



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

PURPOSE

Texas Education Agency (TEA) Program Specialist, Vanessa Alba, conducted a five-year Continuing Approval Desk Review of the educator preparation program (EPP) for The University of Texas-El Paso (UTEP) on January 27, 2020. Per 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(b), "...An entity approved by the SBEC under this chapter shall be reviewed at least once every five years...". Dr. Clifton Tanabe was identified as the program Legal Authority and Dr. Erika Mein, Backup Legal Authority, was identified as the primary EPP contact for the review process. UTEP was approved as an EPP on January 8, 1972. At the time of the review, the EPP was rated Accredited. At the time of the review, UTEP was approved to certify candidates in the following classes: Teacher, Principal, Superintendent, School Counselor, and Educational Diagnostician.

Per 19 TAC §228.1(c), "all educator preparation programs are subject to the same standards of accountability, as required under Chapter 229 of this title." The TEA administers TAC required by the Texas legislature for the regulation of all EPPs in the state. (See the complete [TAC](#) for details.) The five-year Continuing Approval Review was conducted in a "Desk Review" format where EPP staff submitted requested documents to TEA for review.

The scope of this review included: 1) verifying compliance with Texas Administrative Code and Texas Education Code as applicable to all certification classes in all certification routes offered by the EPP; and 2) developing a plan for improvement based on review data, performance indicators identified in 19 TAC §229.4, and self-reported EPP information provided in the Status Report. Next Steps were developed to address plans for quality improvement. Evidence of compliance was measured using a rubric aligned to TAC.

EPP staff participating in the review at various stages and in attendance at the phone conference on February 14, 2020, were: Dr. Erika Mein, backup Legal Authority & Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies and Educator Preparation, Dr. Joyce Asing-Cashman, Assistant Dean, Teacher Preparation, Dr. Beverley Calvo, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, Ms. Laurie Ramirez, Certification Officer, Dr. Paul Carrola, Associate Professor and Clinical Coordinator-Mental Health Counseling & Special Education, Dr. Carleton Brown, Assistant Professor, School Counseling, Dr. Alyse Hachey, Co-Chair, Department of Teacher Education, Dr. Olga Kosheleva, Co-Chair, Department of Teacher Education, Dr. Arturo Olivarez, Chair, Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations, Dr. Teresa Cortez, Assistant Professor of Practice, Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations, Dr. Rick Myer, Chair, Department of Educational Psychology and Special Services, and Dr. Rudy Rincones, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations.



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

DATA ANALYSIS

Information concerning compliance with TAC governing EPPs was collected by a variety of means. A Status Report and related program documents were submitted to TEA on December 17, 2019. Additional EPP documents, including records for 30 candidates, were submitted on January 9, 2020. Qualitative and quantitative methodologies of content analysis, cross-referencing, and triangulation of the data were used to evaluate the evidence.

FINDINGS, COMPLIANCE ISSUES, and RECOMMENDATIONS

“Findings” indicate evidence collected during the review process. If the program is “not in compliance” with any identified component, the program should consult the TAC and correct the issue immediately. “Next Steps” may be drafted during the review that identifies compliance issues to be addressed and a timeline for completion. “Recommendations” are suggestions for general program improvement and no follow up is required.

COMPONENT I: GOVERNANCE – 19 TAC §228

Findings

- Governance was not reviewed as a part of the Desk Review. TEA relied on self-reported data contained within the Status Report. UTEP self-reported in the Status Report that it met all requirements. [19 TAC §228.20(b)]
- TEA did not find evidence of a published calendar of activities for any of its programs. For evidence, TEA referenced the website links provided in the Status Report. [19 TAC §228.20(g)]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps)

- 19 TAC §228.20(g) UTEP did not have a calendar of program activities for any of its programs.
Action: Develop and implement a calendar of program activities that must include a deadline for accepting candidates into a program cycle to assure adequate time for admission, coursework, training, and field-based experience requirements prior to a clinical teaching or internship experience. If the EPP accepts candidates after the deadline, the EPP must develop and implement a calendar of activities to assure adequate time for completion of all activities prior to clinical teaching or internship.

Recommendations

- None

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP was not in compliance with 19 TAC §228 – Governance of Educator Preparation Programs.



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

COMPONENT II: ADMISSION - 19 TAC §227.10

Findings

- UTEP has informed applicants and candidates of the required information about the EPP on the website. Admission & completion requirements, supply & demand, the right to request a criminal background check prior to employment, and ineligibility of certification if convicted of an offense were all posted on the website. [19 TAC §227.1(c-d)]
- All five undergraduate candidates were enrolled in the undergraduate program at the time of admission to the EPP, all five alternative certification program (ACP) teacher candidates were admitted based on a degree held at the time of admission, all five school counselor candidates were admitted based on a degree held at the time of admission, all five principal/principal as instructional leader (PIL) candidates were admitted based on a degree held at the time of admission, all five educational diagnosticians were admitted based on a degree held at the time of admission, and all five superintendent candidates were admitted based on a degree held at the time of admission. UTEP met enrollment and degree requirements as prescribed. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(1-2); 19 TAC §241.5; 19 TAC §241.45; 19 TAC §242.5]
- One out-of-country candidate file was reviewed. The file contained evidence of a transcript evaluation from the Foreign Credential Academic Services of America (FCASA) and met the requirement as prescribed. [19 TAC §227.10(e)]
- All candidates met the minimum grade point average (GPA) requirement for admission. The undergraduate GPA range was 2.75-3.5, the ACP GPA range was 2.58-3.93, the school counselor GPA range was 3.0-3.72, the principal GPA range was 2.93-3.67, the educational diagnostician GPA range was 2.55-4.0, and the superintendent GPA range was 3.43-4.0. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(3)(A)]
- All applicants met content knowledge prior to admission. Transcripts for the five undergraduate files reviewed reflected 12 or 15 content hours as applicable. Transcripts for four out of five ACP files reviewed reflected 12 or 15 content hours as applicable and one ACP candidate was admitted via PACT. All non-teacher files were admitted based on a degree held. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(4)]
- All candidates met basic skills requirements prior to admission. All five undergrad candidates were admitted based on acceptable THEA scores and all others had a degree at the time of admission. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(6)]
- All applicants demonstrated proficiency in English language skills prior to admission. All files contained evidence of a degree/transcript from a U.S. school. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(7)]
- One out of five undergraduate teacher candidates were screened with a written essay scored on a rubric. None of the ACP files were screened. None of the school counselors were screened. None of the educational diagnosticians were screened. All five principal files were screened with an interview scored on a rubric, three letters of



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

recommendation, and a statement of purpose. Four out of five superintendent files contained three letters of recommendation with levels of proficiency noted. Both the principal and superintendent applicants require more than one screening activity. The program did not meet the interview or other screening instruments to determine if the applicant's experience, skills, and aptitude were appropriate for the certification sought. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §241.5; 19 TAC §241.45; 19 TAC §242.5]

- An application is required for admission. The undergraduate and ACP files all contained an application (100%). Three out of five (60%) of counselor files reviewed contained an application. All five (100%) of principal files contained an application. Three out of five (60%) of educational diagnostician files contained an application. Two out of five (40%) of superintendent files contained an application. Overall, 23 out of 30 files reviewed (77%) contained an application. The program did not meet the requirement as prescribed. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(8)]
- Four out of five undergraduate candidates (80%) contained three letters of recommendation and one out of five (20%) contained an essay scored on a rubric. The website states an application and essay score on a rubric are required for admission. Two out of five (40%) of ACP candidates contained two or three letters of recommendation, but the website did not state that letters of recommendation are required for ACP admission. The program did not meet the other academic requirements for admission. [19 TAC §227.10(a)(9)]
- Three out of five (60%) of school counselor files contained a statement of purpose. The website did not provide admission requirements for the school counselor program. Three out of five (60%) of principal candidates contained a statement of purpose. TEA could not access the website for requirements for admission to the principal program. Four out of five (80%) of superintendent files contained a statement of purpose. Four out of five (80%) files contained a resume. Three out of five (60%) contained three letters of recommendation. The superintendent website states that a letter of intent and three references are required. The program did not meet its own additional admission requirements as prescribed. [19 TAC §227.10(b)]
- Applicants are required to be formally admitted. Four out of five (80%) of the undergraduate teacher files contained a formal letter of admission that corresponded to the ASEP admission date. The fifth file was admitted on 3/24/2016 and should have contained a formal letter of admission but did not. The requirement went into effect on 2/28/2016.

All five (100%) of the ACP teacher files contained a formal letter of admission that corresponded to the ASEP admission date.

All five counselor files contained a formal letter of admission. Three out of five (60%) letters did not correspond to the ASEP admission date and one was admitted prior to the requirement going into effect.



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

Three out of five (40%) principal files contained a formal offer of admission that corresponded to the ASEP admission date. One file (20%) did not contain a formal offer of admission. Two files (40%) were admitted prior to the requirement going into effect. Two out of five (40%) educational diagnosticians were not required to have a formal offer of admission because they were admitted prior to the requirement going into effect. Three out of five (60%) were required to have a formal offer of admission but did not contain the letters to crosscheck with ASEP.

Four out of five (80%) of superintendent files were required to have a formal offer of admission and the letter was provided. All four files (100%) met the requirement. The fifth file was admitted prior to the requirement going into effect.

The undergrad and ACP teacher files met the requirement of being formally admitted. The non-teacher files did not. [19 TAC §227.17; 19 TAC §227.17(d)]

- All candidates in all programs began coursework after being formally admitted as required. [19 TAC §227.17(f)]
- TEA advised the program about contingency admission and that candidates are contingently admitted in the last semester prior to the degree being conferred and not based on attaining a certain GPA. The counselor candidates were “conditionally” admitted pending completion of coursework to have the required GPA for admission. [19 TAC §227.15]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps)

- 19 TAC §227.10(a)(8); 19 TAC §241.5; 19 TAC §242.5 An interview or screening device has not been used to determine applicant admission.
Action: Require an interview or screening device for all applicants. The principal as an instructional leader (PIL) and superintendent applicants require at least two screening devices.
- 19 TAC §227.10(a)(8) Not all files contained an application for admission.
Action: Require an application for admission of all applicants.
- 19 TAC §227.10(a)(9) The EPP did not meet its own additional academic requirements for admission.
Action: Require UTEP to meet its own additional academic requirements for admission as posted on the website and maintain evidence in each candidate file.
- 19 TAC §227.10(b) Additional admission requirements were not met for non-teacher files.
Action: Require UTEP to meet any additional requirements for admission as posted on the website and maintain evidence in each candidate file.
- 19 TAC §227.17 & 19 TAC §227.17(d) Non-teacher candidates were not formally admitted and did not contain an effective date of formal admission.



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

Action: Require all non-teacher files to be formally admitted and require the formal offer of admission to correspond to what is entered into ASEP as the admission date. Require the formal offer of admission to contain an effective date.

- 19 TAC §227.15 Counselor candidates were “conditionally” admitted pending coursework.

Action: If UTEP uses contingency admission, it can only be used in the semester prior to the degree being conferred. In the case of school counselor applicants, it would be the final semester prior to the bachelor’s degree conferred.

Recommendations

- Consider strengthening the screening devices used for the PIL and superintendent certificates to more accurately reflect that the applicant's knowledge, experience, skills, and aptitude are appropriate for the certificates sought.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is not in compliance with 19 TAC §227.10 - Admission Criteria.

COMPONENT III: CURRICULUM – 19 TAC §228.30

Findings

- This component was not scored for this EPP and TEA relied on the self-reported information contained within the Status Report.
- UTEP was advised that all candidates in all certification classes are required to receive training in dyslexia, mental health/youth suicide, and instruction in digital learning with a digital literacy evaluation followed by a prescribed digital learning curriculum based on the [International Society for Technology Education \(ISTE\) standards](#). [19 TAC §228.30(c)(2-3) & (8)]
- UTEP was also advised that all candidates seeking principal certification must receive training in the Texas administrator standards. [19 TAC §228.30(e)]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps)

- None.

Recommendations

- None.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is in compliance with 19 TAC §228.30-Curriculum.



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

COMPONENT IV: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND ONGOING SUPPORT – 19 TAC §228.35

Findings

- Degree plans for all files reviewed served as evidence that UTEP provides candidates with adequate preparation and training. [19 TAC §228.35(a)(1)]
- Coursework is sustained, rigorous, intensive, candidate-focused, and performance-based as determined by files reviewed and transcripts noting coursework completed. [19 TAC §228.35(a)(2)]
- Degree plans/transcripts were provided for all candidates to show progress through the program. [19 TAC §228.35(a)(3)]
- No late-hire files were found. However, it was noted that ACP candidates were able to complete 52 clock-hours of workshops. The example file contained more than the 50 clock-hours allowed for late-hires and the candidate was not a late-hire. [19 TAC §228.35(a)(4)]
- UTEP provided evidence that it has procedures for allowing relevant military experiences and provided links to the Military Student Success Center, Military Leave, and Student Resources – Military Success on the UTEP website as evidence of compliance. 19 TAC §228.35(a)(5)(A)]
- UTEP did not provide evidence that it has procedures for allowing prior experience, education, or training. [19 TAC §228.35(a)(5)(B)]
- Degree plans/transcripts were provided for all files reviewed and served as evidence that the candidate met the required coursework and training requirements. [19 TAC §228.35(b)]
- All undergraduate and ACP teacher candidates completed between 30-57.55 field-based experiences (FBEs) prior to clinical teaching/internship. Undergraduate candidates completed FBEs in the following coursework: ELD 4310, RED 3342, and SCED 4368, EDPC 3300, SCED 3311, and EDPC 3300. Undergraduate candidates completed FBE logs for the required 15 clock-hours of interactive FBEs. ACP candidates completed FBE logs for interactive and non-interactive FBEs. [19 TAC §228.35(b)(1)]
- All FBEs were completed in public schools and the teacher observed was certified. All undergraduate candidates complete FBEs in coursework and syllabi were provided as evidence for each file reviewed. Interactive FBEs were documented for all candidates. TEA could not determine all ACP FBEs. All require written reflections and were not provided. One candidate had no documentation of reflections and completed 52 hours of workshops. Another file contained three reflections and occurred after placement. A third file included 15 hours of professional development. None of the three ACP files were late hires. The remaining two files contained no evidence of reflections completed. While the undergraduate files met the requirement for completing FBEs that meet requirements, the ACP files did not. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(1)]



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

- All teacher candidates completed the required pre-service coursework and training prior to clinical teaching/internship. The pre-service coursework allowed candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the identified required topics. [19 TAC §228.35(b)(2)]
- All 20 non-teacher files completed required coursework. Degree plans, transcripts, and benchmarks served as evidence for the school counselor, principal / PIL, educational diagnostician, and superintendent files reviewed. [19 TAC §228.35(c)]
- Four undergraduate and one ACP teacher candidates completed 14 weeks of clinical teaching. Placement information with start/end dates grade level, subject area, cooperating teacher assigned, and field supervisor assigned served as evidence of compliance. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(A)]
- A standards-based observation instrument was used by the field supervisor when observing each candidate. The formal observation instrument used was found for each observation completed for the assigned candidate by the field supervisor. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(A)(iii)]
- For each of the candidates completing clinical teaching, the field supervisor and cooperating teacher provided recommendations to UTEP regarding the candidate success in clinical teaching. The letters were found in each file reviewed. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(A)(iii)]
- Three ACP teacher candidates completed an internship. Placement information with start/end dates, grade level, subject area, mentor teacher assigned, and field supervisor assigned served as evidence of compliance. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(B)]
- All teacher files reviewed contained degree plans/transcripts showing coursework completed was in the certificate area for which the candidate was seeking certification. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(B)(iii)(IV)]
- All three teacher candidates completing internships held a probationary certificate that corresponded to the area for which the candidate was seeking standard certification and UTEP provided ongoing support to each candidate for the full term of the initial internship and any additional internships. The program requires four formal observations by the field supervisor and all candidates had evidence of four observations completed during the internship year. The candidates were observed by the field supervisor using a standards-based observation instrument to document proficiency. The field supervisor and campus administrator provided recommendations to UTEP regarding each candidate's success during the internship year. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(B)(iv); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(B)(vi); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(B)(vi)(II-V); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(2)(B)(vii)]
- There was no evidence that FBEs included the start of the year, but all candidates that completed clinical teaching or internships began at the start of the academic year. The program met the requirement of experiencing a full range of professional responsibilities including the start of the year as prescribed. [19 TAC §228.35(4)]
- All clinical teaching and internship experiences were completed in public schools. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(6)]



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

- Three school counselor candidates, five principal candidates, three educational diagnostician candidates, and two superintendent candidates reached the point of the 160 clock-hour practicum. The practicum range was 134-314 clock-hours in duration. One principal candidate completed the practicum mostly in the summer months. All practicum assignments were in public schools. Not all candidates had a field supervisor assigned. Five out of 13 had a field supervisor, but it could not be determined if the field supervisor assigned met the certification/years of experience required because acceptable evidence was not provided. All candidates had a site supervisor, but it could not be determined if the site supervisor assigned met the certification/years of experience required because acceptable evidence was not provided. One out of 13 files (7%) reviewed was observed by a field supervisor three times during the practicum using a standards-based observation instrument for a total of 190 minutes. The requirement is 135 minutes of observations are required. The program exceeded the requirement for the one candidate. No evidence was provided that the site supervisor and field supervisor recommended to UTEP that the candidate was successful in the practicum. Some files contained evidence signed by the site supervisor that the practicum was complete, but not that it was successful. [19 TAC §228.35(e)(8); 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(D)]
- All seven candidates (100%) that reached the point of clinical teaching/internship were assigned a cooperating teacher/mentor. Eleven out of thirteen non-teacher candidates (85%) were assigned a site supervisor. [19 TAC §228.35(f)]
- All seven cooperating teachers/mentors (100%) held the required credentials. No information was provided that any of the 13 site supervisors had the required credentials. [19 TAC §228.2(12); 19 TAC §228.2(23) 19 TAC §228.2(31)]
- All seven cooperating teachers/mentors (100%) assigned to candidates were trained locally within three weeks of assignment to the candidate as verified by dated training certificates and training material used. The training material included coaching and was scientifically based. There was no evidence provided that the 13 site supervisors were trained within three weeks of assignment to the non-teacher candidate. [19 TAC §228.2(12); 19 TAC §228.2(23); 19 TAC §228.2(31)]
- All seven teacher candidates (100%) that reached the point of clinical teaching/internship were assigned field supervisors. Five out of thirteen (38%) non-teacher candidates were assigned a professor (field supervisor). [19 TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]
- All seven field supervisors (100%) assigned to teacher candidates had the required credentials. Teaching certificates and service records were provided as evidence. No evidence was provided that the field supervisors assigned to non-teacher candidates had the required credentials. [19 TAC §228.2(16)]
- All seven field supervisors (100%) assigned to teacher candidates had local and state-wide field supervisor training as applicable. Certificates of training were provided as



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

evidence. No evidence was provided that the field supervisors assigned to non-teacher candidates had completed local and statewide field supervisor training. [19 TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]

- All seven teacher files contained evidence of the first contact by the field supervisor within the first three weeks of the assignment. None of the non-teacher files reviewed contained evidence that the field supervisor made contact with the candidate within the first quarter of the assignment. [19 TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]
- Field supervisors are required to hold a pre- and post-observation conference with the assigned candidate for each formal observation. All seven teacher candidates contained evidence that the required conferences were held. The conferences were noted on the observation documents. None of the non-teacher files contained evidence that the required conferences were held. [19 TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]
- Field supervisors are required to provide a copy of the written feedback to the required individuals. All seven teacher candidates (100%) contained evidence that the required individuals received a copy of all observations. One out of thirteen (8%) of the non-teacher files reviewed contained evidence that the required individuals received a copy of all observations. [19 TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]
- All seven (100%) of the teacher files received informal observations/coaching from the field supervisor as appropriate. One out of 13 (8%) of the non-teacher files received informal observations/coaching from the field supervisor as appropriate. [TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]
- All seven teacher files (100%) contained evidence that the field supervisor collaborated with the required individuals. One out of 13 (8%) of the non-teacher files contained evidence that the field supervisor collaborated with the required individuals. There was evidence that the professor (field supervisor) signed off on candidate observations completed by the site supervisor, but that was not the intent of the TAC. [TAC §228.35(g) & (h)]
- All seven (100%) of the teacher candidate files met the requirements for formal observation duration, frequency, and format. All contained evidence of four observations with a duration of 45 minutes or more. Three are required for clinical teachers and candidates on a probationary certificate. The program exceeded the requirement for teacher candidates. One out of 13 (8%) of the non-teacher candidate files met the requirements for formal observation duration, frequency, and format. Three observations in a face-to-face format were conducted by the field supervisor and exceeded the 135-minute requirement.

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps):

- 19 TAC §228.35(a)(4) UTEP had no late-hires. However, the program used school district training as a part of the 300 clock-hours required for certification. The EPP did not use late-hire rule correctly.



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

Action: Require appropriate documentation, such as certificates of attendance, sign-in sheets, or other school district verification that 50 clock-hours of training are provided for late-hires. Retain that documentation in candidate files.

- 19 TAC §228.35(a)(5)(B) Procedures for allowing prior coursework not found.
Action: Require UTEP to implement procedures for allowing prior coursework. If no prior coursework is accepted, display that information where all applicants and candidates can see it.
- 19 TAC §228.35(e)(1)(A)(v) ACP FBEs did not meet requirements.
Action: Require ACP candidates to document all FBEs completed by requiring written reflections of all FBEs completed.
- 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8) 160 clock-hour practicum for non-teacher candidates did not meet requirements.
Action: Require candidates to complete a 160 clock-hour practicum. Require candidates to demonstrate proficiency in the standards in the certification area for which they are seeking certification. Retain evidence that the 160-clock hour practicum was complete in each candidate file.
- 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8) Non-teacher candidates were not observed by the field supervisor using a standards-based observation instrument. Evidence in demonstrating proficiency in standards not found.
Action: Require a standards-based observation instrument to be used by the field-supervisor when formally observing non-teacher candidates. Maintain evidence in each candidate file and in the educator certification online system (ECOS).
- 19 TAC §228.35(e)(8)(D) There was no evidence provided that the field supervisor and site supervisor provided recommendations to EPP that the candidate was successful in practicum.
Action: Require the field supervisor and site supervisor to recommend to UTEP that the candidate was successful in the practicum and maintain evidence in each candidate file.
- 19 TAC §228.2(31) – Non-teacher classes only: No evidence was provided that site supervisors held the required credentials. No evidence was provided that site-supervisors were trained within 3 weeks of assignment to the candidate.
Action: Require site supervisors to be certified in the same class for which they are supervising candidates. Require site supervisors to have three years of experience in the same class for which they are supervising each candidate as verified by the service record. Require that site supervisor training occurs within three weeks of assignment to the candidate. Retain evidence of certification, years of experience, and training in each candidate file.



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

- 19 TAC §228.35(h); 19 TAC §228.2(16) – Non-teacher classes only: No evidence was provided that candidates were assigned a field supervisor that met requirements. No evidence was provided that the field supervisor had the required years of experience. No evidence was provided that field supervisors were trained locally and beginning 9/1/2017 require state-wide field supervisor training. No evidence was provided that the field supervisor made initial contact within the first quarter of the assignment. No evidence was provided that the field supervisor observed the candidate during first, second, and third 1/3 of practicum assignment for a total of 135 minutes. No evidence was provided that the field supervisor provided written feedback to the required individuals. No evidence was provided that candidates in a practicum received informal observations and coaching as needed. No evidence was provided that the field supervisor collaborated with required individuals.

Action: Require the field supervisor assigned to each candidate to have a minimum of three years of experience as determined by the service record in the certification area for which providing supervision. Require the field supervisor to be trained locally and if assigned after 9/1/2017 also require state-wide field supervisor training. Retain certificates of completion in each candidate file as evidence. Require the field supervisor to make initial contact with the assigned candidate within the first quarter of the assignment. Retain evidence that includes the date the first contact was made, and the method used to make that contact in each candidate file. Require the field supervisor to conduct three formal observations totaling 135 minutes of the candidate in the first, second, and final third of the assignment. Provide a copy of each formal observation to the candidate, EPP, and site supervisor. Retain evidence of the written feedback provided for each formal observation in the candidate file and in ECOS.

Recommendations

- None.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is not in compliance with 19 TAC §228.35 – Program Delivery and On-Going Support.

COMPONENT V: ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES AND EPP – 19 TAC §228.40

Findings

- UTEP has established benchmarks to measure candidate progress. The degree plan/transcript and testing record for all files reviewed served as evidence of benchmarks. [19 TAC §228.40(a)]



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

- UTEP provided a sample performance-based assessment scored on a rubric with levels of proficiency as evidence that the program has structured assessments to measure candidate progress. [19 TAC §228.40(a)]
- UTEP has processes to ensure that candidates are prepared to be successful in their certification exams. Transcripts and the date of testing from the testing vendor for all files reviewed served as evidence of compliance. [19 TAC §228.40(c)]
- All but one candidate tested after being admitted to UTEP. One teacher file reviewed tested via the pre-admission content test (PACT) route. All non-teacher candidates tested after admission. The requirements for testing were posted on the website. [19 TAC §228.40(d)]
- UTEP provided evidence of external evaluation for its teacher program, candidate exit survey data from teacher candidates. The program also provided an institutional evaluation of its non-teacher programs dated 2017 that included a seven-year timeline for improvement as evidence that the program evaluates the non-teacher classes of certification. UTEP uses information from a variety of sources to evaluate the teacher and the non-teacher programs' design and delivery. [19 TAC §228.40(e)]
- UTEP has retained records that evidence candidates have met admission requirements and completed all program requirements for a period of five years after the candidate completes, withdraws, or is discharged from the program. The evidence reviewed was all files selected for the EPP review. [19 TAC §228.40(f)]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps):

None.

Recommendations

- None.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is in compliance with 19 TAC §228.40 – Assessment and Evaluation of Candidates for Certification and Program Improvement.

COMPONENT VI: PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT - 19 TAC §228.50

Findings

19 TAC §228.50 requires that during the period of preparation, the educator preparation program shall ensure that the individuals preparing candidates and the candidates themselves understand and adhere to Chapter 247 of this title (relating to Educators' Code of Ethics).

- Each of the ten teacher candidate files contained evidence that each candidate acknowledges receipt of a copy of the Texas Educator's Code of Ethics. In addition, a signed copy of the Texas Educator's Code of Ethics was found in each of the



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

candidate's records. None of the non-teacher class candidate files contained evidence that they acknowledged receipt of the Texas Educator Code of Ethics. The school counselor files contained evidence of receipt of the Counselor Code of Ethics.

- Each of the undergraduate and ACP files contained evidence that the faculty/staff associated with the candidates signed a statement of understanding/abiding by the Code of Ethics. UTEP also submitted evidence that 12 UTEP non-teacher staff signed a Texas Educator's Code of Ethics.

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps):

- 19 TAC §228.50 The candidates in the non-teacher class did not contain evidence that they understand and adhere to Chapter 247 relating to the Educator's Code of Ethics. Action: Require UTEP non-teacher candidates to acknowledge receipt, understanding, and adhering to the Texas Educator Code of Ethics.

Recommendations

- None.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is not in compliance with 19 TAC §228.50 - Professional Conduct.

COMPONENT VII: COMPLAINTS PROCESS – 19 TAC §228.70

Findings

- Per 19 TAC §228.70(b)(1), the EPP complaints process is on file at TEA. The complaint policy is posted on the UTEP website, and at the physical site. The program meets the requirements as prescribed. [19 TAC §228.70(b)(1-4)]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps):

- None.

Recommendations

- None.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is in compliance with 19 TAC §228.70 – Complaints Process.



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

COMPONENT VIII: CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES - 19 TAC §228 and §230

Findings

- Candidates have met the appropriate degree requirements for certification. Seven out of ten undergraduate and ACP files reviewed reached the point of standard certification and all (100%) held the appropriate degree. [19 TAC §230.13(a)]
- All seven out of ten candidates that reached the point of certification (100%) completed the required coursework prior to recommendation.
- Seven out of 20 non-teacher candidates reached the point of standard certification and all (100%) held a master's degree prior to certification. [19 TAC §241.60; 19 TAC §241.20, 19 TAC §242.20; 19 TAC §239.20; 19 TAC §239.84]
- All non-teacher candidates held a valid teacher certificate prior to standard certification. [19 TAC §241.20; 19 TAC §241.60; 19 TAC §239.84]
- All superintendent candidates held a valid principal certificate, but none have reached the point of standard certification. [19 TAC §242.20]
- Service records with required creditable years of service were provided for all non-teacher files that reached the point of standard certification. [19 TAC §241.20; 19 TAC §241.60; 19 TAC §239.20; 19 TAC §239.84]
- Degree issuance and transcripts served as evidence that non-teacher candidates successfully completed the EPP. [19 TAC §241.20; 19 TAC §241.60; 19 TAC §242.20; 19 TAC §239.20; 19 TAC §239.84]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps):

- None.

Recommendations

- None.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is in compliance with 19 TAC §228 and §230 – Certification Procedures.

COMPONENT IX: INTEGRITY OF DATA REPORTED - 19 TAC §229

Findings

- UTEP met the timeline for required data reporting. The EPP had to correct data during second submissions, but the data was reported during the timeline provided. [19 TAC §229.3(f)(1) and related graphic]
- UTEP has accurately reported all data. Observations for one fall 19-20 clinical teacher have not been uploaded in ASEP and the program was advised to do so prior to the end of the 19-20 academic year. The EPP has not reported any observations for the non-



2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report University of Texas-El Paso

teacher classes and was advised to do so for the 19-20 academic year. UTEP has reported the required data accurately. [19 TAC §229.3(f)(1) and related graphic]

Compliance Issues to be Addressed (Next Steps):

- None.

Recommendations

- UTEP was advised that all non-teacher class observations must be uploaded for the 19-20 academic year.

Based on the evidence presented, UTEP is in compliance with 19 TAC §229 – Integrity of Data Reported.

GENERAL PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

- The addition of the Science of Teaching Reading exam (STR) will drive the renewal of the Core Subjects EC-6, Core Subjects 4-8, ELAR 4-8, and ELAR/Social Studies 4-8 certificates. Programs that are not able to demonstrate an updated curriculum will not be able to renew these certificates after January 1, 2021. Teacher program staff are advised to plan to meet the January 1, 2021 certificate issuance requirement.
- Application A has changed – plan to review requirements to prepare for adding new certificate areas.
- Certificate deactivation timelines and requirements changes are proposed. Changes will include new timelines for requesting deactivations and information that must be provided to stakeholders in advance of internship start dates. The field supervisor will need to verify candidate placement information at the beginning of the assignment.
- To ensure continuity in record keeping and other related processes, consider creating a procedure manual documenting EPP processes.
- Implement quality control procedures to ensure ASEP reports, including GPA spreadsheets, are submitted accurately during state reporting each year.
- Align the verbiage of the program to the verbiage of Texas Administrative Code (TAC) (ex. Field supervisor, cooperating teacher, mentor, candidate, site supervisor, etc.).
- Continue to follow the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) meetings and/or review the minutes to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about the current Texas Administrative Code.
- Continue to send staff to relevant training offered by TEA and other entities for the purpose of continuous improvements to the EPP and to stay in step with changes and updates in educator preparation requirements in TAC and TEC.



**2019 – 2020 Continuing Approval Review Report
University of Texas-El Paso**

- Continue to participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Preparation to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current requirements and changes in the Texas Administrative Code.
- Continue to maintain communication with the program specialist assigned to the program.
- Ensure that the TEA staff has the most current contact information by sending updates to the assigned program specialist.

SUMMARY

Next Steps were created collaboratively with the UTEP staff.

“I have reviewed the EPP Report and agree that all required corrections will be made on or before May 21, 2020.”

Signature of Legal Authority **Date**

Printed Name of Legal Authority **Date**