

**INSTITUTIONAL REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION**

**Advanced Programs
Department of Graduate Studies
Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education
University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras**

May 5-7, 2013

**Juanita Rodríguez Colón, Ed.D., Dean
Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education**

Table of Contents

I.	Overview and Conceptual Framework.....	1
II.	Unit Standards.....	5
1.	Standard 1	5
2.	Standard 2	11
3.	Standard 3	16
4.	Standard 4	22
5.	Standard 5	26
6.	Standard 6	35

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT OPTION

I. Overview and Conceptual Framework

I.1 What are the institution's historical context and unique characteristics (e.g., HBCU or religious)? [one paragraph]

The University of Puerto Rico (UPR) is an urban public land grant educational institution of higher education. It was the first professional school in the Island, founded in 1900 in Fajardo (eastern side of the Island) as a Normal School. In 1903, the Normal School was moved to Río Piedras as the first department of the University of Puerto Rico, established by law as an institution of higher education. Today, the University System includes eleven campuses with a population of approximately 56,890 students. The Río Piedras Campus is the oldest and also the largest campus of the University of Puerto Rico System. Under the Carnegie criteria, it is a research university with high research activity (RU/H). In the 1960's, the Río Piedras Campus underwent significant changes related to the incorporation of graduate programs in different colleges that later served as the basis for the creation of graduate schools. The graduate studies of the Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education (EMH-CE) were initiated at the beginning of that decade. In 1963, the Council on Higher Education issued Certification #69 that initiates the graduate programs (Master's Degree in Secondary Education, and in Administration and Supervision). From there on, several programs have been established in the Department of Graduate Studies for the Master's and Doctoral Degrees.

I.2 What is the institution's mission? [one paragraph]

The general mission of the University, as established in Article 2 (B) of the University Law of Puerto Rico (January 20, 1966) is to:

- Cultivate love of learning as conducive to freedom, and to stimulate the pursuit and free discussion of knowledge, in an atmosphere of respect for creative dialogue;
- Conserve, enrich, and spread the cultural values of the Puerto Rican people and to strengthen awareness of their unity in the common undertaking to find solutions to problems in a democratic manner;
- Seek the full development of the student and to impart in her/him a sense of the individual's responsibility to the general welfare of the community;
- Fully develop the intellectual and spiritual wealth latent in our people, so that the intelligence and spirit of those exceptional individuals who arise from all social spheres, especially those least favored economically, may be put to the service of the Puerto Rican community;
- Collaborate with other organizations, within the sphere of action appropriate to the university, in the study of the problems of Puerto Rico.

The UPR at Río Piedras Campus Mission, approved by the Academic Senate (by means of Certification No. 67 in 1989-1990), consists of five clauses, which highlight the University's strong commitment to: *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* (the campus mission is included on page 15 of *Vision University 2016*, the institution's strategic plan (please see exhibit¹ I.5.f).

¹ Throughout the IR, the term exhibit is used to refer to each of the required exhibits for each section according to the Continuous Improvement NCATE template, as well as to the individual documents that comprise each of those exhibits.

I.3 What is the professional education unit at your institution, what is its relationship to other units at the institution that are involved in the preparation of professional educators, and what are the significant changes since the last NCATE review? [2-4 paragraphs]

The EMH-CE is the Professional Education unit for preparation of teachers and other school professionals in the University of Puerto Rico Río Piedras Campus. The EMH College of Education of the Río Piedras Campus shares with the other units of the University of Puerto Rico System the responsibility of contributing to the fulfillment of its mission according to the University of Puerto Rico Law. It shares academic interaction with the Laboratory Schools and with other colleges within the University of Puerto Rico System and the Río Piedras Campus, as well as with other components of the community, candidates/students 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.

Shared responsibility in the preparation of school professionals is promoted at the campus level through the PK-12 Academic Interaction Committee, which is chaired by the Chancellor. The members of this Committee include the EMH-CE Dean, and Deans from the Colleges of Natural Science, Humanities, Social Sciences, General Studies, and Business Administration, Campus level Academic, Administrative and Graduate/Research Deans, candidate representatives from advanced and initial level, teachers from the school community, and the Secretary of the State Department of Education or representative. This Committee meets each semester to review data on enrollment, budget, institutional assessment, to discuss issues and coordinate efforts related to program design, implementation, learning and unit's assessment results, and to make decisions concerning the implementation of programs and initiatives on campus and at the unit level to achieve high quality standards. Key issues are identified in these meetings and are dealt with through individual meetings with deans and with the State Department of Education representatives. Concerning clinical practice, participation of professional community occurs through the continuous communication and collaboration of school faculty in charge of supervising, practicum candidates and university supervisors. Candidates in *Curriculum and Teaching* master's program take a total of eighteen credits in discipline specialized courses at the Colleges of Humanities, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences.

As established in the *UPR By-Laws (I.5.f)*, the Dean of the College of Education is the main executive of the unit who has the authority and the responsibility of leading the planning, implementation and evaluation of all EMH-CE programs within the institutional framework, according to the highest standards of academic excellence, through a participative organizational structure. Appointed by the Chancellor after consultation with the EMH-CE community, the Dean together with an Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, an Assistant Dean of Administrative Affairs, and an Assistant Dean of Student Affairs form the EMH-CE Executive Team that is responsible for the day to day as well as long term operations of the EMH-CE. The Dean of Education is part of the Chancellor's staff of Deans, is ex-officio member of the Academic Senate, and member of the Administrative Board, which are the major decision making bodies on the UPR Campus. The EMH-CE faculty assembly elects six (6) faculty members to represent them as Senators in the UPR-RP Academic Senate.

The EMH-CE Teacher Preparation Program is the most complex and comprehensive program among public and private institutions in Puerto Rico, being the biggest and oldest at the Institution and island-wide. In 1954 it became the first Teacher Preparation Program accredited by NCATE in Puerto Rico. Since that year, it has also been a member of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

The EMH-CE offers programs at the initial and advanced levels. After the 2010 BOE visit, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Board (UAB) determined to continue accreditation at the initial level

until the Fall of 2017 and for two years at the advanced level. The programs at the advanced level did not meet standards 1 and 2. The UAB requested a full visit for the advanced level.

All advanced level programs in the unit reside within the [Department of Graduate Studies](#) (DGS), chaired by a department head appointed by the EMH-CE Dean, in consultation with DGS faculty [please see *DGS Flowchart of Organizational Structure* (6.3.b)]. The advanced programs are an integral component of the unit. Nevertheless, the programs enjoy academic autonomy, thus having their own conceptual framework; the flexibility to revise and create programs and courses without the approval of the initial level faculty; and a direct relationship with the *Deanship of Graduate Studies and Research* (DGSR), through the office of the Dean of the unit [please see *Certification 69 (1963-1964)-UPR Council* (p. 4), [I.5.f](#)].

As *DGS Academic Areas and Programs* ([I.5.f](#)) shows, the department is organized in the following ten Academic Areas:

- Curriculum and Teaching
- Guidance and Counseling
- Leadership in Educational Organizations
- Childhood Education
- Educational Research and Evaluation
- Foundations of Education
- Exercise Science
- Family Ecology
- Special Education
- TESL

There are three doctoral programs and nine master's programs ascribed to these Academic Areas. DGS programs are not exclusively focused in P-12 settings. The programs serve candidates with diverse profiles, many of whom are or will be educators in other contexts, including higher education and community organizations. In the *DGS Academic Areas and Programs* diagram, the six master's programs that work with teachers and other school professionals, and that are therefore part of the NCATE review, are highlighted. As agreed with NCATE in the 2010 pre-visit, all of them are evaluated as programs for other school professionals. These six programs are:

- Childhood Education (pre-school and reading education)
- Curriculum and Teaching (with subspecialties in history, mathematics, science, and Spanish education)
- Guidance and Counseling
- Leadership in Educational Organizations²
- Special Education
- Teaching of English as a Second Language (TESL)

Please, see exhibit *Advanced Preparation Programs and their Review Status* ([I.5.f](#)).

Significant changes at the advanced level since the last NCATE review in 2010 include:

² *Educational and Supervision and Administration*, until the second semester of 2011-2012, when the name change was approved by the *UPR Board of Trustees* [the change is currently being considered by the *PR Council on Education* for ratification; please see exhibits *Certification 78 (2011-2012)-UPR Board of Trustees*, and *Curricular Revisions-Administration and Supervision* ([I.5.f](#))].

1. Approval and implementation of the *Política de Experiencias de Campo en Escenarios Escolares*: this policy requires that all candidates in master's programs that serve teachers and other school professionals participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from diverse groups in a P-12 context. In harmony with DGS goals, two fundamental purposes guided its approval: *to strengthen the knowledge and skills of our candidates to work with diverse populations within school settings, and to tighten collaborative ties with schools and other settings that serve school-age populations*. The *Advanced Programs: Candidates' Learning Assessment Model* [included in exhibit *Assessment Instruments (I.5.f)*] was modified to include data collected through these experiences, which facilitates the systematic evaluation of professional dispositions. The policy was implemented in a pilot fashion during the second semester of 2011-2012, is currently (2012-2013 I) being fully implemented, and in the process of being refined [please, see *Transformative Actions*-this policy is included as action #3; see also [DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#), or exhibit *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy (I.5.f)*].
2. Refinement of the various aspects of the assessment system including developing new rubrics, systematic collection, analysis, dissemination, and use of data for program changes.

I.4 Summarize basic tenets of the conceptual framework, institutional standards and candidate proficiencies related to expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions as well as significant changes made to the conceptual framework since the last NCATE review? [2-4 paragraphs]

The following five key elements of the DGS Conceptual Framework provide the basis for the alignment of instruments of data collection and academic courses included in the Advanced Programs Assessment Model:

1. shared process of creation
2. application of knowledge
3. educators assume responsibility for their own learning
4. educators foster active and continuous learning of others
5. disposition for collaborative work leading to personal and collective transformations.

The DGS Conceptual Framework is aligned with three campus-wide mission learning domains and the DGS graduate profile. The three campus-wide learning domains in which all DGS programs focus are: *integration of knowledge, effective communication, and research and creative activity*. Required and foundation courses are also aligned with the Academic Areas specific graduate profiles. Professional dispositions, aligned with the aforementioned tenets, and which are evaluated in field experiences and clinical practices, include behaviors that:

1. demonstrate fairness;
2. demonstrate the belief that all students can learn;
3. demonstrate capacity to work collaboratively (with peers, colleagues, etc.);
4. reflect the capacity to reflect about students' learning to improve their professional practice;
5. demonstrate capacity to envision transformations that contribute to the well-being of the populations served and to the development of their professional field;
6. demonstrate appreciation for human dignity, solidarity, and democratic pluralism.

The DGS mission statement, principles, and goals were revised by the faculty assembly on May 2011, as part of the periodic revision process. The revised documents emphasize the commitment

towards democratic pluralism, respect towards human dignity, and the role of candidates as agents of transformation within both traditional educational settings and other organizations with educational components [please see exhibits *DGS Conceptual Framework* (1.5.c); *Assessment Instruments*; *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles* (1.5.f); *Required and foundation courses descriptions and syllabi* (1.5.b); and *DGS Mission, principles, and goals* (1.5.f)].

I.5 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.

II. Unit Standards

1. Standard 1

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 What do candidate assessment data tell the unit about candidates' meeting professional, state, and institutional standards and their impact on P-12 student learning? For programs not nationally/state reviewed, summarize data from key assessments and discuss these results. [maximum of three pages]

Candidate assessment data tell the unit that candidates satisfactorily meet professional, state, and institutional standards. Data collected and analyzed throughout candidates academic progress towards the successful completion of their master's degree, reflect that candidates know and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Candidates' learning is systematically assessed at three transition points: (1) *Admissions*; (2) *Approval of required coursework and field experiences, degree examinations, and clinical practice*; and (3) *Graduation*. Assessments instruments are aligned with the *DGS Conceptual Framework* (1.3.1), campus-wide learning domains, and the DGS graduate profile. As stated in the overview and conceptual framework section, professional dispositions, aligned with the aforementioned tenets, and which are evaluated primarily in field experiences and clinical practices, include behaviors that:

1. demonstrate fairness;
2. demonstrate the belief that all students can learn;
3. demonstrate capacity to work collaboratively (with peers, colleagues, etc.);
4. reflect the capacity to reflect about students' learning to improve their professional practice;
5. demonstrate capacity to envision transformations that contribute to the well-being of the populations served and to the development of their professional field;
6. demonstrate appreciation for human dignity, solidarity, and democratic pluralism.

For a comprehensive documentation of the assessment model, instruments, alignments, and results, please refer to exhibits *Assessment Instruments* (1.3.c); *Assessment Results* (1.3.d), *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles* (1.3.c); *Required and foundation courses descriptions and syllabi* (1.3.c); and *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results* (1.3.c); and section 2.1 of this report which provides a brief explanation of the

contents of each of these exhibits. As table *Candidates Learning Model*, included in *Assessment Results* indicates, for most key assessments data are presented for three years.

Knowledge and skills for other school professionals:

Data regarding knowledge and skills for other school professionals are collected through key assessments at the three transition points. In the first transition point, knowledge and skills of advanced candidates are assessed through grade point average (GPA), the Entrance Examination (EXADEP), and the entrance survey administered by the unit.

The GPA and EXADEP results illustrate that candidates enter the advanced programs with fair to high academic credentials from previous academic studies and experiences. The GPA average is higher than the required GPA (3.00) for entrance at DGS programs. The entrance test results (EXADEP) are higher than the mean for candidates across the Island within the field of education (mean between 2008 and 2010 was 441.6), and than the mean for candidates across the Island within all fields (mean between 2008 and 2010 was 467.6).

The entrance survey includes various items related to knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards, including: the extent to which candidates perceive that they master communication (both oral and written) and research skills; how much experience they have in publishing academic and professional articles; and their perceived knowledge regarding legal and ethical aspects of their profession. Overall, incoming candidates assess their competency regarding their communication skills as *excellent*, and moderately so regarding research skills and the use of emergent technologies. Their overall experience doing research was rated as *some experience*, and limited regarding publication. Candidates expressed that they have “some” knowledge pertaining to ethical aspects and legal aspects of their profession. Please see tables in *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results* (1.3.c).

In the second transition point, knowledge and skills are evaluated in *required courses*, *field experiences*, *degree examinations*, *clinical practices* and *progress survey*. In terms of required coursework, data presented in exhibit *Assessment Results* show that candidates meet the expected requirement of a minimum B grade in the courses. Over eighty percent of the candidates that take the courses, obtain a minimum B grade. When the expectation is not met, candidates must repeat the course and obtain the required grade; otherwise, they are not permitted to take the degree examination.

Data collected for field experiences demonstrate that candidates master the expected knowledge and skills. In the common DGS field experience rubric, results show that candidates are consistently evaluated as outstanding or good, with the evaluation as outstanding predominating. This same pattern is observed in the experiences evaluated with the particular rubrics for the *Childhood Education* and *Leadership in Educational Organizations* programs.

Exhibit *Assessment Results* presents data regarding the degree examination: pass rates and examination rubric results by programs. Results reflect that 98% of candidates that take the exam obtain a passing grade, and high averages in individual programs’ rubric indicators. These results tell the unit that candidates demonstrate that they master the necessary professional competencies, educational practices, and capacity to integrate content knowledge in their respective areas of specialization.

Only two of the six master’s programs included in this report—*Guidance and Counseling*, and *Leadership in Educational Organizations*—require a clinical practice. Exhibit *Assessment Results* presents data regarding pass rates for candidates who engaged in a clinical practice within P-12 settings, which reflect a 95% pass rate; and rubric results for those candidates, as evaluated by university and school faculty. Results in both, the DGS common rubric and the rubric particular to the *Leadership in Educational Organization*, reflect that our candidates develop the necessary

knowledge and skills to successfully practice their profession, including that candidates are responsive to students, their families and communities; that they use data and current research to inform practice; and they use technology effectively. Evaluations by university and school-based faculty are consistent with each other.

As the entrance survey, the progress survey includes items related to knowledge and skills; among these: the extent to which candidates perceive that their experience at the DGS has supported the development of their communication (both oral and written) and research skills; their capacity to produce publishable academic manuscripts, proposals, investigations, and other projects; their knowledge of legal and ethical principles relating to their profession; and their skills at evaluating programs and projects. Overall, candidates perceive that the DGS has supported their development. The areas in which candidates perceive that the DGS supported *a lot* their development relate to written communication, research skills and ethical principles in their profession. They perceive between *a lot* and *enough* support in the development of their oral communication; and in their capacity to produce publishable academic manuscripts, proposals, investigations and other projects [please see tables in *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results*, (1.3.c)].

For the third transition point, key assessment data related to knowledge and skills include: the *general evaluation and rubric results of the thesis or project*, the *exit survey results*, and the *alumni survey results*.

Section *Thesis and Projects: General Evaluations* in exhibit *Assessment Results* shows that 94% of our candidates culminating work are evaluated as outstanding or notable. Section *Thesis and Projects: Rubric Results* includes four tables that show how our candidates are evaluated according to eight criteria (aggregated and disaggregated by programs and years); in all eight criteria, candidates were evaluated as outstanding or notable in over 91% of the cases.

Parallel to the entrance and progress surveys, the exit survey includes various items related to knowledge and skills, including: to what extent candidates perceive that their experience at the DGS has supported the development of their communication (both oral and written) and research skills; their capacity to produce publishable academic manuscripts, proposals, investigations and other projects; their knowledge of legal and ethical principles relating to their profession; and their skills at evaluating programs and projects. Overall, candidates perceive that the DGS has supported their development. The areas in which candidates perceive that the DGS supported *a lot* their development relate to oral, written communication, research skills, collaborative work, ethical principles in their profession, and capacity to produce publishable academic manuscripts, proposals, investigations and other projects. They perceive *enough* support regarding the development of knowledge about legal principles related to their profession. In addition, candidates report that they feel *very satisfied* with programs evaluation experience [please, *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results* (1.3.c)].

The alumni survey also includes items related to knowledge and skills. Results show that on a scale with the following five options to respond to how much they learned—*a lot*, *some*, *little*, *nothing*, and *n/a*—most alumni perceive that they learned *a lot* regarding educational foundations (item I.1-70%); theories and literature relating to their specialty areas (item I.2-85%; item I.3-88.3%); professional language, and ethics relating to their specialty areas (item I.4-88.3%; item I.6-70%); identifying strengths and areas for improvement (item I.10-56.7%) and research knowledge, skills and application (item I.11-66.7%).

Responses tended to be between *a lot* and *some* regarding use of technology (items I.5- 36.7% a lot and 38% some; laws and public policy item I.7-42.4% a lot and 40.7% some); roles and responsibilities with professional community; work with diverse populations; and policies related to teaching (item I.8-43.3% a lot and 45% some; item I.9- 35% a lot and 46.7% some; and item

I.12 45% a lot and 40% some). Please see, *Selected Aggregated Data in the Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results (1.3.c)*.

Student learning for other school professionals:

Data regarding student learning for other school professionals are collected through various key assessments at the second transition point: *required coursework, degree examinations*, and primarily, *field experiences* and *clinical practices*. The alumni and employers' survey, which are included in the third transition point, contain questions regarding student learning (the administration of the employer survey is currently in progress).

As previously stated, candidates meet the expectation of obtaining a minimum B grade in required courses. These courses are aligned with DGS graduate profile elements, including three related to student learning [see exhibit *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles (1.3.c)*]:

- utilizes effective and innovative strategies and techniques of his/her discipline pertinent to the environment and the population he/she serves;
- generates knowledge through research and creativity in light of the analysis of the educational, social, and cultural needs of Puerto Rico;
- expresses his/her ideas and knowledge coherently, properly, and accurately according to the environment and the population he/she serves.

Through field experiences, candidates' proficiencies regarding student learning are evaluated. Various criteria included in the DGS field experience common rubric are related to student learning. Among them:

- knowledge of and ability to apply theories, research, and practices that support learning;
- knowledge of and ability to apply assessment of school environment and assessment of students' learning, including students with exceptional talents and special needs;
- behaviors that demonstrate the belief that all students can learn.

Particular rubrics in the *Childhood Education* and *Leadership in Educational Organization* also include student learning criteria. For example, *Gathers data on educational activities that facilitate students' learning* (EDUC 6096 rubric); *Knowledge related to creative ways to find new resources to facilitate learning* (EDUC 6521 rubric). Data collected through all these field experiences rubrics show that the majority of candidates are positively evaluated in these and other related criteria.

Each program has a different rubric with which to evaluate the degree examination; selected criteria in each of them are aligned with the DGS conceptual framework, learning domains, and DGS graduate profile. Please see *Tables with selected criteria in degree examinations aligned with learning domains, conceptual framework, and graduate profile* in exhibit *Assessment Instruments (1.3.c)* to identify criteria in rubrics related to the three student learning elements of the DGS graduate profile (mentioned in the required courses discussion on student learning).

Through clinical practices, candidates' proficiencies related to student learning are also evaluated. The two instruments used for this evaluation are the DGS Clinical Practice common rubric and the *Leadership in Educational Organizations* clinical practice rubric. Criteria in the common DGS rubric are similar to those included in the common DGS field experiences rubric. In the *Leadership in Educational Organizations* rubric, related criteria include the one related to didactic leadership: *demonstrates knowledge and ability to promote success of all students by nurturing a positive school culture, and an effective educational program, applying best practices to facilitate student learning; and by designing comprehensive plans aimed at facilitating the professional development of the institutions' work team*. Data collected through both of these

clinical practices rubrics show that most candidates are positively evaluated in these and other related criteria.

The alumni survey includes a section regarding student learning. Items include: *level of acquired knowledge regarding assessment strategies of learning* and *level of acquired knowledge regarding ability to build positive environments taking in consideration the students' development level*, among others. Responses were all concentrated in a lot (please see *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Result*).

Professional dispositions

Data regarding professional dispositions for other school professionals are collected through various key assessments at the second transition point: *required coursework*, *degree examinations*, and, primarily, in *field experiences* and *clinical practices*. In the third transition point, one of the key assessments, the *thesis and projects rubric* includes two criteria related to professional dispositions. The *progress* (second transition point), and the *exit* and *alumni surveys* (third transition point), include items related to professional dispositions.

As previously stated, candidates meet the expectation of obtaining a minimum B grade in required courses. These courses are aligned with DGS graduate profile elements, including five related to professional dispositions [see exhibit *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles (1.3.c)*]:

- utilizes effective and innovative strategies and techniques of his/her discipline pertinent to the environment and the population he/she serves;
- shows a critical, analytical, and ethical attitude towards the understanding of educational and social problems;
- generates knowledge through research and creativity in light of the analysis of the educational, social, and cultural needs of Puerto Rico;
- expresses his/her ideas and knowledge coherently, properly, and accurately according to the environment and the population he/she serves;
- fosters dialogue that promotes active participation and respect towards diversity in his/her work environment.

Through field experiences, candidates' proficiencies regarding professional dispositions are evaluated. The six criteria included in the DGS common rubric related to professional dispositions assessed in all programs are behaviors that:

- demonstrate fairness;
- demonstrate the belief that all students can learn;
- demonstrate capacity to work collaboratively (with peers, colleagues, etc.);
- reflect the capacity to reflect about students' learning to improve their professional practice;
- demonstrate capacity to envision transformations that contribute to the well-being of the populations served and to the development of their professional field;
- demonstrate appreciation for human dignity, solidarity, and democratic pluralism.

Specific rubrics in the *Childhood Education* and *Leadership in Educational Organization* also include professional dispositions criteria. For example, *includes examples of activities adapted to respond to the diversity of all children* (EDUC 6115 rubric); *demonstrates respect towards diversity (free of stereotypes and prejudices)* (EDUC 6830 rubric); *disposition to gather data to facilitate the reflection process of a teacher as s/he implements an educational practice in the*

classroom (EDUC 6522 rubric). Data collected through all these field experiences rubrics show that the majority of candidates are positively evaluated in these and other related criteria.

As previously stated, each program has a different rubric with which to evaluate the degree examination; selected criteria in each of them are aligned with the DGS conceptual framework, learning domains, and DGS graduate profile. Please see *Tables with selected criteria in degree examinations aligned with learning domains, conceptual framework, and graduate profile* in exhibit *Assessment Instruments (1.3.c)* to identify criteria in rubrics associated with professional dispositions related elements of the DGS graduate profile (mentioned in the required courses discussion on professional dispositions).

Candidates' professional dispositions are also evaluated through clinical practices. The two instruments used for this evaluation are the DGS Clinical Practice common rubric and the *Leadership in Educational Organizations* clinical practice rubric. Criteria in the common DGS rubric are the same as those included in the common DGS field experiences rubric. In the *Leadership in Educational Organizations* rubric, related criteria include the one on ethical leadership: *demonstrates knowledge and ability to promote success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and according to ethical principles in the practicum setting*. Data collected through both of these clinical practices rubrics show that the majority of candidates are positively evaluated in these and other related criteria.

The two criteria related to professional dispositions in the thesis and projects rubric are:

- justifies the problem or theme of study in relation to the educational-social context and field of studies: 78% are evaluated as outstanding and 20% as remarkable;
- discussion is related to the field of studies and the educational-social context: 70% are evaluated as outstanding and 22% as remarkable.

The progress and exit surveys include a question regarding candidates/graduates capacity to work collaboratively. Results show an increase in the percentage of candidates that report that the DGS helped them develop the capacity for collaborative work between the progress and the exit survey. Items related to professional dispositions in the alumni survey include the development of the proficiency to encourage active participation and respect for diversity in their work; 91.4% of the candidates reported that they feel that this disposition was developed [(please see *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results (1.3.c)*].

1.2 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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

n/a

1.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

The DGS is committed to the continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality. Two salient transformative actions and changes based on data have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance:

- strengthening ties with schools, formative entities and communities through diverse collaborative experiences;
- requiring that all candidates in master's programs that serve teachers and other school professionals participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from

diverse groups in a P-12 context; and, that data regarding these experiences, are systematically collected and analyzed;

- developing a common rubric to assess field experiences to assess professional dispositions in field experiences.

Both of these actions are intricately related to enhancing candidates' formative experiences with diverse populations in school settings and in collaborating with school faculty in the design, implementation, and evaluation of those experiences [to see the six transformative actions, please refer to *Transformative Actions (1.3.1)*].

▪ **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 1.**

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in Standard 1 is in essence to continue implementing the assessment model, sharing data with stakeholders, adjusting the programs on the basis of data, and giving systematic attention to each of the six transformative actions with which the DGS has chosen to work. As the transformative actions exhibit shows, the actions are aligned with related findings, data source, learning domains, and DGS goals. The exhibit also shows faculty members working with the action and current status. Each of the actions is the product of collective reflection and decision-making processes of DGS faculty. Candidates' input in various forums, including, for example, presentation and discussion of assessment results in March 15, 2012 also informed the processes [please see exhibit, *Presentation of assessment results to candidates (1.3.1)*].

The other four transformative actions are:

- promoting publication and dissemination of candidates' creative and research works to the external community through systematic initiatives;
- expanding and transforming the *Zona de Talleres* (Workshops Zone) writing experience that already exists at the undergraduate level, to include DGS candidates;
- generating and implementing initiatives that support candidates and faculty in the development of sensibility and knowledge related to working with diverse populations;
- promoting knowledge, reflection and application of ethical and legal aspects associated to candidates' professions.

In order to continue the effective implementation of the assessment model and the transformative action plans, it is crucial that necessary human and fiscal resources be allocated. The DGS administration and faculty are committed to sustaining and enhancing candidates' performance and program quality by supporting both of these processes.

1.3 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.

2. Standard 2

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 How does the unit use its assessment system to improve candidate performance, program quality and unit operations? [maximum of three pages]

The Department of Graduate Studies (DGS), which houses the six advanced programs, has developed and implemented a comprehensive assessment system, and has been consistently and

systematically collecting, summarizing, and analyzing data since the 2008-2009 academic year. This assessment system has been refined and enhanced since the last NCATE visit. The data are being proactively used to improve the performance of candidates and its programs. The DGS faculty delineated six *initiatives* as a result of the findings from the assessment system, all of which are intricately related to candidate performance and program quality [please see *exhibit Transformative Actions (2.3.h)*].

The DGS *Candidates' Learning Assessment Model* is grounded in the University of Puerto Rico and Río Piedras campus missions (please see section I.2 of this report). It follows the conceptual framework of the DGS and establishes three transition points: 1) *Admissions*; 2) *Approval of required coursework and field experiences, degree examinations, and clinical practices*; and 3) *Graduation*. It 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* [please see exhibits *DGS Mission, principles, and goals (2.3.i)*, *DGS Conceptual Framework (2.3.i)*, and *Assessment Instruments (2.3.a)*]. Data from multiple assessments are collected at all transition points and are used to improve candidate performance, program, and unit operations.

DGS Assessment Model and Candidates' Performance:

Various exhibits included in this report present detailed information regarding the DGS *Candidates' Learning Assessment Model*, particularly:

1. **Assessment Instruments:**³ compiles the following documents related to the assessment model:
 - assessment model diagram
 - table detailing key assessments for each transition point; requirements and pertinent information regarding key assessments; and proficiencies evaluated by the key assessments
 - table that aligns the DGS conceptual framework with campus-wide learning domains and DGS graduate profile
 - key assessment instruments with their corresponding scoring guides
 - key assessment instruments aligned with institutional tenets

Key assessments for professional dispositions in the table of contents and related items in the instruments, are highlighted in yellow; key assessments for diversity proficiencies and related items in the rubrics, are underlined in green.

2. **Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles:** includes tables aligning required courses for each program and educational foundations courses with campus-wide learning domains, and DGS and Academic Areas graduate profiles. Elements of DGS profile related to professional dispositions and diversity are in italics and in green.
3. **Required and foundation courses descriptions and syllabi:** includes course descriptions and a compilation of syllabi for the aforementioned courses.
4. **Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results:** includes each of the five surveys included in the model; results for each administration; and selected criteria aggregated data.

³ Various exhibits, including *Assessment Instruments*, include a table of contents, hyperlinks, and corresponding suggestions to facilitate navigating within the documents.

5. *Assessment Results:*

- assessment model diagram
- table similar to the one included in *Assessment Instruments*, indicating period for which data are presented
- aggregated data results for key assessments

Key assessments for professional dispositions in the table of contents and related items in the results, are highlighted in yellow; key assessments for diversity proficiencies and related items in the results, are underlined in green.

6. *Assessment Instruments-Validation Information:* Contains information regarding the processes of validating assessment instruments.

The implementation of the assessment system is coordinated by the *Comité de Evaluación de Programas Académicos del Departamento de Estudios Graduados (CEPDEG)* [please see exhibit *DGS Academic Programs Assessment Committee (2.3.d)*]. CEPDEG's work is structured around a rigorous yearly calendar that propitiates the systematic implementation of the model, in its various dimensions: collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data (among faculty, candidates, and other stakeholders); improving and developing assessment instruments as the needs arise; elaborating reports for accreditation agencies, including the *Middle States Commission on Higher Education* and *NCATE*; presenting recommendations to DGS faculty and administration; and engaging in institutional research related to candidates' assessment that informs CEPDEG's decisions and recommendations. CEPDEG has been institutionalized in the DGS since the 2008-2009 academic year; as of October 2012, the institutionalization is reflected in the *DGS By-Laws* [please see *CEPDEG Annual Calendar and Data Collection Information; CEPDEG Ordinary Meetings Agendas and Agreements (2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012); DGS By-Laws* (p. 49, 55-56); and *DGS Flowchart of Organizational Structure (2.3.d)*].

All data collected and analyzed are disseminated and discussed among various constituencies and multiple forums, including: EMH-CE Assessment Retreats, DGS faculty meetings, Graduate Studies Committee meetings [composed of DGS administration and Academic Areas coordinators; please see *DGS Flowchart of Organizational Structure (2.3.d)*], and Graduate Student Association [for examples of these activities, please see *exhibits Presentation of assessment results to candidates* and *EMH-CE Assessment Retreat-What do data tell us? (2-3.i)*]. Discussions that are part of these activities are instrumental in informing CEPDEG's recommendations and faculty decisions regarding assessment changes and transformative actions that strengthen candidate performance and program quality. Among these changes are the transformative actions; the refinement of assessment instruments; and the incorporation of additional data collection sources (particularly within the second and third transition points), in order to obtain richer assessment data.

In summary, as exhibits corresponding to this standard attest, the DGS has institutionalized procedures that are rigorously observed and that insure that admitted candidates bring the necessary skills and academic strengths to be successful in our programs [*Admissions Requirements (2.3.b)* and *Assessment Results (2.3.e)*]; that our assessments of candidates' performance are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias [*Assessment Instruments (2.3.a)*; *Assessment Instruments-Validation Information (2.3.c)*; *DGS Degree Examinations Norm (2.3.c)*; *Norms and Procedures for Thesis, Projects and Dissertations (2.3.c)*; *Examples of activities that support candidates academically and socially (2.3.c)*]; and guides related to field experiences and clinical practices (see exhibit *3.3.e*); that data are regularly collected, compiled, aggregated, summarized, and analyzed, and used for continuous improvement [*CEPDEG Ordinary Meetings Agendas and Agreements (2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012) (2.3.d)*; *CEPDEG Annual*

Calendar and Data Collection Information (2.3.d); *EMH-CE Assessment Retreat-What do data tell us? (2.3.i)*; and *Presentation of assessment results to candidates (2.3.i)*; that data and summaries of results on key assessments are disaggregated by programs [*Assessment Results (2.3.e)*]; that candidates' complaints are managed appropriately [*Candidate Complaints (2.3.f)*] and that significant changes are made in response to data gathered from the assessment system [*Transformative Actions (2.3.h)*].

The assessment model and unit operations

The unit operations component of the EMH-CE assessment model is articulated with the UPR-RP strategic plan *Vision University 2016 (2.3.i)*. Based on a strategic planning and evaluation processes, data are gathered and analyzed on unit operations to evaluate institutional effectiveness in supporting the development of high quality academic offerings and unit operations.

At the unit level, assessment data are used to carry out annual Faculty Assessment Retreats with both initial and advanced level faculty to promote reflection, identify areas that need improvement, and generate actions and strategies to address needs. *Breves Apuntes*, a publication of the EMH-CE Evaluation Office, keeps the community informed about many of these issues (please see examples of *Breves Apuntes* and *EMH-CE Assessment Retreat Agenda*, included as 2.3.i).

Assessment data on candidate performance and unit operations provided through the assessment system are used on a regular basis as an integral part of the unit's planning, evaluation and decision-making processes to improve academic offerings for the preparation of highly effective teachers and other school personnel. Every year, the *Executive Team* (made up by the Dean, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, and Dean of Administration) reviews data on admissions, graduations, retention, attrition, as well as results of the teacher certification test, GPA's, field and clinical experiences, and others. The analysis of these data is pivotal for making decisions on required modifications to courses, programs, and services; changes in policies, norms and procedures; and the development of "emblematic projects" which are incorporated as priorities of the EMH-CE Annual Plan. The aforementioned data are also presented to and discussed by the *Directive Team*, which includes all Department and Program Chairs, and Heads of Special Units and Projects, to elaborate the action plan to implement data driven decisions. Summaries of data and the draft action plan are then presented in Faculty Assembly for discussion and approval [please see exhibit *EMH-College of Education Development Plan (2011-2014) (2.3.i)*].

The DGS has two main government bodies: the *Faculty Assembly* and the *Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)*. The Graduate Studies Committee is composed of the coordinator of each Academic Area, setting, therefore a close communication and relationship between these bodies and faculty. Through regular meetings of these bodies, information on admissions, graduate degree examinations, and thesis, projects, and dissertations are discussed, and each Academic Area Coordinator provides information to the faculty in order to make informed decisions. Other issues, such as revisions of DGS norms and procedures are also discussed within the GSC.

2.2 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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

n/a

2.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

As a result of data collection, aggregation, analysis, and dissemination, important changes have been made at instrument development and validation level, at curriculum improvement level, and at DGS faculty initiatives level.

Instrument development and validation level

The CEPDEG identified the need to collect data on different stages of the assessment model; instruments were then constructed, validated, administered and implemented as part of its assessment model:

- 1) *Entrance Survey* - within the work of CEPDEG, the necessity to count with data that will provide a profile of candidates admitted to the DGS programs became evident, this survey was developed during the 2009-2010 academic year.
- 2) *Thesis, projects, and dissertations rubric* - the development of this rubric was one of the major challenges, it was necessary to assess candidates with a common instrument in order to gain a unit perspective and to honor at the same time the particularities of the diverse academic programs. The rubric was developed and has been implemented since the first semester of the 2009-2010 academic year.
- 3) *Clinical Practices Rubrics* – there was a need to gather data on candidates’ performance during their Clinical Practice experience. The rubric was developed and implemented during 2009-2010 academic year.
- 4) *DGS Candidates Complaint Form*- this form was created during 2009-2010 academic year, as the DGS needed a document that would keep record of the number and issues of complaints, and that would support the follow-up on those complaints (included in exhibit *Candidate Complaints-2.3.f*).
- 5) *Employer Survey* – recognizing the importance of employer feedback is essential for the DGS program improvement, this questionnaire has been developed and its administration is currently in progress (please see exhibit *1.3.j*).

Curriculum improvement level

One significant accomplishment is the revision of courses to include field experiences in P-12 settings in at least one core course in the programs that work with teachers and other school professionals [for details on the policy that establishes this change, please see [DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#), or exhibit *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy (2.3.c)*].

Various courses have been created in order to respond to candidates’ needs. The following courses are responses to candidates’ dissatisfaction with their writing skills and to data from the thesis and projects rubric which indicate a need to strengthen these skills:

- *Writing academic papers* (EDUC 6009 - created in 2010)
- *Production and textualization of knowledge* (EDUC 6915 – created in 2012)

Results from the analysis of methodologies utilized in the thesis and projects indicate that most of the candidates work with qualitative studies. As a result, various qualitative research courses have been created:

- *Controversial issues and ethical aspects in qualitative research* (EDUC 8268 –created in 2012)
- *Seminar on biographical research in education* (EDUC 6268 – created in 2011)
- *Seminar on life stories research in education* (EDUC 6269 – created in 2011)

An additional research course created includes quantitative and qualitative methodologies:

- *Mixed methods research* (EDUC 8088 – created in 2010)

DGS faculty initiatives level

As stated in Standard 1, each of the following initiatives (included in the table *Transformative Actions*) is the product of collective reflection and decision-making processes of DGS faculty. Candidates' input in various forums, including, for example, presentation and discussion of assessment results on March 15, 2012 also informed the processes [please see exhibit, *Presentation of assessment results to candidates (2.3.i)*].

- 1) promote the publication and dissemination of students' creative and research works to the external community;
- 2) strengthen ties with schools, formative entities and communities through diverse collaborative experiences;
- 3) require that all candidates in master's programs that serve teachers and other school professionals participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from diverse groups in a P-12 context;
- 4) expand and transform the *Zona de Talleres (Workshops Zone)* writing experience that already exists at the undergraduate level;
- 5) generate and implement initiatives that support candidates and faculty in the development of sensibility and knowledge related to working with diverse populations;
- 6) promote knowledge, reflection, and application of ethical and legal aspects associated to candidates' profession.

Exhibit *Transformative Actions (2.3.h)* presents and provides additional information regarding these six initiatives, including: related finding; data source; alignment with learning domains, DGS goals, and NCATE standards; faculty working with the initiative; and status as of October 2012.

- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 2.**

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance include the continuous implementation and support of the assessment system; released time for faculty members to continue coordinating the collection and analysis of the data; the involvement of the CEPDEG in the refinement, implementation, and decision-making process concerning the assessment system; and the annual sharing of data and findings with stakeholders, particularly, school partners, candidates, and faculty in order to make data driven decisions and revisions.

As exhibit *Transformative Action* presents, most of the DGS faculty members are involved working with the six initiatives and all initiatives have developed plans that will help improve candidates' performance and program quality, based on the assessment system results. For details on the status and plans of each initiative, please see the aforementioned exhibit.

2.3 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.

3. Standard 3

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 How does the unit work with the school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practice to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn? [maximum of three pages]

There are multiple ways through which the Department of Graduate Studies (DGS) of the Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education (EMH-CE) works with school partners to deliver field experiences and clinical practices to enable candidates to develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to help all students learn. School partners have always played a crucial role in delivering and evaluating DGS candidates' clinical practices. Their expertise and experiences are invaluable in the professional formation of our candidates. They allow candidates to use their facilities, observe, assist, and conduct research, among other structured activities related to the roles for which the candidates are preparing themselves. Partners supervise the candidates, and are available to advice and act as consultants for the candidate. During the past three years, the DGS has intensified its efforts to solidify and broaden this collaboration, and to ensure that all candidates participate in experiences that strengthen their knowledge and skills to work with diverse populations within school settings. Section 3.2.b (continuous improvement) details these efforts.

Field Experiences: As stated in the *Overview and Conceptual Framework* and *Standard 1* sections of this report, a significant change at the advanced level since the last NCATE visit has been the approval and implementation of the *Política de Experiencias de Campo en Escenarios Escolares* which requires that all candidates in programs that serve teachers and other school professionals participate in formal academic experiences within P-12 settings, with diverse populations; and, that data regarding these experiences, are systematically collected and analyzed. For more details on this change, please see section 3.2.b. (continuous improvement). As reflected in this policy, the field experience is evaluated by either the university or school faculty with a common DGS rubric. Candidates must submit a profile of the population with which they implemented the field experience and an example of candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning, as it applies to their professional area. In the case that the candidate engages in a field experience with a population that doesn't reflect the expected diversity, a second field experience is required, in which the candidate engages with a population with different characteristics to those of the first field experience population. DGS administration, with the support of the *Coordinator of Clinical Practices and Field Experiences*, is responsible of insuring that appropriate follow-up is granted to these cases, to guarantee that all candidates comply with this requirement. The policy was implemented in a pilot fashion during the second semester of 2011-2012, is currently (2012-2013 I) being fully implemented, and in the process of being refined [please, see *exhibit Transformative Actions (3.3.h)*, this policy is included as action #3; [DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#), or exhibit *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy (3.3.b)*; and *Candidates' assessment and analysis of P-12 student learning (1.3.g)*].

In two of the six programs included in this report, *Childhood Education* and *Leadership in Educational Organizations*, data have been collected for field experiences in P-12 settings for over three years [please see exhibits *Assessment Instruments (3.3.f)* and *Assessment Results (3.3.g)*].

Clinical Practices: As indicated in Standard 1, although all programs require field experiences, only two of the six master's programs included in this report—*Guidance and Counseling*, and *Leadership in Educational Organizations*—require a clinical practice, as our programs are not exclusively focused in P-12 settings. DGS programs serve candidates with diverse profiles, many of whom are or will be educators in other settings, including higher education and community organizations. Only these two programs are conducive to licensure or certification. When candidates in these programs are interested in becoming school professionals (that is, school directors or school counselors), they are directed through academic advising to choose a P-12

setting for their clinical practice. The State Department of Education requires the approval of a clinical practice within a school setting to grant director or counselor certifications to work within the school system. The other four programs—*Childhood Education, Curriculum and Teaching, Special Education, and TESL*—are not conducive to any endorsements or re-certification.

The DGS has a common rubric to evaluate all clinical practices held within P-12 settings. The same rubric is used by university and school-based faculty to evaluate candidates' performance. Candidates in the *Leadership in Educational Organizations* program are also evaluated with a rubric particular to their Academic Area [please see exhibit *Assessment Instruments (3.3.f)*]. Both programs that include a clinical practice require university faculty to visit the candidate at least twice during the semester. To accomplish clinical practices requirements, candidates prepare an action plan or a proposal that must be approved by university faculty and by the school partner. In the *Guidance and Counseling* program, the activities often emerge from a *Needs Assessment Study* performed by the candidate with the support of the school faculty [please see exhibit *Clinical Practices Action Plans-Counseling and Clinical Practices Action Plans-Leadership in Educational Organizations (3.3.h)*]. The university and school faculty guide, assist, and supervise the candidates in their activities. The university and school faculty meet, as defined in the clinical practice plan or proposal, to follow-up on the candidate's progress. At the end of the experience, they meet again to determine the degree to which the candidate met the established goals and to evaluate the overall professional performance. Criteria established in the selection of school-based faculty for clinical practices are carefully implemented. For more information, please refer to the following exhibits: *Clinical Practice-Entry, Faculty, Hours (3.3.c)* and *Clinical Faculty Qualifications (3.3.c)*.

Clinical Practices and Field Experiences placement: As professional adults, other school professional programs' candidates suggest the setting in which they conduct their clinical practices and field experiences in accordance with their interests, knowledge, and professional and academic experiences. Respectful consensus are reached between faculty and candidates, which are guided by the both the institution's commitment to honor the candidates' interests and by the faculty's responsibility of ensuring academically rich and challenging experiences for the candidates. Through the *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy*, all candidates are required to have experiences with diverse P-12 learners.

In clinical practices, school partners must agree to work with candidates in their respective institutions, and be willing and committed to provide them with the appropriate academic and professional experience. Among other criteria utilized to reach these decisions are: clinical partners' needs, services and working hours; clinical faculty expertise and professional licenses; and candidate's professional, academic, and research interests. Clinical practices and field experience settings that are located throughout the Island, include the public and private sectors, and a diverse student population. For clinical practices, parts of the agreements are ratified in a written legal document that is signed by the university (represented by the chancellor) and the practicum site (represented by its director or equivalent). The document includes terms and responsibilities that should guide the experience. Please see exhibits *Legal Agreements for Clinical Practices (3.3.a)* and *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy (3.3.b)*.

CEPDEG maintains a database with information pertaining to each of the placements where DGS students engage in their clinical practices. The database serves various purposes, including: sharing with DGS candidates information regarding organizations with which the institution has legal agreements and that they could therefore consider as a clinical practice placement; having contact information through which to invite clinical faculty to academic and professional events; and gathering data regarding the populations served by the organizations. The information is obtained by asking the organizations to complete a form that includes questions that are part of the database [please see exhibit *Clinical Practice Centers Information Form (3.3.b)*].

Ensuring that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's framework, state standards, and professional standards: In order to systematically ensure that candidates develop proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards, clinical practices syllabi (EDUC 6320 for *Guidance and Counseling* and EDUC 6210 for *Leadership in Educational Organizations*) are aligned with the DGS conceptual framework and each academic program's particular objectives [please, see exhibits *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles* and *Required and foundation courses descriptions and syllabi (3.3.h)*]. Another valuable mechanism to ensure that candidates develop these proficiencies is the clinical practice portfolio that candidates are required to prepare (examples of clinical practice portfolios shall be available in the DGS upon request at the time of the visit). Moreover, all rubrics that evaluate field experiences and clinical practices are aligned with the conceptual framework, campus-wide learning domains, and DGS graduate profile [please see exhibits *Assessment Instruments (3.3.f)* and *Assessment Results (3.3.g)*]. These rubrics also consider candidates' use of technology as it pertains to their professional areas.

Time for reflection and feedback from peers and clinical faculty: At the heart of the DGS conceptual model of the *educator as transformer in the professional and social context* is the commitment to supporting the development of *reflective and transformative* educational practitioners and the underlying principle of *collaborative work as a means to lead the processes of collective and personal transformation* [please see exhibit *DGS Conceptual Framework (3.3.h)*]. Reflection and collaboration is thus inherent to all the formal educational experiences of our candidates, including clinical practice and field experiences. In clinical practices, mechanisms for feedback include weekly (three-hours) seminars that are part of the *Guidance and Counseling clinical practice*. In these seminars, candidates reflect about their ongoing experiences, and receive feedback from faculty and peers, regarding, for example, ideas on how to deal with challenging situations, clients or future activities. Recorded interviews of the candidates with their clients may be used within the seminar to reflect and receive feedback. Within the *Leadership in Educational Organizations* seminar, an integral part of the clinical practice, specific issues that arise during the practice are discussed and collectively reflected upon; peer suggestions on how to proceed are encouraged through the discussion and reflection. Candidates in this program keep a reflexive diary throughout the clinical practice. For details on how time for reflection and feedback is structured within individual courses in which candidates engage in field experiences, please see *exhibit Field Experiences in P-12 Settings-Hours and Time for Reflection (3.3.e)*.

As discussed in Standard 1, assessment results consistently evidence that our candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions for helping all students learn. Please, refer to Standard 1, particularly the sections related to *student learning* and *professional dispositions*. Refer also to sections on field experiences and clinical practices in exhibit *Assessment Results (3.3.g)* to examine data that provide this evidence.

3.2 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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

n/a

3.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

As stated at the beginning of section 3.1, during the past three years the DGS of the EMH-CE has intensified its efforts to solidify and broaden the collaboration between university and school partners. In fact, one of the actions with which DGS faculty is fully engaged is to *strengthen ties*

with schools, formative entities and communities through diverse collaborative experiences [included as action 2 in exhibit *Transformative Actions (3.3.h)*]. All of the transformative actions included in the exhibit are based on assessment results, and a product of collective reflection and decision-making processes. Various initiatives have been undertaken in order to honor the commitment of strengthening ties with such organizations through collaborative experiences. For example, since 2009 the *Leadership in Educational Organizations Academic Area* has celebrated workshops with clinical faculty with the purpose of generating a critical reflection between university, and school (and other organizations) clinical faculty, regarding the clinical practices of our candidates to strengthen our programs. Taking that initiative as a model, and as of May 2012, the DGS instituted a cycle of activities with school (and other centers where DGS candidates engage in clinical practices) faculty to facilitate the academic and professional collaboration needed between faculty of both sectors. The cycle of activities is centered on three foci:

1. critical and collective reflection
2. collaboration in the design of clinical practices
3. professional development

The first of these activities, held on May 4, 2012 centered on reflection. It was held at the Verdanza Hotel in Isla Verde and was attended by approximately twenty university and twenty school (and other centers) faculty (all DGS faculty, not only faculty of the Academic Areas with clinical practices, were encouraged to attend). Evaluations of the activity were very positive, including comments such as:

- *excellent initiative to integrate two collaborative bodies: university faculty and clinical supervisors;*
- *excellent opportunity to integrate theory and practice, also to improve the curriculum integrating the real experiences in practicum and internship centers.*

The next activity of the cycle will be held on December 7, 2012 at the *Universidad del Este* in Carolina (members of their faculty have been clinical supervisors to our candidates; during the May activity, they generously offered their institution to celebrate this next activity). The upcoming activity will focus on collaboration in the design of clinical practices. The agenda for this activity will be informed by the discussions held, and suggestions given, during the May reflection. Please, see exhibits *Clinical Faculty Colloquium 2012-05* (includes pictures, agenda, activity materials, synthesis of notes from the discussions, evaluations, and assistance list of the May activity); and *Clinical Faculty Colloquium-Invitation 2012-12 (3.3.a)*. Additionally, school-based faculty are invited by the DGS administration to attend academic and professional activities sponsored by the EMH-CE and the DGS.

Another activity in this direction was a *conversatorio* (roundtable discussion) held on October 31, 2012, with school faculty from three laboratory centers that are part of the unit—*Escuela Maternal, Escuela Elemental de la UPR, and Escuela Secundaria de la UPR*—and where many of our candidates engage in their field experiences and clinical practices. As the invitation to the activity indicates [included in exhibit *EMH-CE school-based and DGS faculty roundtable discussion (3.3.a)*], it was intended to be a step toward cultivating more collaborative relationships with school-based faculty. Three questions guided the conversation from which specific ideas emerged, including: identifying school-based faculty research and pedagogical interests to support candidates choices of P-12 settings for their field experiences, and structuring the field experience to include a meeting with the classroom teacher before and after implementing the experience (the agenda is also included in the exhibit). These and other ideas will be further discussed and acted upon electronically and in a subsequent meeting, tentatively scheduled for December 11 (2012). As part of the on-going process of refining the field

experiences policy, school-based colleagues who attended the *conversatorio* will evaluate the *DGS Field Experience Rubric* and give us their feedback.

As stated in section 3.1, a significant change at the advanced level since the last NCATE visit was the approval and implementation of the *Política de Experiencias de Campo en Escenarios Escolares* (transformative action #3). This policy is the result of a profound collective process of reflection to consider alternatives that would systematically ensure that all candidates in programs that serve teachers and other school professionals participate in formal academic experiences within P-12 settings, with diverse populations, and that data regarding these experiences is systematically collected and analyzed. The policy was unanimously approved in an extraordinary faculty meeting (April 2012). In harmony with DGS goals, two fundamental purposes guided its approval: *to strengthen the knowledge and skills of our candidates to work with diverse populations within school settings, and to tighten collaborative ties with schools and other settings that serve school-age populations*. This policy requires that all candidates in master's programs that serve teachers and other school professionals (*Childhood Education, Guidance and Counseling, Curriculum and Teaching, Leadership in Educational Organizations, Special Education, and TESL*) participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from diverse groups in a P-12 context. The assessment model was modified to include data collected through these experiences, which facilitates the systematic evaluation of professional dispositions.

Moreover, the DGS administration has implemented various collaborative projects with the PR Department of Education through the [Instituto de Servicios de Apoyo al Departamento de Educación de Puerto Rico](#) (ISADEP). As more fully explained in Standards 5 and 6, this Institute is devoted to improving public education and strengthening the relationship with public schools (P-12) by means of in-service training to school personnel, students and parents, collaboration, and research. Salient among the projects implemented through this Institute are:

- Delta Project: developed in collaboration with the Puerto Rico Department of Education, and involving 28 school principals and 28 school superintendents who participated in a 5 month long professional development program geared at improving principalship in low performing schools. A number of candidates served as project assistants, having the opportunity to strengthen their leadership skills and improve their knowledge in a wide spectrum of academic domains such as assessment, action research, leadership, professional development, monitoring and evaluation, conflict resolution, curricular mapping, schools and communities, instructional technologies, among others.
 - Professional development projects for Mathematic Teachers-Elementary Level (*Adiestramiento e investigación en la enseñanza de estándares, medición y análisis de datos y probabilidad para maestros de escuela elemental y cuarto al sexto grado*) and for Spanish Teachers P-12 (*Nuevos enfoques en la enseñanza de la lengua materna*): these are three projects that will impact 450 teachers of the public school system.
- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 3.**

Plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 3 include:

1. achieve an official partnership, alliance, consortia or letter of understanding between the Puerto Rico Department of Education (responsible for P-12 context public schools in Puerto Rico) and the DGS;
2. refine the policy on field experiences in school settings with school faculty and candidates' feedback;

3. continue working with clinical faculty in the design, implementation and evaluation of clinical practices through the established cycle of activities;
4. continue evaluating candidates' performance, and assessing their progress and challenges on the field experiences and clinical practices;
5. developing in the DGS *Field Experiences in School Settings* page ([DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#)) a blog space in which candidates can share observations, questions, and reflections regarding their field experiences;
6. developing processes to evaluate school-based clinical faculty performance;
7. refining processes to support candidates' choice of clinical practices and field experiences settings.

3.3 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.

4. Standard 4

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 How does the unit prepare candidates to work effectively with all students, including individuals of different ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and/or geographical area? [maximum of three pages]

The preparation of candidates to work with diverse student populations is a central tenet of the mission and conceptual framework of the Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education (EMH-CE) of the University of Puerto Rico, based on an understanding of the concept of diversity that stems from our history, culture and institutional reality. According to this understanding, diversity includes several factors that define the social-cultural characteristics of the student body as well as the professors and school professionals involved in the preparation of candidates. Since the Spanish colonization, the Puerto Rican population developed as a mix of Spaniards, Africans, Taíno Indians, and multiple migratory waves that have constantly enriched our identity, resulting in an ethnicity that is diverse within itself. As our history developed, we have embraced the concept of diversity based on nationality, gender, physical or psychosocial capacities, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and class, among others. Therefore, our programs direct efforts to prepare professionals that have a broad understanding and appreciation of the highest educational, ethical, aesthetic, ecological, and spiritual values of the general culture and the cultures that have contributed to the formation of the Puerto Rican people.

Attention to diversity is at the heart of the DGS culture, vision, and practices, as reflected, for example, in the following excerpts from the DGS mission, philosophical principles, and goals [please see *DGS Mission, principles, and goals* (4.3.j)]:

To promote that graduate students develop research skills, knowledge management, leadership, and creative abilities to generate transformative educational practices and policies from ethical, reflective, and critical perspectives that are respectful of human dignity. (Excerpt from the Mission Statement)

The DGS aims to promote in its students the values of equity, solidarity, and democratic pluralism. It establishes the value of human dignity as its point of departure and places the person in the social and cultural context as the core of the educational project, as both student and as educator. (Excerpt from the Philosophical Principles)

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 environment. (DGS Goal #1)

That a significant number of DGS, EMH-CE, and campus-wide extracurricular activities address the topic of diversity, is also a reflection of the deeply ingrained appreciation towards diversity that our academic community embodies [please see exhibit *Extracurricular Academic Activities-Diversity* (4.3.j)].

Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences:

In the design, implementation, and evaluation of learning experiences that prepare candidates to help all students learn, the EMH-CE advanced programs incorporate the understanding of diversity as it pertains to the candidates' professional areas. Knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity that candidates are expected to demonstrate are included in exhibit *Proficiencias and Curriculum Components-Diversity* (4.3.a). These proficiencies are addressed and assessed in various components of the academic programs, particularly in foundation courses, field experiences and clinical practices. *Teaching and Curriculum* and *Leadership in Educational Organization* programs require candidates to take courses offered by the *Educational Foundations Academic Area* in which diversity is a key topic [please see exhibits *Proficiencias and Curriculum Components-Diversity* (4.3.a), *Assessment Instruments* (4.3.c), and *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profiles* (4.3.c)]. Through the *Política de Experiencias de Campo en Escenarios Escolares*, all candidates are required to participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from diverse groups in a P-12 context [please see [DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#), or exhibit *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy* (4.3.i)]. Moreover, during the three academic years included in this report, twenty percent of the candidates addressed issues of diversity as a primary focus in their thesis or project, the culminating academic experience for these programs. As exhibit *Thesis and Projects Main Topics Categorization* (4.3.j) reflects, diversity was the fourth most repeated category (out of twenty-two).

Exhibit *Assessment Results* (4.3.c) presents data that reflect that candidates demonstrate the expected knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions related to diversity. For example, data collected in field experiences and clinical practices through DGS common rubrics, and through rubrics particular to the *Childhood Education* and *Leadership in Educational Organizations* programs, show that candidates are positively evaluated in all criteria related to diversity (please, see exhibit 4.3.a-b, *Proficiencias and Curriculum Components-Diversity*; key assessments results for diversity proficiencies are underlined in green in the *Assessment Results* exhibit table of contents and in related items in the results).

The DGS' concern to deliver and assess learning experiences that prepare candidates to help all students learn and to work effectively with students from diverse populations, as it pertains to the candidates' professional areas, is also reflected in the alumni survey. Items related to these proficiencies, and to which responses were concentrated between *a lot* and *some*, include: *level of acquired knowledge relating to diversity of populations and communities*; and *use of strategies and effective innovative techniques to the discipline pertinent to the context and population served*. With regards to the development of the proficiency to encourage active participation and respect for diversity in their work, 91.4% of the candidates reported that they feel that this

disposition was developed [please see, section on *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results* (4.3.c)].

Experience working with diverse faculty:

The policies and practices, including good faith efforts for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, are shown as exhibit 4.3.g. It includes the *Reglamento General de la UPR (UPR By-Laws)*; *Certification 87 (2005-2006)* of the Administrative Board, which specifically address the topic of diversity as it pertains to faculty recruitment; and, *Faculty Positions Announcements* (includes publications in local newspaper and in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*). The Office of Human Resources oversees the enforcement of the federal laws about equal opportunity employment (for information regarding faculty recruitment and immersion processes, please see Standard 5). For additional institutional policies related to faculty recruitment and equal opportunities, please visit the following sites:

<http://www.uprrp.edu/rectoria/eeo/oportunidades.html>

<http://www.uprrp.edu/rectoria/>

http://daarrp.uprrp.edu/daa/normativas_y_guias.html;

Exhibit 4.3.d, *Diversity of Professional Education Faculty*, shows demographic data about the faculty in the advanced programs as well as faculty institution-wide. The majority of the faculty has a Hispanic background. The *Diversity Survey for Faculty* in the advanced programs, administered in August 2012, includes information that evidences diversity in terms of country of origin, socioeconomic upbringing, countries in Latin America where they were born and raised, and academic background, among others. Eleven professors or 58% were born in Puerto Rico; other places of birth include Bolivia, Colombia, Cuba, México, Perú, and the United States. Most of them speak Spanish at home, and 50% speak English and Spanish. In terms of race, 29% are White, 25% Black. For a significant number of faculty members it was not an easy task to classify themselves in terms of race. Most of them did graduate studies abroad (67%), while 33% did graduate studies in Puerto Rico. For 37% high school was the highest level of studies of their mothers, while 33% of mothers went to university and 29% did not finish high school. As it regards to the father, for 21% high school was the highest level, 54% went to university and 25% did not finish high school. Seventeen percent of faculty (17%) informed that they have some type of disability. As shown in table *Diversity of Professional Education Faculty*, 79% of advanced faculty members are female [please see exhibit *Faculty Diversity Survey-Instrument and Results* (4.3.j)].

Surveys that are part of the candidates' learning assessment model, specifically the progress and exit surveys, include items regarding the opportunities that candidates have to interact with faculty. Most candidates respond that they are either *very* or *sufficiently satisfied* with such opportunities [please see, section on *Selected Aggregated Data* in the *Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results* (4.3.c)].

Experience working with diverse candidates:

Exhibit 4.3.e, *Diversity of Candidates in Professional Education*, presents data of enrollment in 2011. It shows that 56% of candidates in education are of Hispanic background and for 42% the race/ethnicity is unknown. In terms of the institution, 47% are of a Hispanic background and for 51% the race/ethnicity is unknown. In addition, exhibit *Admitted Applicants Profile* (4.3.e) provides information regarding admitted students in years 2011 and 2012. Data were gathered by the *Deanship of Graduate Studies and Research* (DGSR) through the electronic admissions system. For the last period of admissions (August 2012), 99% informed to be Hispanic. The information about race shows that 61% are White, 25% Black and 14% other race. Seventy five (75%) informed that they need financial aid to complete their degrees, 100% are fluent in reading,

writing and speaking Spanish, while 79% informed that they are good in reading English, 61% are good in writing English and 56 % are good in speaking the same language. There is a notable difference between how applicants perceive their Spanish and English language proficiencies. The campus-wide student population is more diverse than the DGS student population. In general, the information shows the difficulties of the population to report race due to the reasons explained above. Candidates apply through the electronic system administered by the DGSR, deanship that also participates in recruitment activities abroad where information of DGS programs is disseminated. Admitted students are assigned to an academic advisor who holds periodic meetings with them. At every transition point, candidates participate in orientations regarding the expectations before and after each step of their academic career. In addition, the area of student affairs in the DGS conducts workshops, orientations and meetings that address the needs of different groups of candidates. Furthermore, the counselor conducts individual meetings with those candidates that have special needs in order to provide the appropriate resources. At the DGS level, candidates complaints are managed promptly and systematically. The institution has other services for students with disabilities, students with limited Spanish language proficiencies, sexual harassment policies, among others. Many of the institutional policies related to students can be accessed through the Deanship of Student Affairs (<http://www.uprrp.edu/servicios/>). In addition, the Student Ombudsman has policies and procedures to ensure that students' grievances are dealt with according to institutional standards [please see exhibits: *Examples of institutional certifications that support candidates*; *Links related to candidates' support*; *Examples of DGS activities that support candidates academically and socially*; *DGS Recruitment Plan*; and *Candidate Complaints (4.3.h)*].

Surveys that are part of the DGS assessment model, specifically the progress and exit surveys, include questions regarding the opportunities that candidates have to interact with each other: 47% are *very or sufficiently satisfied*, 36% are *somewhat satisfied*. The surveys also include questions regarding attitudes towards handicapped and foreign candidates, to which most respond that they feel *very or sufficiently satisfied*, or that they don't know/not apply [please see, section on *Selected Aggregated Data in the Assessment Model Surveys-Instruments and Results (4.3.c)*].

Experience working with diverse students in P-12 schools:

As stated previously, all candidates are required to participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from diverse groups in a P-12 context [please see [DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#), or exhibit *DGS P-12 Field Experiences Policy (4.3.i)*].

Exhibit [4.3.f](#), *Diversity of P-12 Students in Clinical Practices Sites*, presents the demographics of students where the candidates conduct clinical practice. Although information for some of the centers was not available, the information gathered represents the broad range of experience in terms of gender, socioeconomic background (students with free or reduced lunch) and students with exceptionalities.

Several DGS's policy documents are emphatic in the commitment to diversity. Salient among them, is the *Política de Experiencias de Campo in Escenarios Escolares*, mentioned above. One of the fundamental principles that guide this policy is *to strengthen the knowledge and skills of our candidates to work with diverse populations within school settings*. The policy requires that all candidates in programs that serve teachers and other school professionals engage in formal academic experiences within P-12 settings, with diverse student populations (please see section III of the policy, *Requisite to work with diverse populations*).

4.2 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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

4.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

n/a

4.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

Listening to alumni, through the corresponding data from the alumni survey, led the DGS to embrace the following transformative action: *Generate and implement initiatives that support candidates and faculty in the development of sensibility and knowledge related to working with diverse populations* [please, see exhibit *Transformative Actions (4.3.j)*]. As part of this transformative action, the DGS included the following goals for all candidates:

1. 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;
2. to foster educational leadership in candidates so that they assume their social and professional responsibility and develop innovative projects that promote the common welfare;
3. to contribute, through service and updating of knowledge, to the search for alternatives to meet the educational, social, cultural, and ethical challenges of the country, in its Caribbean and international context.

- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 4.**

In order to accomplish these goals, the DGS has appointed a Committee on Diversity who is in charge of developing an action plan. Among the activities and changes that the committee is proposing for discussion are:

1. redefine and broaden the definition of diverse population in questionnaires and policies, procedures and assessment documents of the DGS to account for differences in abilities, talents and special physical, cognitive and emotional conditions; race, sexual orientation, ethnical group, social class, among others;
2. develop and implement an annual colloquia for faculty about the profound meaning of diverse population, its relationship with human rights, and the integration of this topic in the curricula of DGS programs;
3. integrate workshops and sensitivity training activities for candidates through other initiatives of the DGS, particularly the activities developed to foster an exchange with international candidates, guest speakers, and the EMH-CE community at large.

At this stage, the committee is in the process of establishing priorities, date lines, and resources. As soon as the blueprint is ready it will be presented to the DGS faculty.

4.3 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.

5. Standard 5

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 How does the unit ensure that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance? [maximum of three pages]

Through scholarship, service, teaching, collaboration and assessment of their performance, the faculty models the *Department of Graduate Studies* (DGS) conceptual framework-knowledge, skills and dispositions-that candidates are expected to accomplish:

- application of knowledge;
- educators foster active and continuous learning of others;
- educators assumes responsibility for own learning;
- disposition for collaborative work;
- shared process of creation.

Modeling these key components of the conceptual framework ensures that the faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators, who in turn, will perform as professionals and practitioners in diverse school and community environments.

How the unit ensures that its professional education faculty contributes to the preparation of effective educators will be discussed under each element in section 5.2a.

5.2 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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.

The *Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education* (EMH-CE) advanced programs are currently performing at target level in the areas of qualified faculty; Modeling best professional practices in teaching; Modeling best professional practices in scholarship; modeling best professional practices in service; unit evaluation of faculty performance; and unit facilitation of professional development. As data presented in exhibit *Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences* (5.3.a) shows, the faculty of the DGS is composed of highly qualified scholars committed to education, research and creation and professional service. They are engaged in a diversity of P-12 school projects and activities that keep them abreast of the reality and challenges of schools and classrooms. Faculty members deliberately model best practices in teaching in their own instruction. They align courses with the DGS conceptual framework, learning domains and DGS and Academic Area profiles [see exhibit *Required and foundation courses aligned with domains and profile* (5.3.a)]; incorporate candidate learning assessment and technology as a learning tool; systematically engage in self-assessment of their teaching; and are sensitive to diversity. All faculty members are engaged in scholarly activities related to teaching, learning and their disciplines. Scholarly production has been abundant during the period of 2009-2010 to 2011-2012. Faculty is also at target level in service to the department, the unit, the Institution, and the community including P-12 schools. They are leaders in their profession at the national and international level. Faculty performance evaluation is continuous, systematic, grounded on the *UPR By-Laws* (5.3.g), and peer reviewed, thus enhancing the reliability, validity and fairness of the evaluation. Institutional policies foster faculty professional development

activities aimed at the creation of knowledge, acquisition of skills and active participation in transformative projects in the community.

Qualified faculty:

The unit searches for professors with the highest academic and research credentials as evidenced in the exhibit *Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences* (5.3.a). Recruiting requirements for the DGS include: a doctoral degree in their respective area of expertise, experience in research, published books, chapters or articles in peer-reviewed journals, experience in teaching at the graduate level, supervision of candidates in research projects, contributions to curricular development or improvement of teaching, participation in P-12 schools and community projects, and in the academic and professional world [please, see *Faculty Positions Announcement* and *DGS Faculty Development Plan* available as exhibits (5.3.a)]. Faculty members continue to foster their professional development through their engagement in school-based projects, research, participation in professional organizations and in professional development activities offered by the University of Puerto Rico. The DGS faculty is composed of 27 full time faculty members, of which 2 are administrators with faculty rank. Of the full time faculty, 19 are Full Professors, 4 are Associate Professors and 4 are Assistant Professors. All full time faculty members (100%) hold a Ph.D. or Ed.D. Faculty assignments include teaching courses in their specialization areas, chairing theses, projects and/or dissertation committees; and supervising internships or practicum [DGS By-Laws (5.3.e)]. Faculty also receive release time for other assignments like research, coordination of an Academic Area, participation in the Academic Senate and chairing or coordination of special projects such as the *Center for the Study of Reading, Writing and Children's Literature* (CELELI), the Clinical Practices and Field Experiences Coordinator, the [UNESCO Chair for Higher Education](#), and the *Center for Graduate Research*. DGS part time faculty, for the 2011-2012 academic year and fall 2012 semester, consists of 22 members. Out of these, 6 are tenured at the initial programs at the EMH-CE; 1 is tenured at the *UHS Lab School*; 2 are retired DGS professors that direct candidates' thesis, projects, and dissertations; and 13 are external professors hired on a short term basis. Part-time faculty meet the same standards as regular full-time tenure-track faculty as required by departmental procedures. Professors and other lecturers from research institutes, other universities or the private sector that have the qualifications, may be appointed as adjunct professors, following the policies and procedures established by the Institution [please, see *Adjunct Professor-Certification 24 and DGS Mechanism*, available as an exhibit (5.3.a)].

The two academic programs that have clinical practice, *Leadership in Educational Organizations* (LOE) and *Guidance and Counseling*, have established criteria for clinical practice faculty [see exhibit *Clinical Practice-Entry, Faculty, Hours* (5.3.b)]. School based clinical practice faculty for the LOE program must be licensed by the state as school principals, hold a master's degree in school administration and supervision, have a minimum of two years experience as school administrators and be in charge of only one school. University clinical faculty is required to have a terminal degree in the field. For the *Guidance and Counseling* program school-based faculty must be licensed professional counselors (CPL). University-based clinical faculty must also be licensed professional counselors and must hold the terminal degree in the field. The DGS insures that these criteria are consistently met. The exhibit *Clinical Faculty Qualifications* (5.3.b) reflects that not only are these criteria met, but often times are exceeded as 6 of the school based clinical faculty for the 2009-2010 to 2010-2011 academic years have a terminal degree. Please, see exhibit 5.3.c for related documents.

Modeling best practices in teaching:

DGS cultivates teaching excellence in its faculty. Various tables included in exhibit *DGS Faculty: Modeling Best Practices in Teaching* (5.3.h) attest to this commitment. Full-time as well as part-time faculty have ample, diverse backgrounds and professional experiences in P-12 school

settings. DGS faculty have an in-depth understanding of their fields and are teacher scholars who integrate what is known about their content fields, teaching, and learning in their own instructional practice (evidenced in table *Research Lines and Courses Taught*). Tables *Course Analysis of Teaching Practices and Assessment Activities* show that faculty members align courses to the latest research and developments in their respective fields, incorporate knowledge and experience in diversity, and use a variety of strategies to encourage the development of reflection, critical thinking, and professional dispositions. The faculty is committed to best practices in teaching in their own classroom instruction. Table *Instructional and Assessment Strategies* demonstrates that professors implement several teaching strategies that are considered best practices such as: action research, teachers' work samples, problem based learning, cooperative learning, process writing, field experiences, and inquiry approaches, among others. Faculty have integrated technology as an instructional tool for enhancing candidates' learning in the candidates, thus modeling the best use of technology as a tool to foster student learning in school settings (evidenced in table *Use of technology and courses on Blackboard*). Faculty use digital audiovisual presentations, online research of databases, discussion boards, online forums, *Blackboard* and blogs, among others. Technology is also used for communication purposes with candidates within the context of the courses; exchange of candidates' academic work, revision of candidates papers; and for research. Faculty encourages candidates to use technology for the creation and presentation of required projects and assignments in the courses. See table *Self Assessment of Teaching* for information regarding the variety of strategies used by faculty to assess their teaching effectiveness.

Faculty members become mentors and coaches of the candidates as they model best teaching practices, encouraging and supporting their joint participation as presenters in professional congresses and conferences such as the *Congreso Puertorriqueño de Investigación en la Educación*, *Congreso de Lectoescritura de Guatemala* and the *American Education Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting*.

Our faculty members are consistently recognized as outstanding teachers by candidates and peers across campus and in the profession. They are frequently invited to perform as keynote speakers at national and international conferences and congresses, as consultants and external evaluators by private and public agencies, and recognized for their excellence in performance. One of the most prestigious recognitions that the UPR System can grant its active faculty members is Distinguished Professor. Dr. Ángel Luis Ortiz, member of the *Curriculum and Teaching Academic Area* since the 1960's, was granted this recognition in 2011 [please see *Samples of Faculty Recognition (5.3.h)*]. He is one of seven system-wide professors who have received this important recognition.

Modeling best professional practices in scholarship:

The DGS Faculty has demonstrated a high level of scholarly productivity in the past 3 years (2009-2010 to 2011-2012), thus contributing to the advancement of the profession at the local, national and international contexts [see exhibit *Faculty Scholarly Production-Aggregated (5.3.d)*]. As summarized in exhibit *Professional Education Faculty Qualifications and Experiences (5.3.a)*, 100% of the full-time and part time faculty have been involved in scholarship activities. These include publishing books, chapters in books and manuals; articles in peer reviewed professional journals, as well as professional organization written and digital newsletters, electronic pages and local newspapers; interactive media like CD's and DVD's; creative projects and research funded by the university ([FIPI](#)), and grant awards from the Puerto Rico Department of Education, the Puerto Rico Council on Education, the Department of Family Affairs and the National Endowment for the Arts; presentations at professional conferences, in Puerto Rico and abroad: United States, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Mexico, Panamá, Italy, Hungary, Chile, Australia, and France, among others; workshops, skills training sessions,

lectures and conferences at the Río Piedras Campus and within the UPR System, as well as other institutions of higher education or private universities, public and private schools, and non-profit organizations. A list of scholarly activity by faculty members can be found in the four tables that comprise exhibit *Faculty Scholarly Production (5.3.d)*: Research and Creative Activity; Publications; Lectures, Conferences and Other Presentations; and Grants.

Samples of DGS Faculty-Publications are available as exhibits (*Scholarship Samples-5.3.d*).

The Graduate Studies Department policies on research and creation are presented in the document *DGS Research and Creative Activity Policy (5.3.d)*. The DGS goals and objectives with respect to faculty practices in scholarship respond to the tendencies and projections of the UPR System, the UPR-RP campus, and the EMH-CE with respect to research, internationalization, creation of knowledge, participation in the community and social endeavors [documents *Ten for the Decade, Vision 2016* and *EMH-CE Development Plan* available as exhibits (5.3.d)]. Faculty members must keep updated information about their research, publications and creative work, lectures and presentations, and project proposals in FACTUM (online system developed by the campus [Academic Planning Office](#)). The self-evaluation for tenure and promotion includes a section and specific criteria for scholarly production [please see the *DGS Dossier Evaluation Instrument*, included in exhibit *Faculty Evaluation-Procedures, Instruments, and Results (5.3.d)*]. Newly hired faculty sign a contract that stipulates specific commitments related to scholarly activity.

Modeling best professional practices in service:

The DGS mission, philosophical principles and conceptual framework demonstrate commitment to service, leadership and collaboration as a means to lead the processes of collective and personal transformation that will have an effect on education and the Puerto Rican society in its local and international context [see *DGS By-Laws* and *DGS Conceptual Framework (5.3.e)*]. Faculty members are expected to be involved in service to the institution, the profession and the community at large.

As demonstrated in exhibit *Service and Collaboration by Faculty (5.3.e)*, faculty strengths include active involvement in service related to practice in P-12 schools, and higher education institutions, service to the institution (UPR), community involvement and leadership roles in professional organizations, both at the local and at the national and international levels.

Exhibit *Example of Projects at P-12 Level (5.3.e)* describes the abundant number of projects of faculty at P-12 schools and includes: *CELELI* which provides tutoring at the campus facility for children from neighboring communities and has provided tutor training to teachers in low-income schools; *PIMAMC*, project directed to develop teachers in K-12 in the teaching of science and mathematics; project with teachers of UPR laboratory schools to develop a collection directed to facilitate the implementation of educational practices in the classroom; and [Instituto de Servicios de Apoyo al Departamento de Educación de Puerto Rico](#) (ISADEP) projects: *DELTA*, geared to provide professional development for school superintendents and principals from persistently low performing public schools, and *CAIMAP* and *Lengua Materna*, aimed at improving the teaching skills and content knowledge of math and Spanish teachers, among many others.

Continuous collaboration takes place with governmental and community service institutions. Faculty members serve as consultants to the PR Department of Education on specific issues of concern to particular schools or at the administrative level, participate on advisory boards to the PR Council of Education for the evaluation of new academic programs, have presided the “Board of Examiners of the Professional Counselors of Puerto Rico”, and being a member of the Steering Committee that prepares and corrects the Teacher Certification Test for teachers of English in Puerto Rico.

Faculty members hold memberships and participate actively in a variety of professional organizations related to their particular disciplines [see exhibits *Membership in Professional*

Organizations and Sites of professional service activities and collaborative liaisons (5.3.e). Faculty members attend and make presentations at annual national and international meetings of professional organizations, are reviewers of refereed journals and are members of professional associations' board of directors.

At the international level, the faculty is actively collaborating with UNESCO through two Chairs: UNESCO Chair for Governance, Innovation, and Collaboration in Higher Education and UNESCO Chair for Peace Education. One of the faculty is member of the board of the *Comité Latinoamericano para el Desarrollo de la Lectura y la Escritura de la Asociación Internacional de Lectura (IRA)* and *Worlds of Words: International Collection of Children's and Adolescent Literature*. Collaborative projects have been established with the Education System of Dutch Antilles, the University of Guatemala, public schools in Guatemala and Ghana, School System of Finland and others [please, see exhibit *Examples of Projects, Higher Education and Community (5.3.e)*].

Service to the institution includes: participation in committees (departmental, faculty, campus, system and/or ad-hoc), curricular development, Academic Area coordination, and other assignments related to teaching, research, or administration. Service is one of the required categories for the evaluation of faculty [please see the *DGS Dossier Evaluation Instrument*, included in exhibit *Faculty Evaluation-Procedures, Instruments, and Results (5.3.d)*].

Unit evaluation of professional education faculty performance:

Unit faculty evaluations are systematic and are used to enhance faculty performance and to collect data on the quality of teaching in the unit. Tenure and promotion procedures used by the DGS Administration follow guidelines established in the *UPR- By-Laws (5.3.g; article 45.3)* and pertinent institutional certifications [see [Administrative Board](#) and *Faculty Evaluation-Sites, Presentations, and Policies (5.3.f)*]. Page 49 of the Río Piedras Campus *Faculty Manual* (included in the aforementioned exhibit) states that one of the primary objectives of the evaluation processes is the continuous improvement of the academic and professional life of the faculty. The determinant criteria should be the quality of the faculty performance in all the stages which include teaching, scholarship, and service.

Annually, the unit conducts systematic and comprehensive evaluations of faculty's teaching, scholarship and service performance to enhance its competency and intellectual vitality. Performance is assessed by means of: (1) candidates' evaluation; (2) in-classroom observation evaluation by peers; and (3) self-administered Faculty Evaluation Instrument which requires the inclusion of evidences for each criterion (dossier evaluation instrument). Evaluations are followed by a discussion with the Departmental Personnel Committee. The DGS Personnel Committee has established internal procedures for the evaluation of faculty members. These procedures include formative evaluation of full-time faculty, in-classroom evaluation of part time faculty, and the evaluation of the dossier [please see exhibit *Faculty Evaluation-Procedures, Instruments, and Results (5.3.d)*].

The Personnel Committee acts as a consulting body and recommends the DGS Chairperson on decisions regarding the faculty. Upon initial appointment, each faculty member receives a contractual letter which describes the university's expectations of their duties which include teaching, research and creation, external funding, presentations and publication, and service. Annual evaluations for tenure and promotion are based on the agreements contained in the contractual letter. The initial appointment of part-time faculty is made upon recommendations of the Academic Area and based on a review of curriculum vitae, official transcript and the justification for its appointment. Re-appointment of part-time faculty each semester is made by department chairperson based upon feedback from the student and personnel committee evaluations and in consultation with Area coordinators within specific concentration areas.

The majority of the faculty performed very well on the unit's evaluation, as reflected in *Summary of Faculty Evaluation Results* [included in exhibit *Faculty Evaluation-Procedures, Instruments, and Results (5.3.d)*]. Of the 33 full-time and part-time faculty members, visited and evaluated by the DGS Personnel Committee with the In-classroom Observation Instrument since the 2009-2010 academic year, 76% (25) were classified as outstanding or excellent, 12% (6) as good, and 6% (2) as not satisfactory. During the reported period (2009-2010 to 2011-2012), the dossier of twelve professors were evaluated with the corresponding instrument and all of them received at least 90 points out of a possible 100 with the average being 95 points. The aforementioned summary presents scores divided by each evaluation instrument criteria: teaching, professional development; research, creation and publication; service to the institution and service to the community. Candidates' evaluations of faculty are positive, with the majority of candidates rating faculty performance as *excellent* in the areas of preparedness, fairness in evaluation, respect for students, enthusiasm, and clarity of instruction. Results from Section II of the *DGS Progress and Exit Surveys* demonstrate that most of the candidates are either highly satisfied or quite satisfied with the academic services aspects related to the courses, like quality of teaching, content depth, adequacy of course content, diversity of teaching methods used, and personal attention provided to candidate needs. Positive evaluations by the candidates are also evidenced in the Faculty of Education Evaluation Office Report. It can be observed that a large percentage of the candidates have rated the faculty as excellent or good in all the teaching criteria presented.

Unit facilitation of professional development:

Based upon the Institutional policy of the Campus as a Community of Learners, the unit provides opportunities for faculty development of new knowledge and skills. Unit policies related to professional development are reflected in various official documents, among them (in the following link or available as exhibits): [UPR-RP Faculty Manual](#) (Manual del Profesor); *UPR By-Laws* (article 63); and *Vision University 2016 (5.3.g)*.

The [Center for Academic Excellence](#) (CAE) implements the Institution's professional development policy through a yearlong program. This Center offers lectures, workshops and trainings on a variety of subjects related to excellence in teaching, assessment, research and administration. Within the unit, faculty has been both provider and recipient of activities organized by the Center. For a list of activities offered by CAE, please visit their webpage. Faculty receives information through the university communication systems (electronic and internal mail) about professional development activities on campus or island-wide and attends according to the needs that have been discussed in the evaluation process or self assessed. Newly hired faculty goes through one week of intensive orientation provided by the CAE.

Exhibit *Institution/Unit Facilitation of Professional Development (5.3.g)* describes and offers links to the ample list of professional development centers or activities offered or sponsored by the institution, the *Deanship of Graduate Studies and Research (DGSR)*, the EMH-CE and the DGS. For a list of professional development activities offered or sponsored by the DGS in the past 3 years see exhibit *List of professional development activities offered or sponsored by the DGS 2009-2012 (5.3.g)*.

During the past three years, faculty have actively participated in different professional development opportunities like: courses or workshops on the integration of technology to courses and creation of virtual spaces, workshops focusing on special needs' students and diversity, workshops organized by the DGSR for coordinators and directors of graduate programs to improve the quality of graduate programs, workshops organized by the Office of Government Ethics, national and international professional conferences in their respective fields, seminars and conferences on topics such as: ethics in research, assessment strategies, electronic portfolios, databases in the UPR Library System, technological tools for teaching and others [please, see *Professional Activities-Faculty Participated (5.3.g)*].

▪ **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

Activities that have led to target level performance by faculty and have had an impact on candidate performance and program quality include:

- Increased grants and external funding through proposals developed by faculty and the DGS direction. In particular, the Institute for Services and Support of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (ISADEP), created by the DGS as a special unit in 2011, which has achieved four grants in 2011-2012 that are strengthening opportunities and experiences to collaborate with PK-12 organizations in the improvement of education.
- Increased faculty production of high quality research, publications, creative endeavors, and service to the P-12 community, institution and professional organizations, thus reflecting a high degree of commitment and consonance with those aspects of the UPR-RP, unit, and DGS Mission.
- Candidates' recognition of the outstanding dedication and excellence in teaching as evidenced by faculty and course evaluations.
- Identification and development of six transformative actions as a result of collective reflection and decision-making processes of DGS faculty. These are summarized in exhibit *Transformative Actions (5.3.h)* that includes finding that promoted the action, data source, campus learning domain, DGS Goals, faculty member working with the action and status. As presented in the table, all DGS faculty participate in at least one of the action's committee and have started to develop respective working plans, and in some cases, specific activities during the 2012 fall term.

Transformative actions related to faculty teaching, service and professional development include:

- *Strengthening ties with schools, formative entities and communities through diverse collaborative experiences.* Activities have led to increased involvement of faculty with P-12 schools in particular with the UPR laboratory schools and to increased communication and collaboration between school based and university clinical faculty (See standard 3).
- *Requiring that all candidates in master's programs that serve teachers and other school professionals participate in at least one supervised field experience with students from diverse groups in a P-12 context.* Faculty have engaged in the implementation of this policy, including its design and evaluation [please see *Política de Experiencias de Campo en Escenarios Escolares (5.3.h)* and [DGS P-12 Field Experiences Webpage](#)].
- *Generate and implement initiatives that support candidates and faculty in the development of sensibility and knowledge related to working with special populations.* Working plans include celebrating activities like an annual "Conversatorio" among faculty to propitiate deep reflection about our understanding of "diverse populations", so as to support the integration of associated concepts to the curricula and pedagogical practices (see standard 4).

▪ **Discuss plans for obtaining and/or sustaining target level performance through continuous improvement as articulated in the rubrics of unit Standard 5.**

- Continue the DGS efforts to secure external funding that will provide resources to increase incentives and opportunities for faculty professional development and the support of projects that are key to the accomplishment of the DGS mission as leader in

the preparation of highly qualified educators in the professional community. The DGS Chairperson has engaged for the past two years in systematic fund seeking, an initiative that has already produced positive results [see standard 6-Continuous improvement and exhibit *Grants by Faculty* included in *Faculty Scholarly Production (5.3.d)*]. As stated in the recently revised Norms for the Distribution, Administration and use of Indirect Costs, 25% of external funds indirect costs will be assigned to deans and directors for the unit's development (see purposes and authorized use of indirect costs in *Norms for the distribution, administration and use of indirect costs, (5.3.h)*).

- Support and continue the working plans produced by the corresponding transformative action committees [see column status as of October 2012 in table *Transformative Actions (5.3.h)*]; for example, *Conversatorios* between school-based and university clinical faculty and annual discussions activities that promote sensibility and knowledge regarding service to diverse populations.
- Support and participate in the recently created EMH-CE Academy for Professional Development of the University Community. The objective of the academy include: identify needs of professional development of faculty, develop a calendar with corresponding activities and identify funds for support to attend international conferences and congresses, and create a center for professional dialogues [see *EMH-CE Development Plan (5.3.d)*]. A center for faculty professional dialogue and interaction, *Café Galería*, was inaugurated in April 2012.
- Continue the mentoring project on publication for junior faculty. Aligned with Goal 1, Objective 1.4 of the institutional document *Vision University 2016* (increase and diversify the divulgation of the results of research and creative work of the institution with emphasis in the publication in refereed journals), the unit has established a mentoring project to support publication by faculty and students [see initiative 2-*EMH-CE Development Plan (5.3.d)*]. The unit has already started and will continue to organize a series of lectures and workshops for that purpose in which all faculty going for tenure or promotion have to attend. The *Center for Educational Research* will be involved in this project identifying and offering possible authors, the requirements of the corresponding journals and editorial companies and offering support in submission of manuscript [see *EMH-CE Annual Work Plan (2012-2013) (5.3.h)*].
- Support and increase the use of technology as a learning tool in the curricula and as a tool for institutional effectiveness. Includes the following department, unit and institution initiatives and proposed working plans:
 - technological integration to administrative processes. This a DGS administrative initiative project (PITPA), that promotes the use of digital technology for administrative processes and supports the green university policy, [Recinto Verde](#);
 - promotion of distance education courses (*EMH-CE Development Plan Initiative 5*);
 - integration of technology to the curricula using emergent tools (*EMH-CE Development Plan Initiative 6*);
 - use of adaptive technology for enhancing candidates and student learning in special populations (*EMH-CE Development Plan Initiative 4*);
 - training and use of *Power Campus*, a complete university academic and administrative management system;
 - training and development on computer programs (for example GEM) to manage and submit proposals electronically.
- Continue to strengthen the leadership role of faculty through promotion and support of collaboration with professional and educational national and international organizations

and associations like: Department of Education, Puerto Rico Council of Education, UNESCO chairs for Peace Education and Research in Higher Education, Sapientis, International Study of Successful Principalship, National Board of Professional Counselors, International Reading Association, amongst others.

5.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]

n/a

5.3 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.

6. Standard 6

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 How do the unit's governance system and resources contribute to adequately preparing candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards? [maximum of three pages]

The [Eugenio Maria de Hostos College of Education](#) (EMH-CE) is the Professional Education Unit for the preparation of PK-12 teachers and other school personnel in the [Río Piedras Campus of the University of Puerto Rico](#) (UPRRP). The governance system of the UPRRP is grounded in the Organic Law of the UPR System ([Law 1 of 1966-Ley UPR](#)) as the main public higher education institution in Puerto Rico, and its implementation is established in the *UPR By-Laws*. Academic programs are authorized through licenses approved by the [Puerto Rico Council of Education](#). UPRRP is accredited by the Middle States Association, based on evidence of compliance with high quality standards as reported in [April 2012](#). As established in the *UPR By-Laws*, the Dean of the EMH-CE is the main executive officer of the unit, and has the authority and the responsibility of leading the planning, implementation and evaluation of all EMH-CE academic programs within the institutional framework to meet the highest standards of academic excellence through a participative organizational structure. The Dean is a faculty member appointed by the Chancellor after formal consultation with the EMH-CE community. Together with an Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, an Assistant Dean of Administrative Affairs, and an Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, the EMH-CE Dean forms the Executive Team which is responsible for the implementation of the institutional and unit's governance and administrative policies and procedures on both a day to day and long term basis. The Dean of EMH-CE is part of the Chancellor's staff of Deans, ex officio member of the Academic Senate, and member of the UPRRP Administrative Board, which are the major decision making bodies on the UPR Campus. Within the EMH-CE, the Faculty Assembly is the main decision making body, and it elects six (6) faculty members to represent them as Senators in the [UPR RP Academic Senate](#).

The six academic departments of the EMH-CE, include five undergraduate or initial level departments which are: Foundations of Education; Curriculum and Teaching; Arts, Technology, and Innovations; Family Ecology; Physical Education and Recreation; and the sixth department which is Graduate Studies. Each department, except Foundations of Education, houses specific school personnel preparation programs. For more information and documentation on Policies, procedures, and practices for governance and operations of the unit, see Exhibit [6.3.a](#). Also, see Exhibit [6.3.b](#). for Organizational chart of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure. The EMH-CE Department Chairs are faculty members appointed by the Dean of Education after formal consultation with the personnel of each

department. Within each EMH-CE department, the Chairperson is the leader responsible for working with the faculty through a participative process in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the programs offered according to the highest professional standards. To ensure effective communication and coordination among all levels of the EMH-CE, the Deans, Department Chairs, and Directors of other EMH-CE Offices constitute the EMH-CE Management Team which meets monthly to address all matters related to the planning, delivery and operations of the unit, departments, programs, offices, and special projects. Every year, the Dean elaborates the EMH-CE development plan which is based on the results of systematic evaluation and projections of the unit and its academic programs, within the framework of the campus-wide strategic plan, *Vision University 2016*. At the first Faculty Assembly meeting of the academic year, the Dean presents a written report that accounts for the achievement and progress of the plan of the previous year.

Faculty committees and the Faculty Assembly discuss and decide upon unit policies and procedures, by-laws, curriculum, faculty development, and others. The EMH-CE Personnel Committee and the Curriculum Committee are the two standing committees of the unit established by institutional regulations. Each year, faculty members are appointed voluntarily to these committees at the department level, and the departments designate representatives from these committees to the unit-wide committees. The Personnel Committee recommends and informs decisions related to hiring, evaluation, tenure, promotions, sabbaticals, transfers, and other licenses available for faculty. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for reviewing proposals for the revision and creation of academic programs before these come to the Faculty Assembly for approval.

Shared responsibility in the preparation of school professionals is promoted at the campus level through the PK-16 Academic Interaction Committee, which is chaired by the Chancellor. The members of this Committee include the EMH-CE Dean, and Deans from the Colleges of Natural Science, Humanities, Social Sciences, General Studies, and Business Administration, Campus level Academic, Administrative and Graduate/Research Deans, DGS Department chair, candidate representatives from advanced and initial level, teachers, and the Secretary of the Puerto Rico Department of Education or representative. This Committee meets each semester to review data on enrollment, budget, institutional assessment, to discuss issues and coordinate efforts related to program design, implementation, learning and unit's assessment results, and to make decisions concerning the implementation of programs and initiatives on campus and at the unit level to achieve high quality standards.

Advanced programs for the preparation of other school personnel are housed in the EMH-CE Department of Graduate Studies ([DGS](#)). The advanced programs are an integral component of the EMH-CE unit yet enjoys academic autonomy (Certification 69, 1963-64), formulates its' own conceptual framework, with the flexibility to revise it without the approval of the initial level faculty; and a direct relationship with the [Dean of Graduate Studies and Research](#), which establishes policies for graduate studies in the UPRRP. One faculty member of the DGS is elected by the faculty as representative in the UPRRP Committee of Graduate Studies, which assists the Dean of Graduate Studies in the Campus in planning, revising and developing campus policies for graduate studies.

There are ten Academic Areas in the DGS, to which twelve academic programs belong, including three (3) doctoral programs and nine (9) master's programs. Six (6) of the master's programs are subject to NCATE accreditation because they prepare school personnel, these are: Curriculum and Teaching, Leadership in Educational Organizations, Child Education, Special Education, Teaching English as a Second Language, and Guidance and Counseling. The Chair of the DGS, together with six faculty teams, provide the leadership to ensure that advanced programs meet the professional, state, and institutional standards. The DGS Chairperson is a member of the EMH-

CE Management Committee, and of the PK-16 Academic Interaction Committee of the UPRRP. Six teams are established by the DGS By-laws: (1) Administrative Team, (2) Graduate Studies Committee, (3) Faculty Personnel Committee, (4) Curriculum Committee, and the (5) Student Affairs Committee. A sixth committee, the Programs Assessment Committee, created in 2008, is in charge of the Assessment System in collaboration with the DGS faculty. The Graduate Studies Committee, made up by the coordinators of each Academic Area, meets monthly to discuss and advise the DGS Chairperson on key issues related to policies, procedures and practices to promote the quality of DGS programs and candidate services. DGS candidates are represented in the DGS Curriculum Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Assembly. The Association of Graduate Education Students is a bona fide student organization to support the participation of graduate students in academic affairs and professional enrichment activities. See Exhibit [6.3.b](#) for Organizational chart of the unit governance structure and its relationship to institutional governance structure.

The design and implementation of the DGS academic programs is the task of faculty within each Academic Area under the direction of the DGS Chairperson. These Academic Areas are coordinated by faculty members who are provided 3-4 credits of their academic load for this role, which includes all curricular, candidate, and administrative affairs related to their Academic Area. Final decisions on DGS By-Laws, norms and regulations for exams, and thesis/dissertations, and others, are made by the DGS Faculty Assembly in monthly meetings preside by the DGS Chair.

Academic advising of candidates from admissions to graduation is among the main responsibilities of DGS faculty. Coordinators form the *Graduate Studies Committee*, which meets monthly with the DGS administration, ensure the coherent coordination of all academic processes and formulate policies and procedures that are proposed for consideration in the Faculty Assembly. Every semester academic advisors meet with their candidates to advise them of academic progress and guide in the selection of courses. Also every semester, the DGS Administration and Academic Area faculty offer orientation meetings for candidates on preparation for clinical experiences, candidacy exams, and thesis development as well as follow-up and support during these experiences. The DGS administration posts flyers in bulletin boards in the EMH-CE building, writes letters, both electronic and paper, and maintains a [homepage](#) to keep all candidates abreast of deadlines, procedures, events and developments. The homepage provides access to important documents for candidates that include 1) the DGS Student Handbook, 2) Academic Advising and Studies Plan, 3) Norms and procedures for candidacy exams, and 4) Procedures for Thesis, Projects and Dissertations. Personal guidance and counseling for candidates is provided by the UPRRP Office of Student Counseling and the DGS part-time Counselor. The DGS provides a [listing of institutional services](#) for all graduate students. For further description of Policies, procedures, and practices for candidate services such as counseling and advising, see Exhibit [6.3.c](#).

Candidates are recruited through various means of dissemination, including announcements through the UPR eleven-campus system via electronic communication mailings, to newspaper ads for graduate programs of the UPRRP, to presentations by DGS faculty with UPRRP and other UPR campuses undergraduate PK-12 education candidates who are in their teaching methods course and practicum. Admission requirements are publicly announced in the official UPRRP webpage under the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, where general requirements established by the institution as well as specific requirements for the DGS Academic Areas are presented. Applications for DGS programs, as for all UPRRP graduate programs, are done through the online [Apply Yourself system](#). Documentation on each solicitant is evaluated by the DGS faculty of the Academic Areas, and those solicitants who fulfill requirements are interviewed. Faculty evaluates each candidate with scoring guide, and recommends admissions to the DGS Chairperson, who grants admissions. For further description of Policies, procedures, and

practices for candidate recruitment and admission, and accessibility to candidates and the education community see Exhibit [6.3.d](#). The UPRRP establishes an [institutional calendar](#) each semester, and the also DGS prepares and disseminates a more [local calendar](#) in its own webpage. The [DGS catalogue](#) and [grading policies](#) are announced in the [DGSR webpage](#), which is currently being updated. The Academic calendars, catalogs, unit publications, grading policies, and unit advertising see Exhibit [6.3.e](#).

Funding for the UPR system is assigned through legislative appropriations based on a fixed formula. The budget for the Institution, the EMH-CE, and the DGS, the amounts allocated by the unit for professional development, assessment and technology, and a comparison of this budget with other graduate programs in the UPRRP is presented in Exhibits [6.3.f](#) and [6.3.g](#). The DGS Chair prepares a budget request each year which is included in the EMH-CE budget request to the Chancellor. Significant institutional resources have been invested for assessment since the creation of the DGS Programs Assessment Committee, and include providing released time for three faculty members within their academic load, to dedicate themselves to the development and implementation of the assessment system. A graduate assistant assigned to the Assessment Committee works 18 hours per week. The DGS Assessment Committee also receives support from the EMH-CE Office of Evaluation. The DGS budget is being supplemented by external grants, which in 2011-13 amount to over \$4 million in approved grants, to implement special initiatives to serve the educational community in Puerto Rico as well as to provide professional development experiences for DGS faculty and candidates as resources in these projects.

The personnel of the DGS comprises twenty-seven (27) full time teaching positions, twenty-two (22) part time faculty, nine (9) administrative positions, one part time counselor, and one part time professor who coordinates integration of technology. The DGS Chairperson, appointed by the EMH-CE Dean after consultation with the DGS community, together with the Administrative Team is responsible for providing leadership and administrative support for the coherent implementation of all graduate programs and candidate services according to the highest professional standards. The Chair shares the direction with an Associate Director of Academic Affairs, and an Assistant Director for Student Affairs. The staff includes a Student Affairs Official, an Administrative Affairs Official, a Lab Technician assigned to the Counseling Lab, and three secretaries who have specific responsibilities to provide support to faculty and candidates. As established in the UPR By Laws and the [Faculty Handbook](#), DGS faculty must have a minimum workload of twelve (12) credits up to a maximum is 21 credits, which include teaching courses, academic advising, supervision of theses/projects/dissertations, coordination of programs, development of special initiatives, committee work, and scholarly endeavors. In its effort to maintain adequate workloads, the average of DGS faculty has been fifteen (15) credits in 2011-12, and first semester of 2012-13. Work above 12 credits is paid in additional compensation. For documentation on Policies, procedures, and practices for faculty workload and summary of faculty workload, see Exhibit [6.3.h](#). In addition to the DGS personnel, every year, an average of fifteen (15) graduate candidates is awarded assistantships from the UPR Dean of Graduate Studies and Research to work with faculty, providing a fundamental support for scholarly activity.

DGS facilities are located in the EMH-CE Building, including classrooms equipped with digital projectors for classes, presentations of theses, projects and dissertations, and faculty committee meetings. All full time faculty have a private office in the EMH building (2nd, 4th and 5th floors) and there is a DGS faculty meeting room (EMH 570). The DGS has administrative offices (EMH 436) with computers for all personnel, files for candidates, faculty and personnel records, and academic documents, and a small meeting room (EMH 444). The DGS Programs Evaluation Committee has an office (443) with a secured computer and files. DGS Initiatives such as [CeLELI](#) (the Center for the Study of Reading, Writing and Child Literature), the [Center for Studies in Higher Education](#), and the Institute for Support Services to the Department of

Education ([ISADEP](#)) also have offices and other facilities (Amphitheater #1 Office, Office 525, and Office 480 respectively). The Graduate Research Center (CIG) which provides assistance and workshops to DGS candidates and faculty on research methods and tools, is located in room 523-C and is equipped with fifteen (15) computers, including a Mac, and a printer, tables and projection facilities. Room 523-D is assigned to the Association of Graduate Students Association and [PAIDEIA Puertorriqueña](#), the DGS journal. The EMH building also has three amphitheaters for large meetings, activities and orientations with candidates, a Computer Center, and a TV studio. An Educational Technology Center (2nd floor) lends equipment, mostly laptops and digital projectors to faculty and candidates for classes and projects. The Assistive Technology (AT) Center (Office 481) is equipped with a diversity of technology and provides demonstrations and professional development workshops on AT for faculty, candidates and school personnel, and offers services for persons who need AT.

Technology resources are available for candidates and faculty through the [Graduate Commons](#), housed in the General Library building, where graduate students have access to laptops and wireless connection, group study rooms, and conference rooms. The online library of the UPRRP [Library System](#) has a rich body of literature of 43,481 titles including books, magazines, newspapers, films and archival material. There are 211 titles of printed journals received through subscriptions, exchange program and donations and access to electronic journals through database subscriptions. The [Gerardo Sellés Solá Library](#), the library of the EMH-CE occupies the first floor of the building, with open access to printed and audiovisual resources related to the curriculum of the Faculty, and thesis, projects and dissertations by EMH-CE candidates, computer terminals for using the online library system, and an Information Competencies Room with seventeen (17) computers where candidates participate in workshops and guidance on the access, evaluation, and use of information resources. Through its webpage, under [MIUPI](#) the institution provides access to students and faculty to technology tools such as *Blackboard* for online coursework and *Google Applications for Education*. The Academic Area of *Guidance and Counseling* has a special laboratory for faculty and candidates located in offices 482-483, which provides space for individual and group counseling learning experiences that are observed through a one-way mirror. It was overhauled in 2009 with new technology to record sessions for training and analysis. The Graduate Center for Research offers assistance to graduate students for carrying out their research, as well as workshops on topics such as academic honesty, validation of instruments, analysis of quantitative and qualitative data and others. It has 15 computers, a printer, and NVIVO, AMOS, and SPSS software. The Assistive Technology Center for Special Education is located in Office 481 and the equipment consists of fifteen computers with adaptive features and specialized software for AT. For further information on Candidates' access to physical and/or virtual classrooms, computer labs, curriculum resources, and library resources that support teaching and learning, see Exhibit [6.3.i](#).

6.2 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 you are moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Standard on which the unit is moving to the target level [maximum of five pages]

n/a

6.2.b Continuous Improvement [maximum of three pages]

- **Summarize activities and changes based on data that have led to continuous improvement of candidate performance and program quality.**

Continuous improvement at the DGS related to Standard 6 has focused on strengthening leadership in the professional community through the development and institutionalization of collaborations with diverse educational organizations that will provide access to and the sharing of resources for enhancing the quality of DGS academic programs, preparation of candidates, and

faculty development. These initiatives are being developed based on decisions made in a DGS Faculty Meeting during May 2011 in which data from evaluation and assessment reports was discussed. The faculty proposed and approved six transformative actions, one of which states that the DGS shall “strengthen ties with schools, formative agencies, and communities through diverse collaborative experiences”. Since then, the DGS Chairperson and faculty members have engaged in systematic efforts to broaden partnerships with key educational organizations in Puerto Rico that include seeking external funds to enhance the resources available for DGS programs.

One major initiative that stems from the transformation action is the establishment of the [ISADEP](#) (*Instituto de Servicios de Apoyo al Departamento de Educación de Puerto Rico* –Institute for Supporting Services to the Puerto Rico Department of Education, Office 480), devoted to improve public education and strengthen the relationship with public schools (P-12) by means of in-service training to school personnel, students and parents, collaboration, and research. Through ISADEP, the DELTA Project was developed in collaboration with the Puerto Rico Department of Education, which involved 28 school principals and 28 school superintendents who participated in a professional development program geared at improving principalship in persistently low performing schools. A number of DGS candidates served as project assistants in DELTA, which provided them the opportunity to strengthen their leadership skills and improve their knowledge in a wide spectrum of areas related to PK-12 education such as assessment, action research, leadership, professional development, monitoring and evaluation, conflict resolution, curricular mapping, schools and communities, instructional technologies, among others. As they served as assistants, candidates reinforced their observational skills, data collection, data coding, data analysis, and report writing skills. Recent DGS graduates, hand in hand with DGS faculty, had the opportunity to offer coaching services to school principals for two months in 2012. More recently, three more professional development projects have been funded by the Department of Education through ISADEP, one for K-12 Spanish teachers, and two for K-6 Mathematics teachers. The total amount of funding for ISADEP projects is over \$4 million in 2011-13, an achievement without precedent in the DGS. Over the next years, these projects, as well as others that are in the planning and design phase, will provide further resources and opportunities for DGS faculty and candidates to participate in the development and implementation of professional development and classroom coaching with teachers.

Other efforts developed by DGS faculty have been continued during recent years to strengthen DGS leadership among external educational organizations. Two of these projects are a) *Professional Training for Teachers of English to Diverse Learners: Strategies for Language Enhancement*, sponsored by the Puerto Rico Council on Education during 2009-2012 to provide professional development and support for sixty (60) K-12 teachers in the San Juan Region to integrate arts, technology and theatre in teaching English as a second language, and b) *Professional Development for Schools of Diverse Learners Principals: Strategies for Leadership and Language Enhancement* for twenty principals from public and private schools, during 2010-12. Another significant project that has developed over the past years is *The Interdisciplinary Project to Improve Learning in Mathematics and Science* to provide professional development and support for K-12 teachers of mathematics and science. The CELELI continues to seek resources through contributions of renowned professionals and authors to develop its initiatives in the area of childhood reading, writing and literature, providing unique professional development opportunities for DGS candidates, and has increased its collection to 5,000 titles which is available for the EMH-CE community as well as for teachers and general public.

As part of the search for additional resources to support the improvement of DGS programs, numerous proposals have been submitted to external agencies, including the Department of Education, at both federal and state level, the Puerto Rico Council on Education, the Puerto Rico Foundation for Humanities, and National Science Foundation. A [blog](#) on external funding was

created and disseminated to DGS faculty. Funded projects have a direct impact on P-12 public education, as they are geared at improving schools performance in general, the principalship, and student achievement in disciplines such as mathematics, science, Spanish, and English at the primary and secondary levels.

- **Discuss plans for sustaining and enhancing performance through continuous improvement as articulated in unit Standard 6.**

To promote the sustained improvement of the quality of advanced programs in the EMH-CE, the DGS Chairperson and the DGS Faculty Committee created to implement the transformative action to strengthen ties with the external education community, will exert leadership in advancing collaborations with key organizations both in Puerto Rico and abroad. New initiatives are targeted while ongoing ones will be strengthened, such as those with the [Puerto Rico Department of Education](#), public and private schools, the [Puerto Rico Teacher Association](#), and [Sapientis](#), and as those with countries in Africa, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic, and the UNESCO Chair for Peace Education and UNESCO Chair in Higher Education. Two examples of efforts that have been initiated to enhance the contribution of the DGS at the global level are participation in the [International Study of Successful Principalship](#), and a proposal to establish collaboration with the University of New Delhi in India under the Obama Singh Initiative. These leadership initiatives will enhance access of the DGS to resources available to carry out the professional development and collaborative activities with educational organizations. In particular, the ISADEP will continue to seek funding and will facilitate the use of revenues from grants to increase faculty development activities, such as trips to present research findings at international conferences and congress attendance; and support for students' research and participation in professional activities. A series of workshops are planned to be offered during the second term of 2012-13 to promote and support DGS faculty development of proposals to obtain grants for collaborations with educational organizations.

Another priority of the DGS in terms of securing resources to strengthen the quality of the academic programs in 2012-13 will be to support the implementation of program revisions in the Academic Areas of Curriculum and Teaching, and Leadership in Educational Organizations that were approved in April 2012, through Certifications (#78 and #79, 2011-2012). Three new areas of emphasis will start in 2013-14 in Learning Technologies; Physical Education; and Theory, Design and Curricular Evaluation at the master's and doctoral levels. Three professors will be recruited from existing faculty at the graduate and undergraduate levels. In addition, in the Area of Special Education, new 18-credits curricular sequences are planned to address particular professional development needs among the PK-12 teacher population, such as the sequence in Autism which began in August 2012. A challenge that must be faced in terms of human resources to provide services for candidates is to have a full time position for a graduate counselor which was requested for August 2012, but due to the financial shortage, funding was not approved by the institution. The position will be requested again in the 2012-13 DGS budget. Finally, the approval of the revision of the UPRRP institutional policy for graduate studies by the Academic Senate in November 2012, includes provisions to designate the position of DGS Chairperson as an Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. This organizational change will broaden the authority of the DGS head as academic leader and strengthen capacity to advance DGS priorities towards continuous improvement of advanced programs.

6.3 Exhibits

Please see table *IR Exhibits* (included in the exhibit room), which details the documents and links associated with each required exhibit, and lists additional documents or links included in each section of the report.