University of Puerto Rico

Río Piedras Campus

Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education

Standard 5. Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

March, 2018

II. Standard 5. Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity

Title: Verify use of analysis of data as outlined in the SSR

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Periodic evaluations of the assessment system: 2005, 2009, 2014
The SSR states that this assessment system has been subjected to "Periodic evaluations and enhancements in 2005, 2009 and 2014."

Response:

Since the EPP formally began to develop the unit-wide assessment system in 2001, it has been subject to periodic evaluations and enhancements. In 2005, a two-day faculty retreat was carried out with faculty representation from all programs and candidates' representation of the Student Council to examine and discuss the progress of the development of the assessment system. As a result of the retreat, the model was revised to incorporate the advanced component and special emphasis on the use of data for supporting decision making and actions to improve candidate preparation. The assessment system has also been evaluated and approved by the Dean of Academic Affairs and Academic Senate of the UPR Río Piedras Campus as part of the undergraduate curriculum revision mandated through Certification 46, 2005-06.

In 2008-2009, the Assessment System was evaluated and revised once again by the EPP Directive Committee, comprising Department, Program, and Special Unit directors and coordinators, and changes were made to ensure its alignment with the revision of the EPP Conceptual Framework and to incorporate a third component for the evaluation of unit operations.

The new version of the assessment system was approved in December 2008 by the EPP Directive Committee and by the EMHCE Faculty Assembly in February of 2009. The ongoing evaluation of the unit assessment system through the interconnected efforts of the various working groups has contributed significantly to the evolution of the system since it was originally conceptualized and designed. (See Addendum Report Evidence 5.1 Evolution of the EPP Assessment Model). As of 2017, (last revision of the model began in 2013 with a task force in charge), the full implementation of a unit-wide assessment system that integrates multiple and diverse data elements for all key areas of candidate preparation as envisioned in the EPP Conceptual Framework and CAEP standards has been completed. Among the major developments that have taken place are the assessment of the electronic portfolio or Portae; the assessment of writing skills; the development of more comprehensive partnerships for clinical preparation and performance evaluation; the assessment of the EPP completers' impact on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools; annual assessment of the satisfaction of completers and employers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation; and the incorporation to a centralized database (OLAS) that collects and reports data on key assessments for each candidate, as well as the program and campus level.

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed:

"In 2013 a Task force was established to analyze CAEP's new standards and to determine compliance of the assurance system with those standards. The processes and assessment instruments in place were analyzed and recommendations to revise or create new processes and assessment instruments were made.

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Where are the specific recommendations made based on this analysis?

See Addendum Report Evidence 5.2 Table: How to comply with CAEP's new standards, developed by the task force
Examples of recommendations incorporated in the EPP assessment process:

1.1 Develop new instruments that measure dispositions was followed by the development of an Candidate Exit Survey to measure dispositions.
1.1.b Review rubrics of field experiences to measure dispositions.
2.2 Indicate the number of teachers who have passed the cooperative teacher course. Every teacher provided evidence of having passed the cooperative teacher course.
3.1 Develop a recruitment plan and the administrative structure that supports it.
4.3 Employer survey in process and will be administered this semester as a pilot; "promotion and retention" will be included in the employer survey.
5.1 Review and adapt authentic evaluation model with quality criteria.
5.5 Check and review model and specify CAEP's standard in each assessment process.

What are specific examples of program change based on this analysis?

1. Porta-e: Rubrics were revised, and the reflexive seminars were restructured so that the ten EPP competencies would be evaluated in the three seminars.
2. Induction program: A coordinator was appointed, and activities were designed to determine EPP program impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools; satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation; and satisfaction of employers with the completers' preparation for their assigned responsibilities in working with P-12 students.
3. Field experiences assessment and rubrics: Field experiences assessment rubrics were revised, and a partnership for clinical preparation was established (CAECE) to ensure collaboration to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

How were P-12 stakeholders involved in this process?

Cooperative teachers participated in an assessment retreat to revise the assessment model and processes, and in CAECE meetings.
The Puerto Rico Department of Education participated in the induction program in the data gathering processes of measures required by the state for its teachers.

What is the makeup of the Directive Committee?

The Directive Committee or the Administrative Team is composed by the deans, department chairs, and EPP chairpersons responsible for the direct delivery and day-to-day operation of teacher preparation programs and other academic and professional programs. The Administrative Team meets bimonthly and discusses all the matters that concern the planning, delivery, assessment, and operations of programs.

Title: Verify regular and systematic performance assessment results used to improve program elements and processes

Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

SSR Evidence 5.1.2, Five years EPP Evaluation Plan UPRRP Learning Outcomes lists alignment of standards with InTASC. While years are ascribed to each outcome, it is unclear how these years factor into the evaluation of these standards.

Response: The year indicates the moment when evaluation data was gathered.

Table 5.1.3, Data collection and analysis process provides evidence for the data analysis process complete with timelines and stakeholders involved. Specific examples of how this data informs program effectiveness was not listed in these exhibits.

SSR Evidence Table 5.1.3 is a panoramic description of assessment processes.
SSR Evidence 5.3.2 lists data driven changes for program improvement.

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

SSR, p. 30, Evidence 5.1.3 summarizes the data collection and analysis process of the quality assurance system through the four transition points. This evidence presents data collected, collection date, person responsible, how data is analyzed, data reported, and data use.

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

How was data used to inform specific program and EPP changes?
SSR Evidence 5.3.2 lists data driven changes for program improvement.

How did stakeholder involvement inform these changes?
In SSR Evidence 5.3.2 Section A, the column titled "Actions" describes the involvement of different stakeholders in each process; Sections B and C, on the column titled "how data is shared," describe stakeholder involvement.

Title: Verify validity and reliability of EPP created assessments
Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

As stated in Evidence 5.2.2, "...all of the competencies were evaluated by more than 70% of the experts as Good in the areas evaluated in Pertinence of the information and Adequate scaling of the performance levels. In Content clarity and Adequate writing style, only

Competency 8 obtained 64% in both items. In these cases, the suggestions for corrections by the evaluators were followed."
It is unclear what these suggestions were.

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

Table 5.2.4 Results of Validation Process of the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument Results Evidence 5.2.2 show that all of the competencies were evaluated by more than 70% of the experts as "Good" in the areas evaluated in "Pertinence" of the information and "Adequate" scaling of the performance levels. In "Content clarity" and "Adequate writing style," only Competency 8 obtained 64% in both items. In these cases, the suggestions for corrections by the evaluators were followed.

Response:
The suggestions made by the evaluators of the validation process of the 2010 Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument were:

> 1) Review the wording of the indicators to make it clearer.
> 2) Improve the writing of the performance levels.
> 3) Include the ethical aspect of the evaluation.
> 4) Include in outcome A "Collect information through various techniques and instruments."

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

What are the suggestions and plans for validating the reliability and validity of all EPP created assessments?

Response:

Quality assurance system instrument validity and reliability

Instruments created by EPP

This section describes the construction processes of the instruments developed by EPP, especially the aspects related to its validity and reliability. It offers a substantial extension to the information offered in the self-study, in addition to presenting the information with greater organization.

Each instrument and evaluation process of the quality assurance system goes through a process of development and evaluation in which the faculty ensures there is fairness, accuracy, consistency, and lack of bias.

All assessment instruments are developed by those faculty that administers them as part of the key courses in which data are collected. They establish assessment criteria that are aligned with the EPP Conceptual Framework and the standards of the specific professional areas. Based on these criteria, rubrics are elaborated along with procedures for their use.

Once the initial versions are completed, they are evaluated by all professors who will administer them, and then they test them by assessing candidates. The Evaluation Office, the Educational Research Center, and the Teaching Practice Office collaborate in this task. See Addendum Report Evidence 1.3 Rules for the Construction of a Questionnaire, as an example of this collaboration process. Below are the names of the instruments developed by EPP and the data on their validity and reliability.

A. Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument (CPEI)

Objective

The objective of the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument is to evaluate the performance of the candidates during the practicum.

What is measured

The instrument measures the degree to which candidates have developed the ten EPP competencies:

1. Knowledge and Mastery of Subject Matter
2. Knowledge of the Student and the Learning Process
3. Planning of Instruction
4. Implementation and Research of Teaching
5. Creation of Learning Environments
6. Communication
7. Integration of Emerging Educational Technologies
8. Evaluation of Learning
9. Relationship with the Community
10. Professional Development and Performance

Alignment

The instrument is aligned with the conceptual framework of the faculty, CAEP standards, and InTASC standards.

Instrument validity process

The construction of the instrument was conducted by the Teaching Practice Office in the years 2000 to 2003. The practicum coordinator, the practicum supervisors, and the cooperating teachers participated in the process. In the initial stage, they made an analysis of the components of the candidate evaluation process during the practicum and the evaluation instrument that they were using. For a three-semester period, the literature review on how to evaluate the teacher candidate was conducted. The advice of graduate-level professors was important in the process.

The conception behind the candidate evaluation process was guided by the following premises:

- The emphasis of the evaluation must be on the training process.
- The candidate's analysis and reflection should be facilitated in relation to their strengths and weaknesses.
- The professional and personal development of the candidate must be encouraged.
- The evaluation must take into consideration the diversity and needs of the candidate.
- Evaluation is conceived as a continuous and collaborative process.

Working groups were formed to elaborate the learning outcomes and the levels of execution for each of the 10 competences that are presented in the conceptual framework of the EPP. Four levels of execution were decided for each learning outcome: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, In Progress, and Initiated. It was also decided that three evaluations would be carried out during the semester so that the evaluation would be a progressive and formative one.

In the academic year 2002-2003, a pilot project was carried out involving 22 cooperating teachers, candidates and supervisors of practice to validate the instrument. Among the participating schools of the pilot study were Antonio S. Pedreira, Ramón Vila Mayo, UPR Elementary School, UPR Secondary School, Julio Sellés Solá, and Juan Ponce de León. Students from the K-3 and 4-6 grade levels, Theater, Spanish, Science, Music, Family Ecology, and Art were included among the participating programs. The observations and recommendations offered by these groups were collected, and the instrument was revised.

In 2010, a second validation process of the instrument took place. This process was led by Dr. Ana Miró, who was the coordinator of the Teaching Practice Office. All clinical practice professors participated in the process, candidates and cooperating teachers. The validation process consisted of four stages.

During the first stage of the validation process, the competencies developed through the Conceptual Framework approved by the Faculty of the College of Education were reviewed. At that time the main changes were establishment of an emphasis on diversity, integration of the research component within the implementation competency, incorporation of a technology competency, and fusion of the competency related to professional performance with the professional and personal development competency.

During the second stage, the revised instrument was distributed to all clinical practice professors, and their feedback was included in the instrument. It was received feedback from teachers at the preschool and elementary levels; eight components were added to the two competencies that were fused during the first stage (these were divided into four components); the technology component was eliminated from the implementation competency since during the first stage this component (technology) became a separate competency, and, in its place, the research and creation component was added; and, lastly, more manifest discrimination criteria were established between the achieved and the outstanding levels.

The third stage primarily consisted of a review of the document developed during the second stage by a group of professors representing the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels; assessment; and other areas not related to primary subjects. During this phase, professors representing the different levels/areas verified the pertinence of the language used and verified all established criteria related to their professional area. Additionally, they worked on ranking the performance levels of each component within all the competencies.

The fourth stage was the content validation of the most recent version of the instrument. During this phase, the alignment of the competences included in the instrument was included alongside the dispositions of the future teacher as outlined in the Conceptual Framework of the EPP. Also, in this phase, representatives from different sectors, including professors and students, cooperating teachers, and administrators were included.

During the validation process a template was used (See Self Study Evidence 5.2.3) where the 12 evaluators performed their evaluation. The template included the 10 EPP competencies and the evaluation of the following criteria: Pertinence of the information, Content clarity, Adequate writing style, Adequate scaling of the performance levels, and their relationship with the dispositions. For each one, the evaluators used the following scale: 3: Good, 2: Average, and 1: Needs Improvement. Three was indicative that the evaluator was completely satisfied with the statement and one would indicate that this premise needed improvement because it did not comply with the established criteria. An additional column was added for comments.

Next table shows that all the competencies were evaluated by more than 70% of the experts as Good in the areas evaluated in Pertinence of the information and Adequate scaling of the performance levels. In Content clarity and Adequate writing style, only Competency 8 obtained 64% in both items. The suggestions made by the evaluators of the validation process were:

1. Review the wording of the indicators to make it clearer.
2. Improve the writing of the performance levels.
3. Include the ethical aspect of the evaluation.
4. Include in outcome A "Collect information through various techniques and instruments."

These suggestions were incorporated into the instrument.

Results of Validation Process of the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument

Compe-tencies	Pertinence of the information			Content clarity			Adequate writing style			Adequate scaling of the performance levels		
	Good	Average	Needs improve-ment	Good	Average	Needs improve-ment	Good	Average	Needs improve-ment	Good	Average	Needs improve-ment
1	100%	0%	0%	90%	4%	6%	92%	2%	6%	75%	6%	19%
2	97%	3%	0%	86%	14%	0%	100%	0%	0%	89%	3%	8%
3	100%	0%	0%	85%	8%	6%	81%	2%	17%	75%	4%	21%
4	100%	0%	0%	88%	0%	12%	87%	3%	10%	82%	5%	13%
5	100%	0%	0%	88%	4%	8%	94%	6%	0%	79%	2%	19%
6	98%	2%	0%	100%	0%	0%	79%	4%	17%	79%	4%	17%
7	92%	0%	8%	81%	6%	14%	78%	3%	19%	72%	6%	22%
8	86%	6%	8%	64%	8%	28%	64%	8%	33%	75%	6%	19%
9	96%	4%	0%	83%	0%	17%	75%	8%	17%	83%	0%	17%
10	98%	2%	0%	90%	2%	8%	79%	8%	13%	79%	2%	19%

Reliability data

To know the internal consistency of the CPEI instrument, a reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach's Alpha procedure. The analysis was performed for years 2013-2014, 2014-2015, and 2015-2016, separately. In each analysis, the data of the 10 evaluated competences were included. Next table shows the sample sizes used in the analysis and the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha). Results from the analysis shows high reliability coefficients for these three years. In all the analyses, the reliability was greater than .90.

Years	N	Cronbach's Alpha
2013-2014	175	.933
2014-2015	200	.933
2015-2016	163	.932

Administration

The instrument is administered three times during the practicum.

Analysis

The averages obtained by the candidates in each competence are calculated and compared with the approval points according to the amount of learning outcomes of each competence.

B. Electronic Portfolio Rubric

Objective

To assess the evidence presented by students in the electronic portfolio to support the development of EPP competencies.

What is measured

It measures the degree to which candidates have developed EPP competencies.

Alignment

The instrument is aligned with EPP competencies, CAEP standards, and InTASC standards.

Instrument validity process

The Porta-e rubrics were initially developed and piloted in 2003-04 by the Porta-e Committee with a group of 13 candidates from different programs. The evaluation findings evidence a very effective experience in assessing candidate competencies and promoting reflection and in-depth learning of candidates. Since then, as part of the effort to broaden the implementation of the Porta-e at the unit wide level with all candidates through the creation of the Professional Reflexive Seminars (FAED 4001, 4002, 4003) with the revised baccalaureate programs which started in 2008-09, the rubrics have been thoroughly revised twice by participating faculty to increase the effectiveness of the assessment process. Dr. Cynthia Lucena, Coordinator of the Porta-e at the time and professor of educational technology, designed the Porta-e digital platform with the assessment rubrics that all professors use to provide feedback to candidates on their work. The Porta-e platform and the professor and student resources site describes the assessment process and rubrics, and clearly explains what is expected from candidates for each part of the portfolio and examples of the types of evidence candidates may present. To see this information, go to https://sites.google.com/a/upr.edu/profesoresportae/home and https://sites.google.com/a/upr.edu/portae/.

To promote consistency in the use of the Porta-e rubric, Dr. Lucena held a meeting with all participating professors in December 2009, in which subgroups of professors evaluated candidate evidences and compared their scores to achieve more consensus in the interpretation of the criteria and performance levels.

Procedure: Samples of evidence and reflections collected through *My Trajectory* and Principles 2, 4, 7, and 10 that were being worked with at the time within the Reflective Seminar FAED 4001 and 4002. The rubric designed for said purpose was used and the statistical results among evaluators were compared.

Results obtained using the rubric: To evaluate the work submitted, the professors used the quality criteria established in the rubric to evaluate the E-Portfolio.

Electronic Portfolio Rubric[1]

Criteria (C)	Not evidenced 0	Initiated 1	In process 2	Attained 3
1. The evidence selected properly illustrates the attainment of the principle/competency. (Double weight upon adding)				
2. Describes and contextualizes the evidence in a clear and precise manner.				
3. The justification explains the relationship between the evidence and the principle in a clear and convincing manner.				
4. The justification reflects the significant development of the student as it relates to their learning and realization as a teacher. (Double weight upon adding)				
5. The writing in the justification shows appropriate use of language. Ideas are presented clearly and coherently.				

The results of the calibration process were as shown below.

Principle: #2 Learning and development

Professor	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
Sandra Macksoud López	14	2	3	2	4	3
Ana Quijano	21	6	3	3	6	3
José del Valle	21	6	3	3	6	3
Consuelo Torres Burgos	12	2	3	2	2	3

The average of the evaluation in this group was 17 out of a possible 21, which translates to 81%. The total scores granted by the evaluators ranged from 12 to 21, displaying considerable divergence among the evaluators.

---

[1] Note: A new rubric is presented in Addendum Report Evidence 5.3

Principle: # 4 Critical thinking, research, and creativity

Professor	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
Annette López	17	4	2	3	6	2
Ileana Quintero	11	2	2	1	4	2
Claudia Álvarez	11	4	1	1	4	1

The average of the scores for this principle was 13 out of 21, which represents 61.90%. In the evaluation of this principle there were three evaluators and two of them granted the same score. Convergence within this principle showed that two evaluators were in agreement and provided the same score and one evaluator had a different score; this phenomenon occurred with all criteria. It could be said that convergence and divergence was two to one respectively. Divergence of opposing points were not well marked; the evaluators differed but to a low degree, with two to one and that occurred in all the criteria related to principle #4.

Principle: #7 Educational technologies

Professor	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
Zulma Medina	7	2	1	1	2	1
Carmen Pacheco	21	6	3	3	6	3
Juan Meléndez	21	6	3	3	6	3

Average: 16.33/21 this average is close to an ideal score with 77.76%. It could improve to reach a performance of 80% or more. As situation similar to the previous principle occurred with this principle since two evaluators agreed to grant the same maximum score. The third evaluator granted very low scores equivalent to 33% of the ideal score.

Principle: # 10 Professional and reflective professional action and development

Professor	Total	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
Anita Yudkin	17	4	3	2	6	2
Annette López	19	6	3	2	6	2
Ileana M. Quintero	17	6	2	2	6	1
Claudia Álvarez	19	6	3	2	6	2

Average: 18/21 this result shows that the score obtained is almost ideal with 85.7%. In this case, the evaluators coincided in granting similar scores that did not differ significantly from one another. There was not much variation in the scores granted. It ranged between 17 and 19.

Average total for all four principles 15.89/21. This result is the sum of the averages for all four principles that were developed during the meeting to discuss the four principles. The 15.89 total average represents 75.66% of the ideal score. In this case, 100% is equal to 21.

Conclusions: In general, there was considerable convergence among evaluators, with some exceptions. In each group there was always a professor who distanced themselves from the others, and the concluding discussion of the evaluation helped to gain understanding of the way the evaluation was done by each one of the participants to achieve higher consensus. It is possible that differences in the backgrounds and prior experiences of some of the evaluators led to differences in the interpretation of the rubric and the evaluation of sample work. The results from this experience allowed us to see that students' performances are not reaching the desired maximum level in any of the principles.

In this sample, all principles would have recommendations for the improvement of the performance evidence. A search for explanations for this phenomenon would be advised to determine if it is related to lack of understanding of the principles, use of technology issues, the importance students give to the development of the Porta e, students' motivation, professors' evaluation criteria, since through the sample used we can see they vary as reflected by the substantial difference in scoring among evaluators.

Recommendations:

1. Hold a second, follow-up meeting to present results and exchange impressions and actions needed to review and improve the Seminar, the Porta e, the rubrics and checklists, and the evaluation process.

2. Wide dissemination of the results of this meeting so that future Porta e evaluators can take into consideration the aspects identified to promote consistency and equity in the evaluation of the Port e, and thus they can reflect on their practice and can provide the means to improve these processes.

3. Hold a meeting to discuss and analyze the principles and reflections that were not included in this initial process to complete the consistency test among all evaluators using the Porta e and everything else related to these principles and reflections.

New rubric construction

One of the recommendations made by the group of professors who worked on the validation of the rubric of the electronic portfolio was to change it to one that was more precise. The Addendum Report Evidence 5. 3 present the new rubric that is being worked on.

Administration

The administration is during the courses FAED 4001, FAED 4002 and FAED 4003.

Reliability analysis: To know the internal consistency of the instrument, a reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach's Alpha procedure for the ten competencies. The analysis was performed for the 2015-2016. The following tables show the sample sizes used in the analysis and the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha). Results from the analysis show a good reliability coefficient for this year.

Semester	N	Cronbach's Alpha
First semester 2015-16	27	.92
Second semester 2015-16	69	.88

C. Exit Survey

Objectives

The purpose of the Exit Survey Questionnaire is to collect candidates' data at the third transition point to know the competencies and dispositions they acquired throughout the EPP preparation.

What is measured

It measures candidates' perceptions about the 10 EPP competencies and 42 dispositions they acquired throughout the program.

Alignment

The instrument is aligned with EPP competencies and dispositions, CAEP standards, and InTASC standards.

Instrument validity process

The construction of the instrument was carried out by the Educational Research Center of the EPP. Dr. Claudia Álvarez, Dr. Annette López de Méndez, Dr. Carmen Pacheco and Professor Consuelo Torres participated in the content validity of the instrument. Using a four-level Likert scale, students were asked about their knowledge or mastery of the professional competencies and the 42 dispositions included within the College's conceptual framework.

Administration

The instrument is administered every semester during the last day of the Practicum Course.

Analysis

The data is processed and analyzed by the staff of the educational research center using SPSS.

Reliability analysis: To know the internal consistency of the instrument, a reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach's alpha procedure for the ten competencies and the forty-two dispositions. The analysis was performed for the 2015, 2016, and 2017 years. The next tables show the sample sizes used in the analysis and the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha). Results from the analysis shows a reliability coefficient for these three years between good (.80 - .89) and excellent (≥ .90).

Ten competencies

Years	N	Cronbach's Alpha
2015	59	.82
2016	38	.88
2017	75	.90

Forty-Two Dispositions

Years	N	Cronbach's Alpha
2015	42	.95
2016	36	.98
2017	64	.98

D. Technology Survey

Objectives

- Identify the technologies used in classroom by professors.
- Identify the technologies promoted in candidates by professors.
- Identify activities professors promote among candidates to present within the electronic portfolio.

Alignment

The instrument is aligned with technology aspects within the EPP competencies, CAEP standards, and InTASC standards.

What is measured

The instrument measures the different technologies used by professors in their courses which are geared to the promotion of their integration/adoption among the candidates. It also measures the technology integration/adoption activities within the classroom.

Instrument validity process

The Department of Arts, Technologies and Innovations oversaw the construction of the instrument since the professors who teach technology and innovation are assigned to this department. A preliminary questionnaire was designed based on the stated objectives and an evaluation of that instrument was carried out by professors (Dr. Luis de Jesús, Dr. Juan Meléndez, and Dr. Carmen Pacheco). It was also reviewed by the director of Educational Research Office (CIE, for its acronym in Spanish) and the director of the Evaluation Office.

Administration

The instrument was administered online in October 2016.

Analysis

The Department of Arts, Technologies and Innovations was in charge of the analysis and interpretation.

<div align="center">

E. Completers' Satisfaction Survey

</div>

Objective

The objective of this survey is to determine completers' satisfaction with the Eugenio María de Hostos College of Education (EMHCE) teacher preparation program, as well as their perceptions of need in relevant topics of their job as educators.

What is measured?

1. Completers' perception of their own competency levels in the 10 EPP competencies and five dispositions.
2. Areas of professional improvement
3. Completers' satisfaction with general aspects of the EMHCE teacher preparation program (foundation courses, practicum courses, professors' preparation, research opportunities, etc.)

Alignment

The items on professional competencies are aligned with the requirements established by CAEP for Standard 4 and the InTASC standards (2011), the EPP competencies, and the UPR Institutional Vision and Mission Document.

Instrument construction process

1. The instrument was constructed using and modifying some of the items from two scales of the questionnaire developed by Dr. Macksoud and colleagues in 2009: 1) Teacher Preparation Program Areas, and 2) Areas of Interest and Professional Development. In addition, the survey included the ten EPP competencies and five dispositions of the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument.
2. To ascertain the content validity of the survey a team of six experts reviewed the instrument. The expert panel was comprised by two professors, two practicum supervisors, one candidate who was doing her practicum and a graduate research student. The group reviewed the instrument in three dimensions: content related to competency, relation of the question to the standard aim, clarity and coherence in the descriptor, and grammar. Recommendations were discussed in a CAEP meeting

with members of all 5 standards. Consensus among the experts was the criteria to accept or not the question/item.

3. The questionnaire is divided into four sections: I. Occupational and Academic Information (17 items); II. Mastery of Professional Competencies (10 items) and Dispositions, which were used to evaluate their clinical practicum, and a scale of 13 items for areas for improvement; III. General Satisfaction of the Program; IV Evidence of Impact Practices. Five questions (both close- and open-ended) concerning the completer's practice in the schools and in their work environment that promote learning, development, and achievements in their students, and professional achievements of the completer. These questions were particularly important because they are related directly and indirectly with the impact of teachers' actions in their students.

4. To meet the criteria of teachers' impact on her/his students, five questions were developed: a) Activities or initiatives created that had a positive impact on the students' academic growth; b) the completer had to choose from nine categories of "students achievements supported by teacher" (completer) on a multiple response question, where the completer could mark all that applied. Nine categories of students' achievements were presented: c) the survey asked the completer to describe with some detail (type of achievement, date, place, name of the prize, context) of the achievement of his/her students; and d) the question of completer achievement also adds foundation to his/her professional profile.

Administration

It was administered online using the Google Academic for Education Tool provided by the institution. The director of the Induction Project and her assistant designed and corrected the instrument in their drive. Induction Project developed its data base of completers with data form the Clinical Practice Office, Registrar's Office, clinical practice supervisors, and many professional workshops that were programed. We had research permission granted from the University of Puerto Rico Institutional Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research. (CIPSHI #1617-036).

Analysis

The director of the Induction Project was in charge of analyzing the data along with her research assistants. A reliability analysis (internal consistency) was performed using Cronbach's alpha. Results from this analysis showed high (.98) reliability coefficients for the competencies scales and .97 for the dispositions scales. The items for Professional Improvement had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.96, indicating excellent reliability and the items for Program Satisfaction had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.93, indicating excellent reliability.

F. Completer Information Form (before "Contact Survey")

The Contact Survey will now be called the "Completer Information Form" because the data gathered was intended for database building purposes. All the data was descriptive and qualitative. It was validated in content and appearance by an expert panel of two practicum supervisors, two student-teachers, one graduate student, and two professors. A pencil-paper version was piloted with 15 completers on March 2015, and the response was positive; the 15 completers answered all the questions, and no negative comments were received. The data that the completers provided about their professional achievements and their students' achievements as well was used to create categories that were included in the Completers Satisfaction Survey Section IV called "Evidence of Professional Practice."

The categories created for "student achievements supported by completers" as well as "completers' professional achievements" were used on both the Employer Satisfaction Survey and the Completers' Opinion Survey II.

G. Employers' Opinion Survey

Objectives

To know the satisfaction of employers (school directors) with the teacher preparation program of EMHCE and the completers' professional achievements.

What is measured

The questionnaire measures the opinion of the school directors on the execution of completers, professional achievements, student achievements, and their opinion regarding the quality of the EMHCE Teacher Preparation Program.

Alignment

The questionnaire is aligned with the requirements established by CAEP for Standard 4 and the InTASC standards. Ten (10) EPP competencies and five dispositions (included in one question) were aligned to the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument. The questions included in Survey II related to promotions and recruitment responded to CAEP Requisites on Standard 4.

Instrument construction process

This survey was originally created in 2007 and developed by the Educational Research Center (CIE, for its acronym in Spanish) and was titled as Employers' Opinion Survey. Data provided by the employers (school directors) through this instrument was used in the Self-Study for NCATE accreditation on 2010 with good results. The CIE presented their results before many audiences.

For accreditation and research purposes, the instrument was revised and modified, considering CAEP criteria, by the director of the Induction Project and her staff, currently in

charge of the Standard 4, and piloted in January 2016 – Employers' Survey I and refined as Employers' Satisfaction Survey II.

The Employers' Opinion Survey I (2016) included questions directly related to professional competencies and five dispositions and incorporated new questions about student achievements promoted by completers to connect valuable information for 4.1 Student Impact. We also included completers' achievements and questions related to promotions. Seven experts in different areas (three professors, two clinical supervisors, one method design expert, one school principal, and one teacher) read the instrument and provided meaningful suggestions such as, shorter questions, using concepts that were well understood by school principals from public system, municipal and private, and to reduce long explanations. After the panel revised the document, it was piloted with 28 directors, and these results were analyzed (SSR evidence 4.3 Employers' Satisfaction Survey I).

On September 2016, it was revised and titled Survey II, adding questions related to public school labor conditions, and specific questions about novice completers (experience within the last five years or less); thus, we were able to fully comply with the standard. We decided to include instructions to the employers that they provide amount of information related to novice teachers.

To ascertain the content validity of the instrument, a team of six experts reviewed the questions of the instrument. The expert panel were two professors, two practicum supervisors, one graduate student in Educative Leadership Program (before known as the "Administration and Supervision Program"), who was doing her practicum and a graduate research student. They revised individually the instrument in three dimensions: content related to competency, relation of the question to the standard aim, clarity and coherence in the descriptor, and grammar. Recommendations were discussed in a CAEP meeting with members of all 5 standards. Consensus among the experts was the criteria to accept or not the question/item.

Administration

The survey was administered through a digital link created with Google Educational Tools used in the UPRRP, designed by the Induction Project for this accreditation process. Survey II (2016) was completed by 98 employers/school principals online and through an official memorandum from the Central Office. For the private sector, the contact was the Private Schools Association and the PR Council of Education. We had research permission granted from the University of Puerto Rico IRB or Institutional Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research. (CIPSHI #1617-036).

Analysis

Dr. Nellie Zambrana, the director of the Induction Office, and her assistant Yamil Ortiz, were in charge of analyzing the gathered data. It was used the Statistical Package for the Social

Sciences to gather the data and Intellectus Statistics to calculate the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the competencies and dispositions scales.

Reliability

The items for Competencies had a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.98, indicating excellent reliability. For the disposition scale, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients was .97.

References

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2016). *SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference, 11.0 update* (14th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Intellectus Statistics [Online computer software]. (2017). Retrieved from https://analyze.intellectusstatistics.com/

H. Evaluation of the Teacher Practice Experience

Objective: To evaluate the practicum course by candidates.

What is measured

The performance of the Supervisors of the Practicum, Cooperating Teacher, School Director and Teaching Practice Office in the Practicum.

Alignment

This instrument is aligned with the number 141 certification of the academic year 2013-2014 of the Academic Senate of the Rio Piedra's Campus: Evaluation of Professor in University Courses and with circular letter number 2-2012-2013 of the Department of Education of Puerto Rico: Public Policies Related to the Norms that Regulate the Organization and Functioning of the Teaching Practice Program.

Validity processes

This instrument was designed by the CAEP Standard 2 committee. This committee consisted of a supervisor, a cooperating teacher and a teacher practice coordinator. It was reviewed by the CAEP Committee - Standard # 2 on April 25, 2016 and May 9, 2016 by Dr. Loida Martínez, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs of the Faculty of Education and Dr. Rubén Rosado of the CAEP Committee Standard # 5.

The questionnaire consists of four scales: a scale to evaluate the Supervisors of the Practicum that consists of 14 items, another scale to evaluate the Cooperating Teacher that consists of 12 items, another scale to evaluate the School Director of 6 items and the last of 4 items the Teaching Practice Office is evaluated.

Reliability data

To know the internal consistency of the instrument, a reliability analysis was performed using Cronbach's Alpha procedure. The analysis was performed for second semester 2016-2017. Results from the analysis shows a good reliability for the Teaching Practice Office Scale and a high reliability for the Supervisors of the Practicum, Cooperating Teacher, and School Director scales. See table below.

	N	Cronbach's Alpha
Supervisors of the Practicum	44	.91
Cooperating Teacher	46	.92
School Director	44	.91
Teaching Practice Office	44	.80

Administration: It was administered in the second semester of the 2016-2017 academic year. The results will be reviewed, and the results discussed in the next meeting of the CAECE Advisory Committee on Educational Clinical Experiences.

Note: The Evaluation of the Teacher Practice Experience instrument is presented in Addendum Report Evidence 5.4.

Title: Verify measures, analysis and sharing of completer impact data to ensure future improvement

Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Completer impact is evidenced in 5.4.1. Evidence regarding data, analysis and future plans from analysis regarding patterns and trends was unclear. For example, in the area of P12 student learning/development the future directions column stated:
"Strengthening of the Induction Program. See Planning Section."
No planning section on this document was found.

Response:
The planning section referred in the SSR was Section V Selected Improvement Plan. In this Addendum Report, this Plan is strengthened and is found in Section V: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP).

Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
SSR, p. 32, See Evidence 5.4.1 Monitoring and use of measures of completer impact and outcome measures; Evidence 5.4.2 EPP Enrollment, Retention, Graduation Rates and Benchmark Information by Program; Evidence 5.4.3 Longitudinal Analysis; 5.4.4 UPRRP Analysis of EPP Academic Programs; Analysis and Reflection of the EPP Academic Programs to improve retention and graduation rates.

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Where is the planning section for each action listed on 5.4.1? What are these plans? How are all stakeholders involved in these plans?

Actions listed for Impact Measures 1,2,3,4, and outcome measure #7 related to Standard 4, Program Impact are addressed in Section V, Selected Improvement Plan of the SSR and this Addendum.

Outcome measure #5 Completer graduation rate -EPP Student Affairs Deanship annual operational plan and resources listed in SSR Evidence **3.1.1**

RECRUITMENT, RETENTION, AND GRADUATION PLAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

1. **Insure retention and graduation of students in order to reduce social gaps**				
Goals and Objectives	**Strategies**	**Activities**	**Resources**	**Time Frame**
Objective 3.1. Increase retention rates to 75%. Increase graduation rates between 3 and 5% annually within the next two years	A. Review academic program: Course offer, schedule	Review course offer to insure that there are no conflicts between schedules and achieving the enrollment of the highest possible number of students	Department Directors	Twice per semester while preparing course schedule
	B. Expand summer services, distance education programs, and exchanges	Offer more summer courses	Directors and Professors	Summer

1. **Insure retention and graduation of students in order to reduce social gaps**				
Goals and Objectives	**Strategies**	**Activities**	**Resources**	**Time Frame**
	C. Strengthen academic guidance and counseling	Workshops, conferences, and meetings with students	Academic counselors and guides Student guides Program	Twice per semester
	D. Provide support to students with personal, financial, and mental health problems	Make referrals to appropriate personnel in each area	Deans, directors, academic advisors, and professors	Year round
	E. Strengthen intervention processes for students withdrawing from courses	Establish policy and protocol to work with course withdrawals	Student Affairs Dean, Directors, and Area Coordinators	March, 2015
	F. Celebrate recognition for goal achievement activities	Dean's Honor Roll Awards and Medals activity Assign a budget at the Office of the Dean level for these activities and to purchase the awards that will be presented in the activities	Student Affairs Office Director Academic Advisors Student Affairs Dean	December and May

1. **Insure retention and graduation of students in order to reduce social gaps**				
Goals and Objectives	**Strategies**	**Activities**	**Resources**	**Time Frame**
		Recognize students that have been able to get out of probationary status Identify funding from agencies and professional associations related to education		

Outcome measure # 6. Licensure rate is a shared responsibility of the EPP Academic Affairs Deanship and EPP Academic Departments

Stakeholders involved in these plans are:
-P-12 Interactive Committee: An annual meeting is celebrated where plans, actions, assessment data are shared and discussed to determine roles and strategies needed to solve important issues that have arisen.
- Puerto Rico Department of Education: Meetings are held to coordinate activities and develop processes to gather and analyze completers data and assessment results.
- School directors, private and public schools: Contacts by email, phone calls, school visits, meetings, attendance to seminars, conferences and congresses held by the EPP to gather and share data on assessment processes.
-Completers and cooperative teachers: contacts by email, phone calls, school visits, meetings, attendance to seminars, conferences and congresses held by the EPP to gather and share data on assessment processes.

Title: Verify systematic sharing of CAEP's eight outcome and impact
Measures

Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Specific information regarding how the eight outcomes and impact measure are shared with the community.

-P-12 Interactive Committee: An annual meeting is celebrated where plans, actions, assessment data are shared and discussed to determine roles and strategies needed to solve important issues that have arisen.

- Puerto Rico Department of Education: Meetings are held to coordinate activities and develop processes to gather and analyze completers data and assessment results.

- School directors, private and public schools: contacts by email, phone calls, school visits, meetings, attendance to seminars, conferences and congresses held by the EPP to gather and share data on assessment processes.

-Completers and cooperative teachers: contacts by email, phone calls, school visits, meetings, attendance to seminars, conferences and congresses held by the EPP to gather and share data on assessment processes.

- Office of Evaluation Bulletin Breves Apuntes, EMHCE WEB Page, Induction WEB page and Facebook

-*Teacher's Practice Blog (http://practicadocenteuprrp.wordpress.com)*

-http://paideia.uprrp.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/QUE-DICE-UN-GRUPO-DE-EGRESADOS-DE-LA-FACULTAD-DE-EDUCACION.pdf

Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

How does the EPP share the eight outcome and impact measures with the community? How are these measures used by all stakeholders to assess candidate impact?

Response:
In CAEP ACCREDITATION HANDBOOK, (Version 3- March 2016), STANDARD 5: Provider Quality, Continuous Improvement, and Capacity, page 64, it is stated referring to impact measure #8, Student loan default rates and other consumer information, that: "CAEP does not use consumer information in accreditation decision making"; therefore, the EPP submitted evidence of the 7 outcome and impact measures used by CAEP in accreditation decision making.
The EPP share the 7 outcome and impact measures with the community and stakeholders, using different strategies according to stakeholders' role.

-P-12 Interactive Committee: An annual meeting is celebrated where plans, actions, assessment data are shared and discussed to determine roles and strategies needed to solve important issues that have arisen.

- Puerto Rico Department of Education: Meetings are held to coordinate activities and develop processes to gather and analyze completers' data and assessment results.

- School directors, private and public schools: contacts by email, phone calls, school visits, meetings, attendance to seminars, conferences and congresses held by the EPP to gather and share data on assessment processes.

-Completers and cooperative teachers: contacts by email, phone calls, school visits, meetings, attendance to seminars, conferences and congresses held by the EPP to gather and share data on assessment processes.

- Office of Evaluation Bulletin Breves Apuntes, EMHCE WEB Page, Induction WEB page and Facebook

-Teacher's Practice Blog (http://practicadocenteuprrp.wordpress.com)

-Portfolio evidence and processes
https://sites.google.com/a/upr.edu/profesoresportae/home
and/https://sites.google.com/a/upr.edu/portae/.

-Collaborative Project to Support Neighboring Schools -
http://educacion.uprrp.edu/proyecto-colaborativo-de-acompanamiento-a-escuelas-aledanas-3

Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each.
Area for Improvement: Rationale

AFI: The EPP's quality assurance system for EPP created assessments may not rely on valid and reliable data.
Rationale: The EPP does not provide reliability and validity information on all EPP created assessments.

Reliability and validity information for all EPP created assessment is provided in this Addendum Report, Section: Quality assurance system instrument validity and reliability of Standard 5