

December 6, 2023

Via Email with delivery/read receipt

Mario Torres
University of Texas - San Antonio
1 Utsa Circle
San Antonio, TX 78249

Dear Dr. Torres:

The data we distributed as an attachment to your notice of recommended accreditation status dated November 17 contained some values that were not properly programmed. Namely, some candidates were improperly excluded from calculations for Indicators 1a, 1b, and 4a, some candidates were improperly included from calculations for Indicator 4b, and demographic groups were improperly included for Indicator 4b. Detailed information about these corrections is available from TEA.

Your recommended accreditation status of **Accredited - Probation (Year 1)** is not affected by these updates. The revised data is attached for your reference.

Because this updated recommended status is below Accredited, your EPP is eligible to request an informal review pursuant to 19 TAC §229.7(c)(2).

This recommended accreditation status is based on 2022-2023 academic year data, reflected in the attachment, and the rules currently in effect to determine accreditation ratings.

Once the recommendation is approved by the SBEC, the status will be effective from the date SBEC approves it until SBEC approves the next annual accreditation ratings based on 2023-2024 academic year data. After the SBEC takes action on this recommendation, TEA staff will post accreditation statuses for all Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) on the Educator Preparation Program Dashboards, accessible from the [Consumer Information webpage](#).

The accreditation status is determined as described in §229.4(b), using the methodology detailed in Figure: 19 TAC §229.1(c). Attachment II provides detailed calculations for your EPP.

Your recommended status of Accredited - Probation is due to your EPP meeting the standard described in §229.4(b)(4) with an ASEP Index score of 76.

Per §229.5(c), if candidates in an individual certification class or category fail to meet the performance standard on the content pedagogy examinations for three consecutive years, the approval to offer that class or category shall be revoked. The table below presents certification classes or categories that did not meet the standard in 2022-2023, along with prior results. If this reads "No Data", there were no certification classes or categories that did not meet the standard in 2022-2023.

Certification Class or Category	Certification Exam	2021-2022 Standing	2022-2023 Result	2022-2023 Standing
Mathematics/Science 4-8	Mathematics/Science 4-8	Did not meet Standard	Did not meet Standard	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)
Social Studies – Composite 7-12	Social Studies 7-12	Met Standard	Did not meet Standard	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 1)

Per 19 TAC §229.4(a), the ASEP data collected in 2022-2023 was used for the determination of accreditation statuses. These data were gathered from our systems using our standard processes and analyses. These data are provided in Attachment I. Please note: per 19 TAC §229.4(c), the small-group aggregation was performed this year, using data from the 2021-2022 academic year as available. Because there is only one year of additional data available for the small group aggregation, indicators or candidate groups that had 10 or fewer individuals once the two years were aggregated were not used for the determination of the accreditation status.

Please share this information with appropriate members of your staff. If you have any questions regarding this notification, please contact me at Mark.Olofson@TEA.Texas.gov.

Sincerely,

Mark Olofson
 Director, Educator Data, Research, and Strategy

- cc: Emily Garcia, Associate Commissioner, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement
- cc: Marilyn Cook, Senior Director, Educator Preparation and Certification
- cc: Vanessa Alba, Education Specialist, Educator Preparation, Certification, and Enforcement

- Attachment I: Educator Preparation Program 2022-2023 Academic Year ASEP Results
- Attachment II: ASEP Index Calculations for 2022-2023
- Attachment III: Informal Review Requirements and Procedures

ATTACHMENT I

University of Texas - San Antonio 2022-2023 Academic Year ASEP Results

Standard:	Number of Individuals Meeting Standard	Total Individuals Evaluated	Percent Met Standard	Evaluation Outcome
1a. Certification Exam-Pedagogy	-	-	85	SBEC approved standard
All (1)	245	253	97	Met Standard
Female (2)	194	201	97	Met Standard
Male (3)	51	52	98	Met Standard
African American (4)	12	13	92	Met Standard
Hispanic (5)	158	164	96	Met Standard
Other (6)	22	22	100	Met Standard
White (7)	65	66	98	Met Standard
1b. Certification Exam-Content Pedagogy	-	-	75	SBEC approved standard
All (1)	385	416	93	Met Standard
Female (2)	323	347	93	Met Standard
Male (3)	62	69	90	Met Standard
African American (4)	12	14	86	Met Standard
Hispanic (5)	240	262	92	Met Standard
Other (6)	17	17	100	Met Standard
White (7)	116	123	94	Met Standard
2. Principal Appraisal	-	-	70	SBEC approved standard
All (1)	86	106	81	Met Standard
Female (2)	68	84	81	Met Standard
Male (3)	18	22	82	Met Standard
African American (4)	8	11	73	Met Standard
Hispanic (5)	56	68	82	Met Standard
Other (6)	17	22	77	Met Standard
White (7)	19	21	90	Met Standard
4a. Field Supervision - Observations	-	-	95	SBEC approved standard
All (1)	330	330	100	Met Standard
Female (2)	258	258	100	Met Standard
Male (3)	63	63	100	Met Standard
African American (4)	13	13	100	Met Standard
Hispanic (5)	213	213	100	Met Standard
Other (6)	19	19	100	Met Standard
White (7)	85	85	100	Met Standard
4b. Field Supervision – Exit Survey	-	-	90	SBEC approved standard
ALL (1)	179	187	96	Met Standard
Female (2)	--	--	--	No Data
Male (3)	--	--	--	No Data
African American (4)	--	--	--	No Data
Hispanic (5)	--	--	--	No Data
Other (6)	--	--	--	No Data
White (7)	--	--	--	No Data
5. Evaluation of EPPs by Teachers	-	-	70	SBEC approved standard
ALL (1)	72	112	64	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)
Female (2)	56	87	64	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)
Male (3)	16	25	64	Did Not Meet Standard
African American (4)	2	5	40	Small Group Exception
Hispanic (5)	49	72	68	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)
Other (6)	5	6	83	Small Group Exception
White (7)	16	29	55	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)

Blank cells indicate there was no data. For more information about all calculations please see the ASEP Manual. All numbers were rounded to a whole number. Numbers that end with a decimal value of .4999 or less were rounded down. Numbers that end with a decimal value of .5000 or more were rounded up.

1b. Test Code-Certification Exam	Number of Individuals Meeting Standard	Total Individuals Evaluated	Percent Met Standard	Evaluation Outcome
Art EC-12	17	17	100	Met Standard
Bilingual Education Supplemental-Spanish	9	9	100	Small Group Exception
Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test (BTLPT)-Spanish	16	19	84	Met Standard
Core Subjects 4-8	4	4	100	Small Group Exception
Core Subjects EC-6	87	95	92	Met Standard
Deaf and Hard of Hearing EC-12	7	7	100	Small Group Exception
English Language Arts and Reading 7-12	12	15	80	Met Standard
English Language Arts and Reading/Social Studies 4-8	10	12	83	Met Standard
English as a Second Language (ESL) Supplemental	25	26	96	Met Standard
Health EC-12	1	1	100	Small Group Exception
History 7-12	8	8	100	Small Group Exception
LOTE: Spanish	3	5	60	Small Group Exception
Life Science 7-12	4	5	80	Small Group Exception
Mathematics 7-12	9	11	82	Met Standard
Mathematics/Science 4-8	9	19	47	Did not meet Standard
Music EC-12	15	15	100	Met Standard
Performance Assessment for School Leaders (PASL)	22	22	100	Met Standard
Physical Education EC-12	10	12	83	Met Standard
Principal as Instructional Leader	21	23	91	Met Standard
Reading Specialist	13	13	100	Met Standard
STR for Core Subjects 4-8	2	2	100	Small Group Exception
STR for Core Subjects EC-6	45	45	100	Met Standard
STR for ELAR / Social Studies 4-8	5	5	100	Small Group Exception
School Counselor	19	19	100	Met Standard
Science 7-12	9	9	100	Small Group Exception
Social Studies 7-12	10	14	71	Did not meet Standard
Special Education EC-12	13	13	100	Met Standard
Superintendent	13	14	93	Met Standard

For more information about all calculations please see the ASEP Manual. All numbers were rounded to a whole number. Numbers that end with a decimal value of .4999 or less were rounded down. Numbers that end with a decimal value of .5000 or more were rounded up.

ATTACHMENT II

Educator Preparation Program 2022-2023 ASEP Index Results

As directed in 19 TAC §229.4(b) and fully described in Chapter 9 of the ASEP manual, the ASEP Index score is calculated for the determination of recommended statuses. This scoring system uses data from the seven ASEP Indicators along with differential weights to determine the total number of points possible for an EPP based on the data present, and the total number of points achieved.

The total number of points achieved is calculated based on the EPP performance in each measure for each group. Values are assigned for each cell in the matrix based on the current year performance and performance in the most recent prior year for which the EPP had actionable data.

Performance	Value
Met Standard	1
Did Not Meet Standard and Met Standard in Prior Year	0
No Data/Small Group Exception	<blank>
Did Not Meet Standard and Did Not Meet Standard in most recent prior year for which the EPP had actionable data	-1

The table below presents the measure weights.

ASEP Measure	Weight
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	4
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	2
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	3
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	3
5: Evaluation of EPPs by teachers	2

The table below presents the demographic group weights.

Group	Weight
All	6
Female	1
Male	1
African American	1
Hispanic / Latino	1
Other	1
White	1

Cell Outcome: The following table has your evaluation results for each cell on all ASEP indicators.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	Pilot data						
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard	Met Standard
4b: Quality of field supervision	Met Standard	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data
5: Evaluation of EPPs by teachers	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)	Did Not Meet Standard	Small Group Exception	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)	Small Group Exception	Did Not Meet Standard (Year 2)

Available Points: We multiply each cell by the corresponding measure weight and demographic weight.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	12	2	2	2	2	2	2
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	Pilot data						
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
5: Evaluation of EPPs by teachers	12	2	2	2	2	2	2

Used for Evaluation Table: The following table shows whether the outcome for an indicator cell was used in 2022-2023 of your EPP.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	Pilot data						
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4b: Quality of field supervision	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
5: Evaluation of EPPs by teachers	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

Results Table: Any cell that is a “Yes” in the previous table results in the following points awarded for your EPP in the 2022-2023 ASEP calculations.

ASEP Measure	All	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic / Latino	Other	White
1a: Certification examination results for pedagogy tests	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
1b: Certification examination results for content pedagogy tests	12	2	2	2	2	2	2
2: Principal appraisal of the preparation of first-year teachers	6	1	1	1	1	1	1
3: Improvement in student achievement of students taught by beginning teachers	Pilot data						
4a: Frequency and duration of field observations	18	3	3	3	3	3	3
4b: Quality of field supervision	18	--	--	--	--	--	--
5: Evaluation of EPPs by teachers	-12	-2	0	--	-2	--	-2

Add all the values in the results table: 120.

Add all the values in the data available table: 158.

Divide the results sum by the data available sum and multiple by 100.

Based on these calculations, your ASEP Index score is: 76.

ATTACHMENT III
Informal Review Requirements and Procedures

The chief operating officer of University of Texas - San Antonio or designee may initiate an informal review by sending a written request submitted by mail, email, or facsimile to:

Mark Olofson
Division of Educator Data, Research, and Strategy
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701
Mark.Olofson@TEA.Texas.gov
(512) 463-8911 (office)
(512) 463-7795 (fax)

Pursuant to 19 TAC §229.7(c)(2), a request for an informal review must set out the reasons the EPP believes the proposed recommendation is incorrect and must meet at least one of the allowable criteria stated below. Indicate which reason below the informal review is based on and provide the required information and supporting documentation for each reason indicated:

- If alleging the proposed recommendation would violate a statutory provision, the statutory provision violated and the specific facts supporting a conclusion that the statute was violated by the proposed recommendation.

- If alleging the proposed recommendation would be in excess of the SBEC's statutory authority, the SBEC's statutory authority and the specific facts supporting a conclusion that the proposed recommendation would be in excess of this authority.

- If alleging the proposed recommendation was made through unlawful procedure, the lawful procedure and the specific facts supporting a conclusion that the proposed recommendation was made through unlawful procedure that the Board may make to a rule at adoption.

- If alleging the proposed recommendation is affected by other error of law, the law violated and the specific facts supporting a conclusion that the proposed recommendation violated that law.

- If alleging the proposed recommendation is not reasonably supported by a preponderance of the evidence, each finding, inference, or conclusion of the proposed recommendation that is unsupported by a preponderance of the evidence, and the evidence that creates a preponderance against the specific finding, inference, or conclusion at issue.

If alleging the proposed recommendation is arbitrary or capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion or clearly unwarranted exercise of discretion, each finding, inference, conclusion, or proposed recommendation affected and the specific facts supporting a conclusion that each is so affected.

In addition to the required information above, the request for an informal review must include:

- For each violation, error, or defect alleged above, the substantial rights of the EPP that are prejudiced by such violation,
- A concise statement of the relief sought by the EPP, and
- The name, mailing address, telephone number, facsimile number, and email address of the petitioner's representative.

Pursuant to 19 TAC §229.7(c)(3), failure to comply with the requirements stated above may result in dismissal of the request for an informal review.

TEA staff will review the materials and documents provided by the EPP and notify the program of the final recommendation prior to submission to the SBEC. The final recommendation may include changes or additions to the proposed recommendation and such modifications are not subject to another informal review.

If the final recommendation proposes revocation for an EPP to recommend candidates for educator certification, within 14 calendar days of receipt of the final recommendation, the EPP may agree in writing to accept the final revocation without further proceedings or may request that the TEA staff schedule the matter for a hearing before an administrative law judge at the State Office of Administrative Hearings, as provided by 19 TAC §229.8.

If the final recommendation does not propose revocation of approval of an EPP to recommend candidates for educator certification, the final recommendation will be submitted to SBEC for consideration of a final order.

The rules and procedures governing an informal review may be found in 19 TAC §229.7. The TAC can be accessed at <https://tea.texas.gov/sites/default/files/22-03-ch229.pdf>. TEA must receive the request for an informal review no later than **5:00 p.m. on December 20, 2023**.