NCATE

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:
Dr. Anna T. Kozlowski
Dr. Peter M. Mecca
Dr. Patricia P. Johnson
Dr. Rhona S. Hurwitz
Dr. Catherine Cullen

State Consultant:
Dr. Blanca E. Rivera-Alicea

NEA or AFT Representative:
N/A

Continuous Improvement Visit to:

UNIVERSIDAD DE PUERTO RICO-RIO PIEDRAS CAMPUS

School of Education
P.O. Box 23304
San Juan, PR 00931-3304
April 28-30, 2013

Type of Visit:
Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway (Updated May 2013)

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

University of Puerto Rico-Rio Piedras

Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Standard Met
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Standard Met
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Standard Met
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Standard Met
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Standard Met
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Standard Met

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	At Target (attained)
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras campus is a large public and urban land-grant university. It is the oldest and largest campus within the University System of Puerto Rico. UPRRP began as a normal school in 1900 and moved to the Rio Piedras location in 1903 to become the first department at the university. UPRRP, which is accredited by Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, is proud of its Carnegie classification as a research institution with high research activity. The UPRRP mission focuses on "growth and dissemination of knowledge; initial and advanced education; integral education, critical thinking; effective communication; ethical and aesthetic values; social action; cultural awareness; community service; continuing education, and quality of life" (IR, p. 1). The institution and unit are proud of their Puerto Rican identity and are committed to the advancement of education on the island. Interviews during the site visit revealed an institutional community and culture closely aligned to the mission.

The Eugenio Maria de Hostos College of Education (EMH-CE) is the professional education unit at the

University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras (UPRRP) campus. It was the first educator preparation program on the island to earn NCATE accreditation in 1954. In 2010, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board continued accreditation at the initial level until fall 2017 and for two years at the advanced level. A full visit was requested for programs at the advanced level. The Department of Graduate Studies (DGS) offers three doctoral and nine master's degrees through its 10 academic areas. Consistent with the 2010 BOE Report, only six master's programs are within the scope of this visit:
• Childhood Education
• Curriculum and Teaching
• Special Education
• Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)
• Guidance and Counseling
• Leadership in Educational Organizations
Only the programs in Guidance and Counseling and Leadership in Educational Organizations may lead to licensure. The unit reports the majority of individuals in the counseling and leadership programs seek licensure. For the purposes of this BOE report, consistent with the 2010 BOE report and confirmed by NCATE staff in spring 2013, all programs are considered programs for other school professionals. Current data provided by the unit during the site visit indicated 44.5 percent of DGS candidates were currently employed as classroom teachers. Sixty-two percent of December 2012 graduates were currently employed as teachers. Individuals often enroll in the program to prepare for doctoral studies or pursue individual educational goals other than seeking an educator license.

Since the 2010 visit, the unit has developed and refined its assessment system and implemented consistent field experience policies for graduate programs.

Education in Puerto Rico exists in a unique context. Ninety-two percent of public schools are labelled as low performing. The dropout rate is 42 percent. Almost half school-aged children attend private schools. Recently, more than 3,000 teachers were laid off because of the fiscal crisis.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

The NCATE-only team consisted of five members. No consultants or observers participated in the review. The name of a state consultant was listed in AIMS, but the person did not respond to communications regarding the offsite meeting, the pre-visit, the onsite visit, or email requests for information about Puerto Rico's requirements for program approval. The protocol (p. 9) states that the state assistant chair and personnel from the Puerto Rico Council on Higher Education attend the pre-visit. The team was not able to ascertain the requirements or standards used by the Puerto Rico Department of Education to approve programs in Guidance and Counseling and Leadership in Educational Organizations. According to the unit, the Puerto Rico Department of Education doesn't play a role in the approval of university academic programs.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

No programs are offered at a branch campus, an off-campus site or via distance learning.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

The Eugenio Maria de Hostos College of Education hosted the opening of its annual Education Week celebration on Monday of the visit. Candidates did not attend the open meeting because they were

enjoying the choral presentation in the lobby.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The unit's conceptual framework is a brief, two-page document developed by DGS faculty that identifies five key elements. It is understood in relation to the mission statement of the Eugenio Maria de Hostos College of Education and the philosophical principles of the Department of Graduate Studies, which include:
• Shared process of creation
• Application of knowledge
• Educators assume responsibility for their own learning
• Educators foster active and continuous learning of others
• Dispositions for collaborative work leading to personal and collective transformations

The key elements are aligned with three institutional learning domains and the DGS graduate profile addressing integration of content knowledge, effective communication, and research and creative activity.

The conceptual framework identifies six dispositions and states candidates are assessed in field experiences and clinical practices on demonstrating:
• Fairness
• The belief that all students can learn
• Capacity to work collaboratively
• Reflecting the capacity to reflect about students' learning to improve their professional practice
• Capacity to envision transformations that contribute to the well-being of the populations served and the development of their professional field
• Appreciation for human dignity, solidarity, and democratic pluralism.

The conceptual framework lists theorists whose work undergirds the conceptual framework. It also identifies four main domains as context conception, conception of the student, educational and inquisitive processes and disciplinary content. Courses aligned with the conceptual framework are philosophical foundations, sociological foundations and psychological foundations. Although the team was initially concerned about the brevity of the conceptual framework, exhibits and onsite interviews with faculty and candidates revealed the great extent to which the conceptual framework serves as a guiding and constitutional document for DGS community.

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The Eugenio Maria de Hostos College of Education (EMH-CE), the unit for preparation of teachers and other school professionals at the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras (UPRRP) campus, shares academic interaction with the Laboratory Schools, with other colleges within the University of Puerto Rico System, and with the community, candidates, and graduates. From this responsibility of academic interaction the EMH-CE establishes its purposes, delineates its principles, and defines the diverse dimensions of its mission. All advanced level programs reside within the Department of Graduate Studies (DGS) and enjoy academic autonomy, have their own conceptual framework and the flexibility to revise and create programs and courses. The advanced programs include: Curriculum and Teaching; Guidance and Counseling; Leadership in Educational Organizations; Childhood Education; Special Education and TESL. Candidates who apply for the advanced programs are required to hold a bachelor's degree, although not necessarily in teacher education. Initial teacher licensure is not required at the time of admission. Completion of each program does not result in recommendation by the unit for a teaching certificate. Only two of the six master's programs, Guidance and Counseling, and Leadership in Educational Organizations require clinical practice.
The unit supplied an addendum to the Institutional Report along with new exhibits which detailed descriptions of evaluation criteria and results that were clearly presented for the onsite team members and which are included in the electronic exhibit room as evidence that the AFIs cited in the offsite report were met. This evidence was validated during the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and in interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates. Therefore, the AFIs from the offsite report were removed as a result of the onsite visit.

Each program offered by the EMH-CE requires candidates to complete a degree examination which allows candidates to demonstrate their content and pedagogical knowledge. The examination can include open ended questions, analytical critical essay with oral presentation, forum panel on a selected topic, or participation in congress to present original research. Review of the data on the degree examinations indicates that advanced candidates are successful. Additionally, data indicate that candidates master the learning domains, proficiencies, content knowledge, dispositions and skills delineated in professional and institutional standards at the advanced level.

The unit supplied an addendum to the Institutional Report along with new exhibits which detailed descriptions of evaluation criteria and results that were clearly presented for the onsite team members and which are included in the electronic exhibit room as evidence that the AFIs cited in the offsite report were met. This evidence was validated during the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and in interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates. As requested in the offsite report, the IR addendum, new exhibits, the poster session, and interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates, the unit provided evidence of candidate knowledge and skills at the advanced level; candidate mastery in creating positive environments for student learning at the advanced level, and candidate professional dispositions aligned with standards. Also, rubrics, assessment criteria and results, student learning samples in English, program, institutional and professional standards, and student learning data were validated during the

onsite visit.

Aggregated and disaggregated data from key assessments for required coursework, field experiences, degree examinations, and clinical practices were provided in the Institutional Report and confirmed candidates attain the knowledge, skills, and disposition articulated by the institution, unit, and each program. Additional evidence in the IR addendum demonstrated the alignment of each advanced program with professional standards, the DGS conceptual framework, as well as UPRRP proficiencies and learning domains. Evidence to explain how program candidates meet proficiencies on specific standards was validated.

Additionally, information provided in the IR addendum, and interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates indicated that stakeholder groups have been identified, names have been submitted, letters of appointment will be sent out May 15, 2013, and the new Advisory Committee for P-12 Affairs will have its first meeting in August 2013. Although this action plan is scheduled, substantive activities with the P-12 Advisory Committee have not taken place at the time of the onsite visit.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Graduate faculty in each program regularly engage in continuous improvement through ongoing analysis of candidate work and assessment data. Evidence gained onsite through interviews with faculty and candidates, as well as an inspection of portfolios documenting the development of action research projects, provided affirmation the unit is successful in developing candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions articulated in the conceptual framework and in institutional and unit goals and objectives.

Information provided in the IR addendum, and interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates indicated that stakeholder groups have been identified, names have been submitted, letters of appointment will be sent out May 15, 2013, and the new Advisory Committee for P-12 Affairs will have its first meeting in August 2013. Although this action plan is scheduled, substantive activities with the P-12 Advisory Committee have not taken place at the time of the onsite visit.

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

The advanced programs in Guidance and Counseling and Leadership in Educational Organizations have aligned their curricula with national standards for their areas.

Candidates work closely with faculty to develop and implement high quality action research projects.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit has inadequate data to determine candidate mastery of knowledge and skills at the advanced level.	The unit supplied an addendum to the Institutional Report along with new exhibits which detailed descriptions of evaluation criteria and results that align with professional standards and confirm candidate mastery of knowledge and skills at the advanced level. The evidence was clearly presented for the onsite team members and are included in the electronic exhibit room and in the IR addendum and validated during the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and in interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates. Therefore, the AFI from the offsite report was removed as a result of the onsite visit.
The unit has inadequate data to determine candidate mastery in creating positive environments for student learning at the advanced level.	Data across programs regarding candidates ability to create positive environments for student learning were confirmed in the addendum to the Institutional Report along with new exhibits which detailed descriptions of evaluation criteria and results that were clearly presented for the onsite team members and which are included in the electronic exhibit room. This evidence was validated during the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and in interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates.
	The unit supplied an addendum to the Institutional Report along with new exhibits which detailed descriptions of evaluation criteria and results that align with professional standards and confirm candidate

	mastery of dispositions at the advanced level. The evidence was clearly presented for the onsite team members and are included in the electronic exhibit room and in the IR addendum and validated during the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and in interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates, exit surveys, and alumni surveys.
The unit has inadequate data to determine candidate mastery of professional dispositions at the advanced level.	

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

1.4 Recommendations

For Standard 1

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 2

Standard 2: Assessment System And Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit assessment system is described in the web-based linked IR along with supporting exhibits. The campus-wide learning domains and the Department of Graduate Studies (DGS) Graduate Profile described in the conceptual framework are reflected in the assessment system for all programs in the scope of this review. Interviews with faculty and new exhibits (NE.B.1 – NE.B.6) confirm that courses and major assessments are aligned with professional standards, the conceptual framework, learning domains, and graduate profile. The team did not find evidence of*role of the professional community in relation to the systemic evaluation of the unit assessment system.

The DGS Academic Programs Assessment Committee (CEPDEG) coordinates the collection, analyses,

and dissemination of data among faculty, candidates, and other stakeholders. New exhibits (NE.D.9) describe the identity and define the roles of assessment committee membership at the unit level and department level. Interviews with faculty indicate that the identity and roles of the P-12 community pertaining to assessment are currently under review with anticipated implementation scheduled for August 2013.

The unit collects data from a variety of sources at all transition points and uses data to make changes to monitor candidate performance, and to manage and improve the unit's operations and programs. New exhibits (NE.A.4, NE.D.3, NE.D.4) present evidence of data driven program changes and data driven unit changes. Exit and alumni surveys are conducted each semester and demonstrate overall satisfaction with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions developed in advanced programs. Limited employer survey data was available. The employer survey was first administered in fall 2012, with follow up contacts in spring 2013. The response rate was very low (approximatley 5%).

A monitoring system is used to track performance and to provide support when needed. Interviews with faculty confirm that data from major assessments, including field experiences in all six advanced programs and clinical practice in two programs (Guidance and Counseling, Leadership in Educational Organizations), are collected in multiple areas, including content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills, dispositions, and impact on P–12 student learning. New exhibits (NE.B) provide information on how the assessments are aligned with professional standards.

The unit develops major assessments and transition points to ensure that candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to be successful. The DGS Candidates' Learning Assessment Model for advanced programs follows the conceptual framework and establishes three transition points: 1) Admissions; 2) Approval of required coursework and field experiences, degree examinations, and clinical practices; and 3) Graduation. The learning assessment model focuses on three of the campus-wide learning domains stipulated by the Deanship of Graduate Studies and Research (DGSR): 1) integrated knowledge; 2) research and creative activity; and 3) effective communication. The new exhibit (NE.D.2) describes steps and actions taken by the unit when a candidate does not meet expectations and cannot move to the next transition point assessment. Within transition points 2 & 3, candidates must obtain a minimum grade (B) on coursework, a minimum grade (70%) on the degree exam, and a Pass on a thesis/project. Candidates who do not meet minimum grade requirements do not move to the next transition point assessment. In order to stay in the program and move to the next transition point assessment, candidate must repeat a course or exam. If candidates fail to make satisfactory progress on a second attempt, they are asked to leave the program.

The unit eliminates sources of bias in assessment procedures and improves consistency, accuracy, and fairness. Interviews with faculty confirm that data are collected, analyzed, disseminated and discussed among various stakeholders at retreats, faculty meetings, and graduate studies committee meetings. The new exhibit (NE.D.1) describes the steps taken to improve the accuracy and consistency of major assessment instruments.

The unit maintains an assessment system that provides information on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, competence of graduates, unit operations, and program quality. Interviews with faculty state that the unit manages its assessment system through the use of SPSS and MS Excel. The onsite team reviewed formal candidate complaints and documentation of their resolution.

Interviews with faculty confirm that members of the Executive Team, Directive Team, and the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) use assessment data on candidate performance and unit operations on a regular basis as part of the unit's planning, evaluation, and decision-making process to improve academic

offerings. At meetings, information on admissions, graduate degree examinations, thesis, projects, and dissertations is discussed. Analysis provides information to modify courses, programs, and services; and to make changes in policies, norms and procedures.

Interviews with faculty confirm that they have access to assessment data through their academic area coordinator and that candidate data are regularly shared with candidates and faculty to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs.

As requested in the offsite report, the unit's IR addendum and new exhibits (NE.D.3, NE.D.4) provide information about data driven program changes and data driven unit changes. Four examples of changes at the program and unit levels are included below, and a more comprehensive list is provided in NE.D.3 and NE.D.4.

• Six new courses (EDUC 6009, 6916, 8268, 6268, 6269, 8088) were developed to help candidates learn qualitative and mixed methodologies needed for thesis or projects, and to strengthen writing skills.
• To meet the requirement of a systematic field experience in all programs, all candidates are to have at least one supervised field experience with diverse learners in a P-12 setting.
• Two clinical practice handbooks & rubrics (Counseling Clinical Practice Guide; Leadership in Educational Organizations Manual Field Experiences & Clinical Practice Guide) were updated.
• Nine new computers were purchased to respond to candidate dissatisfaction with the integration of technology in teaching.

The unit's IR addendum and new exhibit NE.D.2 provide evidence of the unit's remediation system for candidates. Candidates may retake courses or exams in order to move to the next transition point assessment and stay in the program.

Interviews with faculty confirm that data are shared with stakeholders through email, regular faculty meetings, and occasional meetings with P-12 school partners.

The new exhibit NE.D.9 clarifies evidence documenting membership, affiliation and work completed by identified groups for the continuous assessment process.

As stated in the IR addendum, a file of candidates' complaints and the unit's responses and resolutions would be available to the team during the onsite visit. The file contains 14 candidate complaints received by the unit during the time period from August 2010 to May 2012. The file includes information on formal candidate complaints and resolutions.

The offsite report requested evidence about the role of P – 12 school partners in the evaluation and use of collected data. It also requested evidence about all key assessments in the unit. The new exhibit NE.A.4 contains information about many of the key assessments. Interviews with faculty confirm that there was very little information about the role of P-12 school partners related to the unit's assessment system.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

As requested in the offsite report, the unit's IR addendum and new exhibits (NE.D.3, NE.D.4) provide information about data driven program changes and data driven unit changes. Four examples of changes at the program and unit levels are included below, and a more comprehensive list is provided in NE.D.3 and NE.D.4.

• Six new courses (EDUC 6009, 6916, 8268, 6268, 6269, 8088) were developed to help candidates learn qualitative and mixed methodologies needed for thesis or projects and to strengthen writing skills.
• To meet the requirement of a systematic field experience in all programs, all candidates are to have at least one supervised field experience with diverse learners in a P-12 setting.
• Two clinical practice handbooks & rubrics (Counseling Clinical Practice Guide; Leadership in Educational Organizations Manual Field Experiences & Clinical Practice Guide) were updated.
• Nine new computers were purchased to respond to candidate dissatisfaction with the integration of technology in teaching.

The offsite report raised an area of concern about the role of P – 12 school partners in assessment. Onsite interviews with members of the assessment committee, program coordinators, and members of the curriculum committee confirm that they are in the process of initiating work with school partners through the establishment of an Advisory Committee for P-12 Affairs. This is still an area of concern.

The offsite report raised an area of concern that the unit does not appear to have a remediation system when a candidate does not meet requirements at a transition point. The new exhibit NE.D.2 provides a description about the actions taken by the unit when candidates do not meet expectations.

The offsite report raised an area of concern about the role of groups (e.g., Executive Team, Directive Team, GSC, CEPDEG) in the continuous assessment process. The new exhibit NE.D.9 describes the identity of the groups and their roles.

The offsite report raised an area of concern that evidence of data for all key assessments (e.g., progress survey, exit survey, alumni survey, employers survey, content knowledge) was not complete and clear. The new exhibit NE.A.4 provides information on progress surveys, exit surveys, alumni surveys, and content knowledge. The team found limited information on surveys from employers because of a single administration with a very low response rate. This is now cited as an area for improvement.

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET	AT TARGET

	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. *OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. *AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
AFI 1. The unit's assessment rubrics are designed with limited capacity to monitor candidate performance.	AFI Rationale: The new exhibit NE.A.4 provides evidence that multiple assessments are used to monitor candidate performance.
AFI 2. The unit has not consistently maintained an assessment system that provides regular and comprehensive information on candidate proficiencies, unit operations, and program results.	AFI Rationale: The new exhibit NE.A.4 provides information on candidate proficiencies, unit operations, and program results.
AFI 3. The unit does not systematically use data for program and unit improvement at the advanced level.	AFI Rationale: New exhibits (NE.D.3, NE.D.4) describe data driven program changes and data driven unit changes.
AFI 4. The unit has not provided evidence to demonstrate that the advanced programs rigorously collect, analyze, and report data to gauge candidate performance.	AFI Rationale: The new exhibit NE.A.4 provides evidence that multiple assessments are used to monitor candidate performance.

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
AFI 1. The unit does not regularly and systematically involve the professional community in the development and evaluation of its assessment system.	AFI Rationale: The unit does not have an existing mechanism to assure the regular and systematic involvement of school partners in the unit's assessment system.
AFI 2. The unit does not regularly and systematically collect employer follow up surveys.	AFI Rationale: The employer survey was initiated in fall 2012 and efforts were made to increase the response rate in spring 2013. The response rate was very low.

2.4 Recommendations

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 3

Standard 3: Field Experiences And Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

All six programs for other school personnel require a minimum of 15 hours in the field (Exhibit N.E.C.2). In addition, the two programs leading to licensure, Guidance and Counseling and Leadership in Educational Organizations, require 225 and 150 hours of clinical experience, respectively. Interviews revealed that faculty coordinate field experiences in their programs and assure that candidates are placed in diverse settings. Individual faculty members in the unit assess candidates with a common rubric that was developed for all field experiences (Exhibit 2.3.a). This rubric is aligned with the unit's conceptual framework.

Evidence from roundtable discussions (Exhibit NE.C.4 and NE.C.5) as well as interviews with P-12 faculty in Counseling and Guidance and Leadership in Educational Programs confirms that these two programs for Other School Personnel have implemented a process by which K-12 partners contribute to the design, implementation and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. These experiences are aligned with professional standards as well as unit goals and the conceptual framework. Each of these programs has one field experience which provides an introduction to the profession; the Counseling and Guidance program then has a clinical experience in which candidates spend 225 hours in a counselor setting; the Leadership in Educational Settings candidate spends 150 hours in the clinical setting. The other four Advanced Programs (Childhood, TESL, Curriculum and Teaching, and Special Education) have implemented at least one formal field experience in each program. (Exhibit 3.3.e). Interviews with candidates indicate that there are also many informal field experiences in their other coursework, and that thesis work completed by candidates also requires extensive time in the field.

A review of course syllabi (Exhibit 2.3.a as well as syllabi provided by faculty) and interviews with both candidates and P-12 practitioners indicate that candidates become action researchers by applying their coursework in the classroom setting, synthesizing theories of teaching and learning with current research, and reflecting upon what has happened in the field/clinical setting. Candidates complete field experiences with populations of diverse learners. Interviews with candidates and practitioners support the assessment results that indicate that candidates demonstrate professional dispositions and believe that all students can learn.

The off-site report indicated an area of concern regarding whether the unit had clearly articulated the purpose, structure and outcomes of the field experience; the unit provided additional exhibits such as Exhibit NE.C.2, which shows the alignment of the field experience objectives with program goals, and field objectives are listed in course syllabi. Exhibit NE.C.2 provided field experience summaries by program.

As requested in the offsite report, the unit provided opportunities to meet with school personnel as well as translated exhibits (Exhibits NE.E.1, NE.E.3) to consider in determining whether P-12 personnel had input into the design and evaluation of the field experience. The provided documentation indicated that the unit has formed an Advisory Committee for P-12 Affairs, but has not yet convened formal meetings in order to solicit their input regarding the design and delivery of candidate field experiences.

The response to the concern regarding how diversity in field settings is assured was addressed in the IR addendum, page 18. Additional interviews with candidates and faculty indicated that faculty who coordinate the field experiences attached to their courses are the ones who determine that the field placement is in a diverse setting.

Documentation regarding candidate analysis of P-12 learning /evidence of candidate impact on student learning did not provide sufficient information to conclude that candidates have an impact on student learning or that they regularly and systematically collect data on student learning.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has organized round table colloquia for the purpose of seeking the input of P-12 partners in the design and evaluation of the Guidance and Counseling and Leadership in Educational Organizations programs. They have also conducted a survey which is designed to "match" student, faculty and practitioner research interests.

The greatest progress is in the design and implementation of field experiences. The unit has formalized field experiences for candidates in the four advanced programs and added field experiences to the two programs for other school personnel. All programs use a shared field experience rubric which was developed specifically for that purpose. Individual programs have developed handbooks to support the field experience component. Interviews with faculty indicate that the field experiences have become a part of the course syllabus, and course syllabi list objectives or activities that are specific to the work in the field.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

not applicable

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard. ***OR*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard. ***AND*** There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Not all other school professional programs required candidates to participate in field experiences and clinical practice.	All programs now have structured field experiences that relate to the roles for which they are preparing and provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to help all students learn.
Candidates in programs for other school professionals do not participate in field experiences and clinical practice that require them to engage in structured activities related to the roles for which they are preparing and do not provide opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn.	All programs now have structured field experiences that relate to the roles for which they are preparing and provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to help all students learn.

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
With the exception of educational administration and supervision, clinical practice in the other school professional programs are designed without input from school partners and other stakeholders.	The AFI is continued for advanced programs in Special Education, Teaching English as a Second Language, Curriculum and Teaching, and Childhood Education. Discussion with both unit faculty and P-12 practitioners indicate that the unit has not yet held formal meetings with P-12 practitioners to solicit their input regarding the design and delivery of candidates' field experiences in these advanced programs. The Guidance and Counseling and Leadership in Educational

	Organizations (formerly Educational Administration and Supervision) programs provided evidence of functioning mechanisms to receive input from P-12 partners.

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
There is little evidence that candidates and clinical faculty (including P-12 personnel) in advanced programs in Special Education, Teaching English as a Second Language, Curriculum and Teaching, and Childhood Education regularly and systematically collect and analyze data on student learning.	There is evidence that some data on P-12 learning has been collected and reflected upon, but there is insufficient evidence that this is a regular and systematic process consistently required for field experience projects.

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 4

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The UPRRP and the DGS maintain that their commitment to diversity is to "form education professionals who value human dignity, solidarity, and democratic pluralism and contribute to the transformation of education in Puerto Rico in its Caribbean and international context." The preparation of candidates to work with diverse student populations is a central tenet of the mission and conceptual framework of the unit and are included in exhibit 4.3.b detailing the proficiencies and curriculum components for diversity aligned for each advanced program.

The offsite report had an area of concern that the unit does not systematically oversee placements so that all candidates interact with diverse P-12 students in order to demonstrate their ability to use instructional practices that demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. This area of concern is removed. Evidence included in the addendum to the Institutional Report along with new exhibits which detailed descriptions of how candidates interact with P-12

students demonstrate their ability to use instructional practices that help all students learn. In addition, evidence from the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and in interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates support candidates knowledge, skills and professional dispositions related to diversity.

New exhibits and evidence from the IR addendum, the poster session with candidates, graduates, program faculty and P-12 collaborators, and interviews with faculty, P-12 school partners, current candidates and graduates confirmed candidates' ability to incorporate multiple perspectives in their instruction and to develop classroom climates that value diversity. Work samples were translated into English and provided for onsite BOE team members during the visit and provided further evidence of candidate proficiencies related to diversity.

The unit has done an excellent job of attracting faculty representing a wide range of preparation sites including members with terminal degrees from many prestigious mainland U.S. universities as well as the University of Puerto Rico. Because faculty hold degrees from such a wide range of institutions, they bring with them different intellectual and social perspectives. As a result, candidates are exposed to a wide range of views – all consistent with the conceptual framework. In addition, faculty come from many countries of origin in North, Central and South America. Some faculty have lived on the mainland for extended periods of time further strengthening their cultural diversity. Although many faculty did not identify themselves when asked to respond about race, those who did indicate a racial composition of 29 percent white and 25 percent black. The IR indicates the breakdown of faculty socioeconomic status, reported by mothers' educational level, suggests a strong mix of first generation college graduates, middle class, and professionals.

The unit chooses to define diversity within the "Puerto Rican context." Broadly stated, this definition views all Puerto Ricans as diverse based upon the history and emergence of contemporary Puerto Rican society. In interviews, unit leadership spoke to the collective resistance of Puerto Ricans to define themselves utilizing racial categories. Puerto Ricans, as one administrator stated, "are comprised of all kinds of racial identities."

Interviews with candidates indicate that the unit intentionally places candidates in settings where both student populations and P-12 faculty are diverse. Again, acknowledgement of the aforementioned definition of diversity must be considered when addressing this standard and unit efforts to afford candidates the opportunity to interact with diverse school faculty in field and clinical experiences. Interviews with candidates in all programs evidence knowledge of instructional strategies for diverse student populations including English language learners and students with exceptionalities. Candidates spoke to these skills as being attained through coursework and through direct experiences with students in area schools. The unit makes a good faith effort to maintain a diverse faculty.

Puerto Rican ethnicity is diverse within itself. The population reflects the history of the island, from the native Taino Indians to the most recent influx of Latin Americans and Dominicans. As such, candidates reflect that diversity, as does the population of the P-12 schools where candidates complete their field and clinical placements. This ethnic diversity was explained in a presentation by the UPRRP leadership which was followed by a question and answer session with the visiting team.

The concern about the placement of candidates so that all candidates have the opportunity to interact with a diverse student population was removed after interviews with the faculty who coordinate their course field experiences revealed that they assured diversity within candidate placements. Candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

As requested in the offsite report, the unit provided a chart with information on the diversity of the schools used for field experiences (Exhibit NE.C.1). This, along with the requested opportunity to discuss the placement process with coordinators of field experiences and the translation of the field experience policy (Exhibit NE.E.1), confirmed that candidates were being placed in diverse settings. Exhibit 4.3.e, Admitted applicants profile, addressed the request for socio-economic data. The IR addendum provided further information on the DGS Committee on Diversity, and provided exhibits related to roundtables and a colloquium held for unit and P-12 faculty (Exhibits NE.F.2 and NE.C.5) showing the unit's commitment to furthering an understanding of diversity. A new exhibit (NE.A.3) showed proficiencies and curricular components related to diversity by program and verified that courses within programs were providing a framework for understanding diversity.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The DGS Committee on Diversity has organized roundtables and colloquia for both faculty and students. Additional presentations are planned which support the unit's commitment to equality and diversity.

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Team members found the DGS and EMH-CE community with a deep and unique commitment to diversity consistent with their conceptual framework, institutional mission, and social context. Curriculum and field experiences are aligned with proficiencies related to diversity. Faculty and candidates frequently spoke to the importance of diversity as a central value of their programs. This was validated through an inspection of syllabi and interviews with candidates.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.

for this standard. *AND* There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	*OR* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	*AND* There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	*AND* There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 5

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance And Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty

performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence provided by the unit addresses each element of Standard 5, and included the IR, website links, electronic exhibits such as handbooks and policy documents, samples of evaluation forms, tabulation of candidate evaluations for the faculty as a whole, and documents listing descriptive data about faculty scholarly work for the most recent three years. Nearly all faculty are members of appropriate professional organizations related to their fields of expertise. In addition to organizations for academic disciplines, many faculty are members of AERA as would be expected in a research university.

Faculty evaluations were not included in the materials prepared for the offsite visit. While onsite, however, interviews with members of the Personnel Committee allowed for a better understanding of the protocol/processes for evaluation of faculty. Additionally, while onsite, the unit provided completed faculty evaluations, faculty tenure dossiers, and data analyses of faculty evaluations.

It was noted in the offsite report that data were abundant, illustrating faculty service, research, publications, and professional learning opportunities. Data are much less descriptive about the depth and breadth of faculty engagement with P-12 schools. A list of activities did not give details regarding the number of faculty engaged, their specific roles in the work, the engagement of P-12 in helping plan the work, or how many P-12 faculty, leaders, and students are impacted by the work. The IR Addendum included a table that outlined all faculty collaborations with P-12 partners. This document evidenced a systemic engagement of unit faculty with P-12 partners. Interviews with faculty further documented the degree to which unit faculty work collaboratively with P-12 partners. Interviews with P-12 partners indicate that the relationship between unit faculty and P-12 faculties is one of mutual engagement resulting in a myriad of learning opportunities for students. Candidates spoke positively of these relationships and the ways in which active involvement of unit faculty with school partners afforded them opportunities to initiate student-centered projects. One candidate remarked on the importance of seeing their faculty in the schools. She further indicated that the combination of educational theory and the practical application of said theory in diverse educational settings best elucidated the educative process for her. A strength cited by several students was the sense that their professors were current on school practices and reforms and that the relationship faculty enjoy with P-12 partners is mutually beneficial and, further, beneficial to candidates. In total, 29 collaborative projects with P-12 partners were highlighted in evidence provided during the onsite visit. Several school faculty mentioned the role they played in unit instruction and the close relationship they experience with unit faculty through collaborative projects. The Center for the Study of Reading, Writing and Children's Literature's annual "Reading Marathon" which benefits over 100,000 students in area schools is but one example of such a collaborative endeavor. Other collaborations include multiple faculty members across multiple disciplines. It is evident that unit faculty work diligently to engage P-12 partners in their work and that these partnerships/collaborations are systemic to the unit and not linked solely to one unit faculty member. Evidence was presented that many workshops and other activities are held through which the faculty provides service to P-12 and the community. Interviews with faculty and P-12 partners confirm that nearly all faculty are actively engaged in collaborative projects with area schools. Projects focus on improved learner outcomes, improving instructional strategies, and other areas identified by P-12 partners as needed. P-12 partners spoke highly of the many projects faculty have collaboratively undertaken with them.

While much of the evidence presented was in Spanish making it difficult to review, unit leadership translated most of said documents for the IR Addendum and for the onsite visit and this afforded the

BOE the opportunity to better understand the evidence/data.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

The unit faculty is very well qualified. All full-time faculty have terminal degrees in their fields from a wide range of highly respected institutions. In addition, with the exception of one, all part-time faculty have terminal degrees. Evidence suggests clinical faculty are well qualified in terms of appropriate degrees and extensive experience in their fields.

Based on evidence presented, faculty model best professional practices in teaching. Candidate ratings of faculty in course evaluations and exit surveys provide some strong evidence to support this, but also provide evidence of candidate concerns related to use of technology and using diverse teaching strategies. For example, 27 percent of candidates responded that they were only somewhat satisfied or not satisfied at all with faculty use of diverse teaching strategies. Almost one third of candidate respondents expressed concern (only somewhat satisfied or not satisfied) regarding integration of online resources in courses. Interviews with unit faculty and members of the Personnel Committee, however, clarified the aforementioned data regarding candidate responses on course evaluations. The number cited (27 percent) drops to below 13 percent when one examines exit survey data on the same questions. Further, additional evidence was shared that demonstrates analyses of faculty modeling best teaching practices in the context of the institutional mission, the unit mission, and the conceptual framework. Faculty were asked to identify research lines, courses taught and course analyses of teaching practices. Additionally, faculty were asked to align course activities and approaches with the tenets of the conceptual framework. Finally, faculty were asked to speak to the ways in which they integrate emergent technology in instruction. It is clear that teaching by the professional education faculty reflects the proficiencies outlined in professional and institutional standards; incorporates appropriate performance assessments; and integrates diversity and technology throughout coursework. Interviews with candidates indicate that faculty adjust instruction appropriately and truly model the very practices (e.g. constructivisim) they advocate to candidates. Faculty consistently emphasized the need to hold true to the tenets of the conceptual framework in the context of student-centered, social justice focused instruction.

The Center for Graduate Research and the Office of Resources for Teaching and Investigation offer technical support to professors and provides guidance in the development of skills in the effective use of technology both for research and in instruction. New faculty participate in a week-long professional development experience. These resources are examples of the unit's interest in fostering, in faculty, the modeling of best practices in teaching and, further, in modeling the inclusion of technology in instruction. Interviews with new and veteran faculty indicate faculty regularly avail themselves of these opportunities.

Scholarship, as measured in terms of publications is impressive for all faculty. The faculty is to be commended for the number of research studies underway or recently completed. In addition, several faculty have been very successful in developing grant proposals that have brought in more than $9 million dollars over the past three years. Over the three-year period reported, a number of books, book

chapters, articles in refereed journals and other journals have been published. Many research projects have been undertaken and reports of project results have been written. The total publications produced over the three-year period reported is high.

The system for unit evaluation of faculty performance measures service, scholarship, and teaching. The system is comprehensive and systematic. The major component of the system ties evaluation directly to assessing the effectiveness of teaching. A personnel committee reviews evaluation results and acts in an advisory capacity to the department head who finalizes the evaluation. Peer review through observation of teaching is a major component of the system and offers feedback through the eyes of colleagues. Evidence reviewed onsite included completed observation forms – the process is rigorous and faculty speak highly of the benefits thereof. Candidates participate in evaluation of faculty through surveys where they respond to questions that address teaching, advisement, communication and other factors. These questions are very appropriate and provide excellent feedback through the eyes of candidates reacting to faculty teaching. Exit surveys provide evidence suggesting satisfaction with the program and faculty. The sophistication of the evaluation system suggests this is met at the target level.

Exhibits indicate professional development is readily available to faculty. It is impressive that beginning faculty have a week-long professional development experience. A wide range of topics is made available and interviews with veteran and new faculty indicate that a large number of faculty take advantage of these professional development opportunities. Faculty spoke passionately about professional development in their respective fields and the need to model best practices that are reflective of unit values. The unit underwent significant budget cuts and funds for professional development are not readily available. Interviews with unit leadership, however, evidenced a commitment to supporting faculty that was impressive. Unit leadership indicated that they were willing to seek out funds regardless of the dearth of monies available. Further, faculty indicated that their desire to attend workshops to enhance their own instruction or to share research is so strong that many fund their own professional development and travels. This commitment to ongoing development and research was impressive.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric

of the target level rubric for this standard.	for this standard.	rubric for this standard.	for this standard.
AND	***OR***	***AND***	***AND***
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
not applicable	

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	At Target (attained)

Standard 6

Standard 6: Unit Governance And Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and

institutional standards.

6.1 Overall Findings

What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence in the IR and Addendum, confirmed by interviews and observations during the onsite visit, confirm the unit has the leadership and authority necessary to coordinate coherent advanced programs to prepare candidates to meet institutional and unit standards. Institutional and unit by-laws and policies delineate the roles and responsibilities of the dean of the Eugenio Maria De Hostos College of Education (EMH-CE), the chair of the Department of Graduate Studies, faculty, and Faculty Assembly in the decision making process. The EMH-CE bylaws articulate the responsibilities of the EMH-CE dean to include chairing the Executive Committee, which is charged with determining strategic goals for the EMH-CE development plan, establishing criteria for assessing progress toward meeting those goals, and providing advice on educational policies.

Interviews and documents indicate administration and faculty understand and adhere to policies. Although all UPRRP educator preparation programs at the institution are housed in the Education Building, the undergraduate and graduate programs are separate entities with their own conceptual frameworks, faculty, and assessment systems. Each program within DGS holds autonomous status within the institution which gives program faculty greater control over the curriculum. The six advanced programs examined in this visit focus on producing researchers, not school faculty or other personnel. Only the programs in Counseling and Guidance and Leadership in Educational Organizations may lead to licensure based on completion. The six programs are approved by the Puerto Rico Council of Education although the team was unable to determine what standards or requirements were used in the program approval process because no state consultant participated. As discussed in Standards 2 and 3, the team did not find existing mechanisms for working with P-12 partners in program design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit. The Academic Interaction Committee, noted in the IR and IR Addendum, works with the undergraduate programs, which are not within the scope of this review.

The offsite report included a concern about the adequacy of resources for assessment and technology, as well as declining enrollments in recent years. UPRRP is engaged in ongoing strategic planning to use limited resources in the most effective ways possible. The assessment system, which operates under the auspices of the permanent Committee for the Evaluation of Programs of the DGS (CEPDEG), and is supported by three faculty members, including the coordinator, who receive release time, and one graduate student. Faculty and candidates consistently stated funding for technology and professional development, although limited, has been adequate to meet needs. Faculty have computers and printers in their offices, classrooms have projection capabilities, and computer labs are available. Additional technology is in some offices and current technologies are available to faculty and candidates as needed. The EMH-CE employs a graphic artist to provide technical assistance to faculty and candidates. Faculty and candidates also have access to centers in the EMH-CE and on the UPRRP campus for workshops, individual assistance, and access to facilities and resources to enhance their writing, research, and technology skills. The education library has developed workshops on research skills that other UPRRP colleges have adopted. The counseling program has newly renovated facilities with observation windows, recording and projection capabilities, and several rooms with different, movable furniture configurations. Faculty avail themselves of numerous professional development opportunities available in EMH-CE, UPRRP, and through distance learning opportunities. UPRRP also hosts a variety of fora each year to allow candidates, faculty, and colleagues around the world to engage in scholarly pursuits. On occasion, they are willing to supplement limited funding with personal resources to attend conferences.

Concerns about workload included in the offsite report were also alleviated during the visit. Institutional policy states 12 hours of teaching are the normal load, which often includes credit for research and serving on dissertation and thesis committees. The average number of hours per EMH-CE graduate faculty has decreased slightly in recent semesters. Adjunct faculty are carefully vetted to ensure program quality. Although they look forward to a restoration of more ample resources in the future, they feel treated fairly and are committed to their individual and collective work and maintain expectations for themselves. The team found no evidence that budgetary constraints hamper faculty engagement in assessment, P-12 collaboration, and service.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Not applicable

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The EMH-CE library has developed and delivered workshops on research skills which have been model resources for other academic areas.

The academic autonomy of each program and faculty who value scholarly activities aimed at understanding and improving education in Puerto Rico have combined to create a vibrant learning community.

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Not applicable

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.

AND	*OR*	*AND*	*AND*
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Not applicable	

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Not applicable	

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
Not applicable	

6.4 Recommendations

For Standard 6

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

Persons Interviewed

Persons Interviewed
Exhibits

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).