11%	4	36%	1	25%		Not Observed	3	17%	6	55%	1	25%	
Learner Centered Leadership and School District Culture	Good (3)	1		5%	6	55%	0	0%																																																																																																												
	Not Observed	3	17%	2	18%	2	50%																																																																																																													
Learner Centered Human Resources Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	14	78%	3	27%	2	50%																																																																																																													
	Good (3)	0	0%	3	27%	0	0%																																																																																																													
Learner Centered Policy and Governance	Very Good (4)	13	72%	1	9%	0	12%																																																																																																													
	Good (3)	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%																																																																																																													
Learner Centered Communications and Community Relationships	Very Good (4)	12	67%	3	27%	2	50%																																																																																																													
	Good (3)	4	22%	3	27%	0	0%																																																																																																													
Learner Centered Organizational Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	15	83%	2	18%	1	25%																																																																																																													
	Good (3)	2	11%	4	36%	1	25%																																																																																																													
Learner Centered Curriculum Planning and Development	Very Good (4)	13	72%	3	17%	2	50%																																																																																																													
	Good (3)	3	17%	2	18%	0	0%																																																																																																													
Learner Centered Instructional Leadership and Management	Very Good (4)	13	72%	2	18%	2	50%																																																																																																													
	Good (3)	2	11%	4	36%	1	25%																																																																																																													
	Not Observed	3	17%	6	55%	1	25%																																																																																																													
	<p>Completer Satisfaction Surveys</p>	<p>Advanced candidates seeking certification complete satisfaction surveys upon graduation. The college is responsible for collecting completer satisfaction data for advanced certification.</p>	<p>No Superintendent Completers from AY 2022-2023 responded to the survey request.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Superintendent N=0</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ability to Engage in the Community</td> <td>No responses</td> </tr> </table>		Superintendent N=0		Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared	Ability to Engage in the Community	No responses																																																																																																											
	Superintendent N=0																																																																																																																			
	Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared																																																																																																																			
Ability to Engage in the Community	No responses																																																																																																																			

			Ability to Engage in Culturally Responsive Practices	No responses	
			Ability to Create Positive Environments	No responses	
			Ability to Lead in the Growth of International/Global Perspectives	No responses	
			Establishing Goals for Professional Growth	No responses	
			Collaborate with Colleagues	No responses	

Advanced Program: Education Diagnostician Certification									
Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation							
Certification Exam	The Education Diagnostician Certification Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Education Diagnostician Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	The mean scores on each domain of the Education Diagnostician Certification Exam were 70 on each domain.							
		Education Diagnostician Certification Exam Domains		N	Mean				
		Domain 1		13	80				
		Domain 2		13	76				
		Domain 3		13	80				
		Domain 4		13	73				
Performance Assessment	Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Education Diagnostician state standards. They must score at the "Average" level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: "1" is Poor; "2" is Needs Improvement; "3" is Average; "4" is Above Average, and "5" is Outstanding. If the standard was not observed, the Site	Supervisors conduct 45-minute observations of candidates engaging in the work of an Educational Diagnostician. As can be seen in these data, most candidates scored "Average," "Above Average," or "Outstanding" on each of the Standards when the standard could be observed during the Performance Assessment. Each standard was not observed during some candidates' observations. Standard 11 was not observed in most candidates' formal observations.							
		Standard	Rating	Observation 1		Observation 1		Observation 3	
				#	%	#	%	#	%
		Standard I. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of the purpose, philosophy,	Outstanding	2	18.18	4	40	3	30
	Above Average		1	9.09	1	0	1	0	
	Average		3	27.27	4	40	2	20	

Supervisor marked "NA" for "Not Applicable."	and legal foundations of evaluation and special education.	Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
		NA	5	45.45	4	40	4	40
	Standard IV. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of student assessment and evaluation, program planning, and instructional decision making.	Outstanding	4	36.36	4	40	6	60
		Above Average	2	18.18	1	0	0	0
		Average	2	18.18	3	30	1	10
		Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
		NA	3	27.27	2	20	3	30
	Standard V. The educational diagnostician knows eligibility criteria and procedures for identifying students with disabilities and determining the presence of an educational need.	Outstanding	3	27.27	2	20	2	20
		Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Average	4	36.36	1	10	2	20
		Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
		NA	4	36.36	7	70	6	60
	Standard VI. The educational diagnostician selects, administers, and interprets appropriate formal and informal assessments and evaluations.	Outstanding	3	27.27	4	40	5	50
		Above Average	1	9.09	0	0	0	0
		Average	2	18.18	2	20	2	20
		Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
		NA	5	45.45	4	40	3	30
	Standard VII. The educational diagnostician understands and applies knowledge of ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic diversity and the significance of student diversity for evaluation, planning, and Instruction.	Outstanding	5	45.45	2	20	2	20
		Above Average	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Average	1	9.09	1	10	1	10
		Needs Improvement	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Poor	0	0	0	0	0	0
		NA	5	45.45	7	70	7	70
		Outstanding	5	45.45	2	20	2	20

		Ability to Lead in the Growth of International/Global Perspectives	100%
		Establishing Goals for Professional Growth	100%
		Collaborate with Colleagues	100%

Advanced Program: Reading Specialist Certification

Provider-Selected Measures	Explanation of Performance Expectation	Level or Extent of Success in Meeting the Expectation							
Certification Exam	The Reading Specialist Exam is taken by all initial-certification completers. Completers must pass the Reading Certification Exam for credentialing purposes.	The mean scores on each domain of the Reading Specialist Exam were 72 and above on each domain.							
		Reading Specialist Certification Exam Domains		N		Mean			
		Domain 1		3		72			
		Domain 2		3		75			
		Domain 3		3		85			
Domain 4		3		76					
Performance Assessment	Candidates are formally evaluated three times. As part of their formal evaluation, they are assessed on each of the Reading Specialist state standard domains. They must score at the "Average" level by the end of their practicum. The scale is as follows: "1" is Does Not Meet; "2" is Meets; "3" is "Exceeds." NOTE: For Observation 2 and 3, only four candidates were observed.	Apart from Observation 3, the scoring of Domains 1, 2, and 3 was evenly distributed between "meets" and "exceeds." No candidate scored "Does not meet" on any of the performance assessments							
		Standard	Score Level	Observation 1		Observation 2		Observation 3	
				N	%	N	%	N	%
		Domain 1: Components of Reading: The Reading Specialist applies knowledge of the interrelated components of reading across all developmental stages of oral and written language and has expertise in reading instruction at the levels of early childhood through grade 12.	Exceeds	3	60	2	50	4	100
			Meets	2	40	2	50	0	0
Domain 2: Assessment and Instruction: The Reading Specialist uses expertise in implementing, modeling, and providing integrated literacy assessment and instruction by utilizing appropriate methods and resources to address the varied learning needs of all students.	Exceeds	2	40	2	50	2	50		
	Meets	3	60	2	50	2	50		
	Exceeds	2	40	2	50	2	50		

		Domain 3: Strengths and Needs of Individual Students: The Reading Specialist recognizes how the differing strengths and needs of individual students influence their literacy development, applies knowledge of primary and second language acquisition to promote literacy, and applies knowledge of reading difficulties, dyslexia, and reading disabilities to promote literacy.	Meets	3	60	2	50	2	50
Completer Satisfaction Surveys	Advanced candidates seeking certification complete satisfaction surveys upon graduation. The college is responsible for collecting completer satisfaction data for advanced certification.	No Reading Specialist Completers responded to the survey request.							
			Reading Specialist N=0						
			Well- Prepared/ Sufficiently Prepared						
		Ability to Engage in the Community	No responses						
		Ability to Engage in Culturally Responsive Practices	No responses						
		Ability to Create Positive Environments	No responses						
		Ability to Lead in the Growth of International/Global Perspectives	No responses						
		Establishing Goals for Professional Growth	No responses						
Collaborate with Colleagues	No responses								

5. Notes on Progress, Accomplishment, and Innovation

This section describes program accomplishments, efforts, and innovations (strengths and outcomes) to address challenges and priorities over the past year.

Program Accomplishments, Efforts, and Innovations to Address Challenges and Priorities over the Past Year

Initial Programs: Teaching and Learning; <i>teachHouston</i>		
AAQEP Standard	Goals from the QAR	Program Accomplishments, Efforts, and Innovations to Address Goals from the QAR
Standards 1 and 2	Intentional revisions to performance data collection	<p><i>Teaching and Learning</i> program leadership revised the existing tools and structures/forms in Tk20 to be more intentional regarding goals based on identified Reinforcements (strengths) and Refinement (growths). For example, <i>Teaching and Learning</i> revised the Coaching Visit such that it specifically asks candidates to set goals based on recent Reinforcements and Refinement areas identified in partnership with the Site Coordinator and/or the Mentor Teacher.</p> <p><i>TeachHouston</i> faculty are addressing the vertical alignment of the curriculum in the following areas: Growth Mindset, Engineering Design, Inquiry-Based Learning, Classroom Management, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, and Instructional Strategies</p>
Standard 3	Strengthening partnerships.	<p>Advisory boards are meeting as scheduled within the respective programs. <i>Teaching and Learning</i> is continuing the work with focused partnerships through <i>Raise Your Hand Texas</i>, <i>Opportunity Culture</i>, <i>Education Impact</i>, and the <i>Innovation Pilot</i> work. Additionally, UH is engaged in two communities of practice led by the US PREP National Center. This work specifically addresses the teacher pipeline in the Houston area with a targeted focus on strengthening community college partnerships.</p> <p>Initial programs expanded their partnerships with the <i>Vetted Award</i> from the <i>Texas Education Agency</i>. Both <i>Teaching and Learning</i> and <i>teachHouston</i> have strengthened our partnerships with districts and the Region 4 ESC via the yearlong residency programs with area districts. Both programs worked with Region 4 ESC and districts on creating companion guides to clearly document candidate, supervisor, and cooperating teacher understanding of responsibilities.</p>
	Opportunities for diversity in recruitment areas	Initial programs continue to look for opportunities to focus on diversity in recruitment efforts. Recruitment efforts are ongoing and year-round. Faculty have engaged in multiple meet and greet fairs where candidates interested in teaching can gain information from a variety of Educator Preparation Programs. Updated recruitment materials have been created and are disseminated at these fairs. Additionally, UH is a partner university for the Charles Butt Scholar, Raising Texas Teachers, program.

		<p>Applicants interested in teaching and attend UH and are eligible to apply for a scholarship of \$8,000 per year for up to 4 years.</p> <p><i>teachHouston's</i> recruitment efforts include the following: attending new student and transfer orientations; collaborating with advisors; open house event; STEM classroom visits; targeted emails; registration/round-up parties; social media; job fairs; informational webinars; informational sessions; and VIP luncheons. We hold bi-annual leadership meetings for all certification areas to address issues or concerns, as well as data use practices. Additionally, We enhanced our induction program. Website updates to improve access to the <i>teachHouston</i> Interest Form. Announcements in the NSM Newsletter to encourage classroom visits by the <i>teachHouston</i> faculty advisor.</p>
	Data collection and the intentional tracking of candidates, issues, and concerns.	Program leadership is continuing to refine their data collection process so there is clear alignment across competencies and T-TESS. See the Goal for Standard 3 below.
Standard 4	High Quality Certification Pathways and Teacher Pipeline	Currently, the focus for the UH Teacher Education Program is access to multiple high quality certification pathways. This has led to the launching of the UH ACP, supported by a 3.5-million-dollar grant from Houston Endowment.
	Focused and intentional completer support.	<p><i>Teaching and Learning</i> and <i>teachHouston</i> are continuing to explore opportunities for supporting completers upon graduation. There are some opportunities to partner with districts through the TECLAS work described in Section 6.</p> <p><i>teachHouston</i> graduates are supported through a summer conference style event, the New Teacher Academy which prepares teachers for the beginning of the school year. Additionally, LEAD master teacher fellows support our graduates through weekly check-ins and visits. We also have social events and professional development throughout the year to support years 1-3 teachers. Faculty maintain ongoing relationships with completers and faculty and staff conduct semester check-ins with completers as well as observation and feedback upon request.</p>
Advanced Programs: Principal; Superintendent; Educational Diagnostician		

Standard 1	Intentional revisions to performance data collection.	Formal observation forms were updated to include specific Likert ratings for each competency within the relevant certification areas. Pre and post conference protocols that address specific goals of the observation have been developed, as well as a form for documentation. An <i>Intern Evaluation and Reflection Form</i> has been developed for Field Supervisors, Site Supervisors, and Candidates. The <i>Intern Evaluation and Reflection Form</i> includes professional ethics, behaviors, reflection, and collaboration as is relevant to the role of the reviewee (Field Supervisor, Site Supervisor, and Candidate). Field Supervisors and Site Supervisors will complete the <i>Intern Evaluation and Reflection Form</i> twice over the practicum. Candidates will complete their reflection eight times over the course of the practicum.
	Coursework and Curricular Revisions	Based on program assessment results and district feedback, the M.Ed. in Administration and Supervision program underwent a program redesign in 2022-2023, including revision of all coursework and the development of two new courses. The Superintendent program area employed “dissertation coaches” to work with current students. Finally, the Education Diagnostician program area initiated a “Culturally Responsive Practice” ongoing activity in Fall 2022, completing it over the course of Practicum I and Practicum II.
Standard 2	Completer Survey Revisions	Program leadership across programs is working with the University Alumni office to update the survey to include specific questions relevant to the certification competencies.
	Employee satisfaction data	Program leadership has begun building an alumni database to track employer information. The next phase will be to create an employer satisfaction survey.
Standard 3	Strengthening partnerships	Advisory boards are meeting, as scheduled within the respective programs.
	Opportunities for diversity in recruitment areas	Candidates in the advanced programs mirror the diversity of students and teachers in the Region 4 area. That said, programs continue to recruit from the Houston metro region. The current annual enrollment goal is 45 students for the Principal certification program. That goal was reached in Fall 2022 and Fall 2023; the current program enrollment is approximately 90 students. Both the Principal and Superintendent certification program areas conducted online information sessions in Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 for Aldine ISD, Houston ISD, Cypress-Fairbanks ISD. The Education Diagnostician program area partnered with Houston ISD Dyslexia Department to train 5 of their dyslexia specialists through a grant funded by Texas Education Agency.

	Data collection and the intentional tracking of candidates, issues, and concerns.	Observation reports from field supervisors and program monitoring reports from site supervisors are now collected using online forms and Power Automate in both the Principal and Superintendent programs. The Education Diagnostician program is using Tk20 for data collection and monitoring of candidates. See the Goal for Standard 3 below.
Standard 4	Focused and intentional completer support	Each of the advanced programs are in the process of contributing to the further development of completers. The Principal certification program area has instituted <i>Performance Assessment Work Sessions</i> for current students. During the fall semester of 2022, recent program graduates coached current students on the completion of the <i>TExES 368 Performance Assessment for School Leaders</i> certification exam). Additionally, in January of each year, a full-day workshop is available for students who are preparing to take the <i>TExES 268 Principal as Instructional Leaders</i> certification exam. The Superintendent area held a state exam prep day on September 30, 2023. Finally, the Education Diagnostician program area developed a workshop, <i>Support for the new Diagnostician!</i> to be implemented in 23-24 for 2022 and 2023 finishers