

Formative Feedback Report for the Selected Improvement Pathway

I: Introduction

1. Brief overview of the Educator Preparation Provider (EPP): Context and unique characteristics; organization structure; vision, mission, and goals; shared values and beliefs; capacity tables

The EPP is a coed, public, comprehensive university with approximately 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students. Located in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, the EPP is a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) focused Land Grant, Sea Grant, and Space Grant serving institution. The EPP is distinguished as one of the leading institutions in the United States awarding degrees to Latinos in STEM fields (SSR, p. 1).

Organizationally, the Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) is headed by the Dean of Academic Affairs. According to the SSR, the TPP prepares teacher candidates in 12 areas: art, biology, business education, chemistry, English, history, mathematics, physical education, physical science, social studies, Spanish, and theater; however, physics is listed in some of the evidence, which would make 13 programs. The Math Education BS and Physical Education BA are offered by the Departments of Mathematical Sciences and Physical Education, respectively, and these two departments report to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The EPP also offer a program in agriculture and reports to the College of Agriculture, Department of Agricultural Education.

The mission of the TPP is aligned with the institutional mission of producing students who have the skills to "prevail in a democratic society" (SSR, p. 1). The TPP list ten core teacher candidate proficiencies that directly align with the InTASC Standards. The ten core proficiencies include content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, human development and learning, critical thinking, communication leadership skills, community building skills, assessment, caring dispositions, diversity, and reflective practice.

The EPP is regionally accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS). Prior to CAEP, the EPP was accredited by NCATE. Because of regional accreditation, the EPP is not required to complete capacity tables as part of this round of accreditation.

2. Summary of programs offered: Number, delivery mode, location(s)

The program offers three BS, Alternate Route (professional development route) programs, and 10 Alternate Route Programs. All programs are offered onsite at UPRM.

3. Special circumstances of the formative feedback review, if any

Numerous sources of evidence were submitted in Spanish. The EPP was given an opportunity to translate these into English, thus delaying the offsite visit.

II: Standard 1. Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The EPP uses candidate performance on Puerto Rico Teacher Certification Exams (PCMAS), the Classroom Observation Instrument, the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS), and GPA as the primary evidence for Standard 1.

Puerto Rico Teacher Certification Test (PCMAS) - Candidates in the Teacher Preparation Program and the Agricultural Education Department (AgED) must take the PCMAS (1.1.4b). The PCMAS are designed by the CollegeBoard to measure content knowledge and skills (SSR, p.11). Over a three year period (2014 to 2016), the aggregate pass rate among all program was 88% (153/174). Candidates in secondary English, Spanish, mathematics, and science had a 100% pass rate for the most recent year (1.1.3). Between the years 2010 to 2013, overall pass rates on the social studies test were below 70%. As such, the EPP did a transcript analysis and discovered that successful candidates had taken different courses than unsuccessful candidates. Based on these results, the Social Sciences Department and the TPP established specific courses in each of the five social science programs that are now required by all social science candidates before enrolling in the method's course (SSR, p. 16). The EPP reports an improvement in passing rates to 84% over the past three years. However, according to evidence 1.1.3, the most recent pass rate for 1016 was 67% (N = 6/9). Candidates in physical education and Agriculture do not take a specialized content test, but they are required to take the generalized elementary and secondary certification exams. Disaggregated data for the generalized tests are not provided for any programs. Instead, data for the generalized tests (evidence 1.1.4) are provided for all UPRM candidates and compared with the state scores. Data need to be disaggregated by program area. Furthermore, it is unclear as to how the specialized and generalize tests provide evidence for CAEP and/or InTASC standards. An alignment table would assist in determining the connection between the state tests and standards.

GPA - GPAs are provided as evidence for 1.1. Prior to 2016, candidates were required to have a 2.8 at all transition points. In fall 2016, the required GPA changed to a 3.0. The range of mean entry GPA across subject or content areas in 2015-2016 was 3.19 to 3.56, and the mean exit GPA across subject or content areas was 3.51 to 3.76 (1.1.5a). GPAs by program area are provided in evidence 1.1.5.b. These data suggest that candidates are mastering course content material. Evidence Table 1.1.5 provides alignment between courses and the InTASC standards. A description of the courses would assist in determining the link between the courses and the standards. Evidence 1.1.5b provides data on credits and GPA by program area. While it is clear that candidates in all program areas are required to take many credits in their content area, it is unclear as to how these data provide evidence for any particular standard. However, evidence 1.1.5b is one of the few sources of data provided specifically for the Agriculture and Physical Education programs. Unfortunately, the data are too broad to provide specific evidence for standards.

Classroom Observation Instrument (COI) - The EPP uses this instrument for formative and summative assessment during student teaching/teaching practice. Items on this instrument are aligned with Puerto Rico Professional Standards for Teachers (PR-PST), InTASC Standards, CAEP Standards, International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), and the TPP's ten candidate proficiencies. The COI originated from the Utah Valley University School of Education's "Continuum of Instructional Practice" instrument. The EPP, with permission from Utah Valley University, modified and adapted this instrument. The process involved translation from English to Spanish, followed by a back-translation from Spanish to English (SSR, p. 14). The instrument was then sent to clinical faculty and cooperating teachers in all licensure areas for content validity (evidence 5.2.1). A questionnaire was then emailed to clinical faculty, cooperating teachers, and school directors for feedback. Clinical faculty then met to align the items with standards. The instrument was piloted in fall of 2014, and minor revisions were made relative to language clarifications. All TPP specialty areas began using the instrument in spring 2015. Major revisions to the COI were made spring 2014 to spring 2015. As such, data from spring 14 are reported separately from the spring 2015 and spring 2016 data (evidence 1.1.2b). One of the major changes made to the instrument was moving from a 3-level rubric to a 4-level rubric. The four levels are: 1) emerging, 2) developing, 3) competent, and 4) exemplary. The EPP has established the acceptable level as level 3 - competent (evidence 5.2.1). It is unclear as to what the EPP deems as a "passing score" on the entire assessment. The COI consists of four categories: 1) Learner and Learning, 2) Content Knowledge, 3) Instructional Practice, and 4) Professional Responsibility. Aggregate data from the spring 2014 old instrument show all candidates meeting or exceeding the proficient target level. For the revised instrument, data provided are disaggregated by the following content areas by category: Art, English, Social Studies, History, Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Math, Business Administration, and Spanish (1.1.2b). For example, based on the revised instrument, spring 2015 averages for learner development within the Learner and Learning InTASC category ranged from 3.13 (Social Studies) to 4.0 (English and Business). Averages for spring 2016 ranged from 2.0 in physics (an example of where physics is mentioned, but not included as a program area in Table 2) to a 4.0 in English and Business Administration. Data from the other three InTASC categories follow the same trend in that for all categories 90% to 100% of candidates meet or exceed expectations on the scoring rubric. No data from the COI are reported for Agriculture and Physical Education programs. Relative to validity and reliability of the COI, more information is needed. While evidence 5.1.1 (p. 12 to 13) describes the steps taken for validity and reliability, no evidence or data were provided to support this claim. In addition, no data for theatre are provided.

Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) - The TCWS is an EPP wide assessment (Art, English, History, Social Studies, Biology, Math, Business Administration, Physics, and Spanish) that occurs at Transition Point 4, practice teaching. Candidates are required to demonstrate their ability to plan, implement, and evaluate a standards-based unit of instruction within a secondary school setting. Within this assessment, candidates are also required to demonstrate impact on

student learning (evidence 1.2.2). The scoring rubric for this assessment is included within the evidence (1.2.2) and includes purported alignment with the following standards: InTASC, TPP, PRDES, ISTE, and CAEP (pgs. 11-18). Three cycles of data are reported (evidence 1.1.2c) in a variety of ways: by InTASC standard for all programs, disaggregated by program for each InTASC category, by TCWS rubric indicator for all programs, and by TCWS rubric indicator by program. The scoring guide is on a 3-point scale: 1 - Indicator Not Met, 2 - Indicator Partially Met, and 3 - Indicator Met. The SSR reports that the majority of candidates are scoring at the target level; however, the "target level" is never defined. For example, the TCWS rubric is on a 3-point scale, but it is unclear if candidates need to score 2's, 3's, etc. to be at the "target level." Means are reported within the data tables (evidence 1.1.2c), but range is not included. There are clearly some candidates who score a 1 - Not Met (see chart within evidence 1.1.2c under section III. InTASC Instructional Practice in TCWS item Lesson & Unit Structure). It is unclear what happens if a candidate does not score at the "target level," nor is it clear what a candidate must score on each section of the rubric or on the entire rubric to reach the "target level." Furthermore, there are alignment issues within the scoring guide. For example, under the section for assessment on the TCWS scoring rubric (p. 16), the indicator "Multiple Modes and Approaches" is aligned with CAEP 2 and ISTE 2. CAEP 2 is regarding clinical experiences, so it is unclear how the rubric descriptor at any level (1, 2, or 3) provide evidence for CAEP Standard 2. ISTE 2 is regarding designing and developing digital-age learning experiences and assessments; however, the rubric descriptor for this item at a level 2 states "The assessment plan includes multiple modes, but all are either pencil/paper based (i.e. they are not performance assessments) and/or do not require the integration of knowledge, skills and reasoning ability." Alignment of this rubric descriptor with ISTE 2 is weak. This is just one example, as similar misalignment examples occur throughout the TCWS scoring rubric. Despite some alignment issues, the TCWS is a proprietary assessment with established validity. More information is needed on how the EPP has determined the reliability of scorers. No data are provided for PE, AgEd, or theatre.

Other evidence Presented:

1.4.4 - EDES 4006 Service Learning Guide - This assessment includes a description, scoring rubric, and data. No data were provided. This assessment was presented as providing evidence for Standard 1, component 1.4.

1.5.1 - Laboratory Lesson with Assessment Blog - this assessment includes a description, scoring rubric, and data. This assessment is intended to provide evidence for the cross-cutting theme of technology. Data are provided for 108 candidates. Data are not disaggregated by program area, nor is it clear if all candidates in the EPP must take this course. Furthermore, validity and reliability of the scoring guide are not addressed in the SSR.

A.1. Analysis of program-level data

Analyses of program-level data are limited to certain programs. For Agricultural Education and Physical Education, only GPA data and PCMAS generalized tests

scores are presented. Data are not presented for the COI or the TCWS. Furthermore, the PCMAS data are not disaggregated by program area, thus making difficulty in determining competency.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. UPRM TPP Alignment with Applicable Professional Standards (1.1.1a)
2. InTASC alignment with UPRM TPP Candidate Proficiencies and Standards (1.1.1b)
3. Classroom Observation Instrument with Rubric (1.1.2)
4. InTASC Standards in Observation Instrument (1.1.2b)
5. InTASC Standards demonstrated in TCWS (1.1.2c)
6. Evidence and analysis of PCMAS Specialty (1.1.3)
7. Evidence and analysis of PCMAS fundamentals & Pedagogical Knowledge (1.1.4)
8. College Board PRDE UPRM Teacher Preparation Program Rating (1.1.4a)
9. CC 23-2015-2016 Public Policy on PCMAS (1.1.4b)
10. Program Progression by Transition Point & InTASC (1.1.5)
11. GPA Learner Courses (1.1.5a)
12. Evidence of Content Knowledge Number of Specialization Credits & GPA (1.1.5b)
13. MSCHE-UPRM Final Study Report (1.1.7)
14. UPRM Strategic Plan 2012-2022 (1.1.8)
15. Research and Evidence in TCWS (1.2.1a)
16. Research and Evidence Classroom Observation Instrument (1.2.1b)
17. TCWS Manual with Standards Alignment (1.2.2)
18. Apply Content and Pedagogical Knowledge to meet Standards (1.3.1)
19. Application of Content in TCWS (1.3.1b)
20. Pedagogical Content Knowledge demonstrated in TCWS (1.3.1d)
21. PRDE Teacher Professional Standards Translated (1.3.2b)
22. PCMAS Report and Tables (1.3.3b)
23. Boletin PCMAS General (1.3.3c)
24. PCMAS Fundamental Report and Tables (1.3.3d)
25. Apply Content and Pedagogical Knowledge to Meet Standards (1.4.1)
26. PRDE Standards are College and Career Ready (1.4.2)
27. Introduction to PR Academic Standards (1.4.2b)
28. Candidate Background College and Career Ready Commitment (1.4.3a)
29. Service Learning Field Experience Exceptional Child Rubric (1.4.4)
30. EDPE 3129 Laboratory Lesson with Assessment in Blog (1.5.1)
31. Candidates Model and Apply Technology Standards in the Classroom (1.5.2)
32. UPRM SimSchool in Methodology (1.5.3)
33. SimSchool Overview 2016 (1.5.3a)
34. Technology Learning Opportunities Progression (1.5.4)

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Component 1.1 - Evidence from 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 do not include AgEd, PE, and theater programs.
2. Component 1.1 - Evidence form 1.1.5b are broad and lacking alignment to standards.

3. Component 1.1 - Evidence from 1.2.1b, 1.12c, and 1.3.1b do not include AgEd, PE, and theater.
4. Component 1.2 - no data provided for AgEd, PE, and theater (evidence 1.2.1a and 1.2.1b).
5. Component 1.3 - Evidence 1.3.1 needs to be disaggregated by program area.
6. Component 1.3 - No evidence provided for Agriculture or Physical Education programs.
7. Component 1.3 - No alignment chart provided for PCMAS tests and state standards, nor CAEP component 1.3.
8. Component 1.4 - No alignment chart provided for PCMAS tests and state standards, nor CAEP component 1.4.
9. Component 1.4 - Evidence 1.4.1 need to be disaggregated by program area.
10. Component 1.4 - Evidence 1.4.4 needs clarifying in that it is not clear as to which candidates complete this assessment and how validity and reliability of the instrument were established.
11. Component 1.5 - Evidence 1.5.1 needs clarifying in that it is not clear as to which candidates complete this assessment and how validity and reliability of the instrument were established.
12. Component 1.5 - Evidence from 1.5.2 need to be disaggregated by program area.
13. Component 1.5 - Unclear as to how 1.5.3, 1.5.3a, and 1.5.4 provide evidence linked to candidate competency.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Tasks

Title: Standard 1 Task 1: Explore the alignment of the PCMAS (Professional and Generalized) with CAEP Standard 1 components and/or InTASC Standards and determine how data provide evidence of aligned standards for each program area.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) How do these tests specifically align with CAEP Standard 1 and/or InTASC standards?

(2) Are disaggregated data available for all program areas for both PCMAS tests - professional and generalized?

(3)

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed

1.

(1) "The TPP and the AgED use Puerto Rico's annual Teacher Certification Test Results to evaluate how well their respective programs are preparing candidates to meet PURM and DEPR teacher requirements, particularly the requirements regarding content and pedagogical knowledge" (SSR, p. 13).

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

(1) Per evidence 1.1.4b, is there now a cut score and if so, what would the pass rate be by program area based on the new cut score?

(2) Theater is listed as a program area within Table 2. Program Characteristics, p. 4; however, no data are provided for this program. Does it still exist?

(3) Physics is listed in some data tables, but not in Table 2. Program Characteristics. Please clarify.

Title: Standard 1 Task 2: Explore how GPA data in evidences 1.1.5 and 1.1.5b provide evidence for InTASC and CAEP standards specific to each program area.

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

2. (1) How do data in 1.1.5a provide evidence for specific program areas within the TPP?
- (2) Is there a description of courses used in obtaining GPAs with alignment to CAEP, InTASC, and State standards that assist in clearly making the connection between the courses and the standards?

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

Title: Standard 1 Task 3: Clarify which programs use the revised Classroom Observation Instrument (COI) and the TCWS?

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

3. (1) What assessment for classroom observation (practice teaching) is used by Agriculture Education, Physical Education, Theater, Physical Science, and Chemistry? Are data available from such an assessment?
- (2) Do data exist for Agriculture Education, Physical Education, Theater, Physical Science, and Chemistry for the TCWS?

B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

- (1) Within the old version of the Classroom Observation Instrument, data for Spanish were included. In the new version of this assessment, data for Spanish were not included. What data exist for candidates in Spanish relative to the revised Classroom Observation instrument?
- (2) If Agriculture Education, Physical Education, and Theater do not use the COI, what is used instead?
- (3) If Agriculture, Physical Education, and Theater do not use the TCWS, what is used instead?

Title: Standard 1 Task 4: Clarify the process used to establish validity and reliability of the COI, EDES 4006 Service Learning Guide, & EDPE 3129 Laboratory Assignment and reliability of the Teacher Candidate Work Sample?

4. A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Verify the process used in 5.2.1 and provide data for validity and reliability.

(2) Translate evidence 5.2.1a

- B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
- C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews

3. Preliminary recommendations for new areas for improvement (AFIs) including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The current depth and breadth of data do not substantiate the claims made with the provided data.	The lack of disaggregated data across all programs makes it difficult to determine if claims are valid.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 2. Clinical Partnerships and Practice

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings.

Evidence exists that clinical practices are required for the preparation of teacher candidates in Puerto Rico (2.1.1 Law 129 Regulating Clinical Education Experiences in Puerto Rico- Motivation and 2.1.2. PRDE Policy Letter 2-2012-2013). However, additional evidence is needed that supports whether clinical practices and candidate expectations are co-constructed, designed, implemented, and evaluated in collaboration and with shared responsibility from all clinical partners. The principle components of the EPP are the Teacher Preparation Program (TPP) and the Department of Agriculture Education (EDAG). The self-study reports that programs in these components share the same conceptual framework and philosophy, promote the same ten candidate proficiencies, and use the same stages in the formative assessment model. However, further evidence is needed that ensures each component collaborates with all partners to ensure high-quality and diverse clinical practices.

In Puerto Rico, the Teaching Practice Programs (TPP) of higher education institutions the Educational Practice Experience Centers (EPEC) are governed by laws and policies of the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE). Representatives of each meet monthly to discuss matters related to clinical experiences (2.1.3 Examples of PRDE Meeting Agendas & Invitations). The PRDE requires that cooperating teachers initially complete a 45-hour course which expires every five years, and to re-certify, they must take an additional 15-hour course. The course is offered online and onsite by the EPP with an agenda prepared by the PRDE in collaboration with TPP directors of all higher education institutions. The self-study reports that partners mutually agree on candidate placements and cooperating teacher selections every semester, but it is unclear which partners have decision-making responsibility in those decisions. The self study also reports that expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit are established in the PRDE Regulations for Teacher Certification. It is unclear what role and shared responsibility the EPECs and TPPs have in the co-construction of those expectations. There is limited evidence of a shared responsibility model with on-going decision-making that includes all partners in the co-construction of assessments, criteria for selection of cooperating teachers, and expectations for candidate preparation and placement.

The self study, the UPRM Undergraduate Catalog (2.2.2), and the UPRM TPP Assessment System Procedures Guide (5.1.1) report that candidates must successfully complete expectations at four transition points which establish candidate qualifications, course sequences, and benchmark assessments required for certification. To enroll in the student teaching clinical experience (Transition #3), candidates must complete the Theory and Methodology course with a grade of B or better, score 80% or higher on the Educational Philosophy Essay Rubric and the Teacher Work Sample Rubric within the e-Portfolio. Candidates must score 80% or higher on the Classroom Observation Instrument and 80% or higher on the Teacher Work Sample Rubric for program completion (Transition

Point #4).

Evidence supports that clinical experiences are sequential (Teaching Practice Manual). Candidates in the TPP participate in 15-hours of classroom observation in a special education classroom at either a public or private school before the student teaching clinical experience. It is unclear if this observation experience is tied to a specific course and if all EPP candidates complete this requirement. In addition, 15 classroom observation hours tied to a methodology course in a specific content area are required. A minimum of 300-hours is required during the student teaching clinical experience. In the TPP student teaching clinical experience, there are two key assessments: the Classroom Observation Instrument and Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) with an e-Portfolio. University supervisors and cooperating teachers use the Classroom Observation Instrument to evaluate each candidate on six or more occasions (three formative and three summative). The TCWS includes artifacts such as lesson or unit plans, exams with analyses, and classroom management techniques. Candidates also complete a group exit interview with the TPP director. Although reported in the self-study, no information or data from these interviews were provided. Candidates in the EDAG program complete two semesters of a clinical practicum for a minimum of 315-hours. Evidence was limited regarding the details of these two experiences and if there are additional field placements required of EDAG candidates prior to the first clinical practicum.

Before the student teaching clinical experience, the self-study reports that TPP candidates participate in classroom observations in elementary and secondary level schools; and that schools in elementary and intermediate levels are usually located in rural areas and secondary schools are usually located in urban areas. The self-study report also indicates that at the beginning of each school semester, TPP and EDAG directors meet with the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education of each educational region to discuss placements of candidates and selections of CTs. However, it is unclear if all candidates have both urban/rural and elementary/secondary experiences in these diverse settings. From 2013 to 2016, with the authorization of PRDE, the TPP placed elementary and secondary candidates in approximately 43 EPECs, of which 29 are located in urban zones and 14 in rural zones. The EDAG placed agriculture candidates in approximately 36 EPECs, of which 19 were in the rural areas and 17 in the urban areas.

The self study indicated that the TPP collaborates with partners to evaluate clinical experiences. For example, in fall 2014, faculty revised the Classroom Observation Instrument to align with the 2013 INTASC standards, the revised PRDE Professional Standards, the indicators in the 2014 PR Core Content Standards, and new PRDE lesson planning guidelines. The TPP adapted the Utah Valley University School of Education's Continuum of Instructional Practice with their permission to create the Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice Improvement. The instrument was distributed to superintendents, principals, supervisors, TPP and clinical faculty, and cooperating teachers in each licensure specialty for content validity. A follow-up questionnaire was e-mailed to solicit suggestions and recommendations about the new instrument. Representatives of

all partners met to align the instrument (2.2.4 Meetings with Cooperative Teachers, Directors and Supervisors to Evaluate the Observation Rubric) to the standards, UPRM student learning outcomes, and TPP Conceptual Framework (2.2.3a Conceptual Framework Specific Evidences). After a pilot test, further revisions were made for language clarification. During the 2015 spring semester, all of the TPP specialty areas implemented the Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice Improvement (5.2.1: Classroom Observation Instrument and Design and Use). A faculty Data Day Retreat was scheduled for fall 2016 and results from this retreat need to be verified. The evidence is also needed regarding the participation of P-12 partners in the creation, revision, use, and assessment of this instrument. Additionally, it is unclear if all EPP programs use this instrument.

According to the self-study, accountability for evaluating cooperating teachers, supervisors, and candidates are demonstrated through a collection of data from several instruments, and results are discussed with faculty and supervisors for decision making and assessment of clinical experiences. This will need to be verified at on-site visit. The TPP and EDAG collect data annually from candidates, alumni, cooperating teachers, and school principals by several surveys: the End of Program Survey, Cooperating Teacher Survey, Clinical Experience Supervisor Survey, Alumni Survey, and Practice Center Principal Survey. This information has brought about programmatic changes. In the 2014 End of Program Survey, candidates made recommendations for improving technology resources. The 2015 Alumni Survey repeated similar concerns regarding technology resources and the integration of technology in coursework. Subsequently, the TPP remodeled its facilities to provide an additional computer center and add smart boards and data displays to several classrooms. Also in response to End of Program Survey data, the Resource Center for Investigation and Educational Services (in Spanish CRUISE) was created to address candidate concerns regarding resources available to them in preparation for their student teaching clinical experience. CRUISE has received external funding by conducting professional development for PRDE teachers that has served to sponsor TPP educational research. CRUISE continues to conduct research and professional development with candidates, faculty, and P-12 partners. However, no evidence was provided about CRUISE and the role of all partners in its operation.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Observation Instrument of Teaching Practice Improvement (5.2.1)
2. UPRM TPP Assessment System Procedures Guide (5.1.1)
3. Teaching Practice Manual (2)
4. TPP UPRM Description and Transition Points 2016-17 Undergraduate Catalog (2.2.2)
5. Candidate Placements and Cooperative Teachers (2.2.1)
6. Conceptual Framework Specific Evidences (2.2.3a)
7. Meetings with Cooperative Teachers, Directors and Supervisors to Evaluate the Observation Rubric (2.2.4)

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Component 2.1 Clinical Partnership and Practice - Partners Co-construct Mutually Beneficial P-12 Partnership: Mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation and exit are established in the PRDE Regulations for Teacher Certification 2012. This appears to be inconsistent with a system in which partners "co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements....and mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit."

2. 2.1.1 Law 129 Regulating Clinical Education Experiences in Puerto Rico- Motivation (needs to be translated and verified.)
3. 2.1.2. PRDE Policy Letter 2-2012-2013 (needs to be translated and verified.)
4. 2.1.3 Examples of PRDE Meeting Agendas & Invitations (2 examples included but more information is needed)
5. Component 2.2 Partners Co-select, Prepare, Evaluate, Support, and Retain High-quality Clinical Educators: All clinical collaborations are governed by the Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) through dispositions in Law 129 of 2016 and Policy Letter 2-2012-2013 which regulate the operation of Educational Practice Experience Centers (EPEC) in Puerto Rico. This appears to be inconsistent with a system in which partners "co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical e
6. 2.2.1 Candidate Placements and Cooperative Teachers (list of placements but does not address how partners assist in those placement decisions)
7. 2.2.3 Official Placement Letters School Directors and CT - Examples
8. Component 2.3 Partners design high-quality clinical experiences: Evidence is lacking that ensures all partners share in the responsibility of design, delivery, and evaluation of clinical experiences.
9. 2.3.1 Best Highly Qualified Cooperative Teachers (list of qualifications of CT but does not address how CTs assist in designing high-quality experiences)
10. 2.3.2 Best Faculty and Clinical Experience Supervisors (list of qualifications of supervisors but does not address how supervisors assist in designing high-quality experiences)

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

Title: Investigate in more detail how the EPP ensures that all candidates have experiences in diverse settings

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Data on candidates' experiences - documentation is needed to ensure each candidate has experiences in diverse settings.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- (1) The 15-hour experience before student teaching "allows candidates to become acquainted with the EPEC where they will probably complete their clinical experience. Candidates may choose another school to complete their clinical requirements." Do some candidates have all field experiences at one site? How does the EPP ensure that all candidates have a diversity of placements?

1. (2) The self-study reports that TPP candidates participate in classroom observations in elementary and secondary level schools and in rural and urban. Do all candidates have both urban/rural and elementary/secondary experiences in diverse settings?

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

- (1) Field experiences of candidates: Who chooses and tracks the placement assignments for an individual candidate? If candidates self-select their placements, how does the EPP ensure diverse field experiences for all candidates?

- (2) Exit interviews (found in UPRM TPP Assessment System Guide): Who conducts the interviews, what data are collected from the interviews, and how are data used for program improvement?

- (3) Special education field placement: Is the special education field placement required by all programs? Is this placement tied to a specific course?

Title: Explore the EPP's definition of partners including the nature and role of the PRDE, school partners, and TPP faculty and clinical faculty towards ongoing decision-making, co-construction of assessments and criteria for selection of mentor teachers

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Surveys reported in the self-study that candidates, clinical supervisors, principals, and cooperating teachers complete: End of Program Survey, Alumni Survey (4.4.3), Principal Survey, Clinical Experience Supervisor Survey, and Cooperating Teacher Survey. A copy of the Alumni Survey was the only survey provided in the SSR.

- (2) Participation of all partners in the development, revision, instruction, and evaluation of course required for cooperating teacher

- (3) Role of each partner in cooperating teacher selections and evaluations

- (4) Role of each partner in determining the placements, evaluations, and expectations for candidates

- (5) Information about CRUISE structure, research and professional development offerings

2. B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- (1) To become certified as a CT, teachers should take a 45-hour course which expires every 5-years. Should or must? What role do the P-12 partners have in this course delivery, design, and evaluation?

- (2) Candidate placements and selection of cooperating teachers for each EPEC are discussed every semester (2.2.1) with faculty and clinical supervisors and used for decision making and assessment of clinical experiences. This needs to be verified on-site. What role do P-12 partners have in these discussions about candidate placements and selection of CTs?

- (3) Official placement letters are sent to School Directors and CT at the EPEC where candidates will carry out their clinical practice (2.2.3 & 2.2.3a). Sent by whom?

- (4) A clinical faculty Data Day Retreat was scheduled for fall 2016 to discuss the pilot study for the modified Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice Improvement. Results from this retreat need to be verified.

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

- (1) How is feedback from all partners (CTs, supervisors, TPP and clinical faculty, and candidates) solicited and used for clinical field experience improvement?
- (2) What evidence exists that P-12 partners are involved in creating and revising data driven assessments?
- (3) According to self study, the TPP and EDAG work in different ways with the PRDE to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure the candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students learning and development. What different ways? Evidence was limited regarding the details of the two student teaching experiences in the EDAG program and if other field experience hours are required before.
- (4) Who oversees field placements and partnerships? Faculty representative? Committee?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The criteria for clinical experiences do not fully describe a process by which partners, "co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators." (Component 2.2).	Evidence that describes partner roles and shared responsibilities for clinical experiences is incomplete.
The criteria for clinical experiences do not fully describe a process by which partners, "co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements...and mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit."(Component 2.1).	Evidence that describes partner roles and shared responsibilities for clinical experiences is incomplete.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The Self-Study Report (SSR) states that the TPP recruits diverse candidates through four major activities a year: 1) annual UPRM Open House and UPR Expo for all public and private high schools in Puerto Rico, 2) first-year student orientations where TPP admission information is provided, 3) Foundations of Education course which UPRM students can take as an elective, and 4) updated information about the TPP offered by diverse academic counselors in various departments. The departments of Agriculture, Math, and Physical Education recruit through the UPRM Admission's Office. However, there are no evidence of a strategic five-year recruitment plan with baseline points and/or goals. No evidence was provided to show that recruitment results are recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies. Responses to a question on the PCMAS survey (Evidence 1.4.3.a) for the years 2014-2016 regarding monthly family income showed that over 46 percent of the reported annual family incomes were below the federal poverty level for a family of one. In addition, it was stated that two out of three responders reported annual family incomes below the federal poverty level for a family of two for 2013-2016. Another question on the PCMAS survey asked for the type of high school attended. For the years 2014-2016, 77 percent of the responders attended a public school. Fifteen percent attended a private school with teaching predominantly in Spanish, and eight percent attended a private school with teaching predominantly in English. Disaggregated data on candidates by relevant demographics such as race/ethnicity and/or sex were not provided. The SSR reports that the TPP and EDAP directors receive monthly orientations regarding the national and local teacher recruitment needs with officials from the Institute for the Professional Development for Educators at the PRDE and the Educational Clinical Experience Program. Each region also has a website for special recruitment regarding areas of urgent hiring needs in Puerto Rico. Evidence was provided of recruiting agencies and the specialties needed for the past three years (Evidence 3.1.2). Evidence was not provided to show, through a recruitment plan, that the provider has moved toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement. No evidence was provided to show that the EPP monitors the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns.

There is a required minimum admission index (IMA) for each department based on a combination of 50 percent high school GPA and 50 percent College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) scores in Verbal and Math (Evidence 3.1.1). The SSR states that the 2013-2014 TPP candidate cohort had an admission index GPA average of 3.64, the 2014-15 cohort had an average of 3.74, and the cohort of 2015-2016 had an average of 3.66, all well above the CAEP 3.00 minima. However, the evidence cited (3.2.1) did not support the narrative in the SSR. CEEB scores in Verbal and Mathematical Reasoning of cohorts admitted to Math, Physical Education, and Agriculture education programs in the years 2013-2016 (Evidence 3.2.3) showed cohorts scoring in the 60th to 70th percentile, meeting the CAEP minima of scoring in the top 50%. For all potential teacher candidates,

2013-2016, scores were also in the 60th percentile or above. Data was not disaggregated by year, however.

The TPP has constructed a Dispositions of Teachers instrument (3.3.3a) to monitor attributes and dispositions of candidates three times throughout their program: during their first year, in their methodology course, and at the end of their clinical practice. The instrument reportedly was to be used for the first time during the first semester of the 2016-17 school year. Thus no data was provided at this time. It is not clear as to how candidates' dispositions are evaluated and monitored throughout the program based on their ranking of the importance of teacher dispositions. According to the SSR, during clinical observation, the clinical experience supervisor notes on the observation instrument if these dispositions are present in the candidates' performance. Also stated is that the TPP observes candidates' dispositions in all of the candidates' courses. Candidates with unsatisfactory ratings on the "Dispositions test" or not presenting satisfactory dispositions to teach are directed to career counseling. It is not clear as to what "Dispositions test" is being referred to since the Dispositions of Teachers instrument is a ranking tool. The administration and purpose of the instrument are clear and items align with InTASC standards. However, it appears to be a self-reporting system for candidate dispositions. It is unclear if candidates' nonacademic behaviors are monitored and/or assessed by the EPP.

Evidence shows there are four key transition points of candidate progression in the TPP (TPP Conceptual Framework, pp. 44-51): 1) Entrance to the Teacher Preparation Program of Secondary Education, 2) Enrollment in Theory and Methodology Course, 3) Admission to Student Teaching, and 4) Program Completion. The EDAG also has four key transition points (TPP Conceptual Framework, pp. 52-58): 1) Admission to the Agriculture Teacher Preparation Program, 2) Completion of Organization and Administration in Vocational Agricultural course, 3) Admission to Student Teaching Practice Courses, and 4) Exit from the Teaching Practice Course. Criteria for monitoring/assessing candidates' development throughout preparation is evident in both programs through monitoring of overall and major GPAs, course completion with a 3.0 GPA or better, satisfactory completion of College Board essay, 80% or higher on the e-portfolio with TCWS, and Classroom Observation Instrument /Student Teaching Evaluation, in addition to other required course work and program specific rubrics. Results and candidates' progressions criteria are used in the following ways: program and course recommendations are made based on academic progress in courses; essay results are the basis for recommending specific actions in a group candidate interview; unsatisfactory ratings on the Writing Skills test are advised to take a writing course or use the tutoring services; candidates with unsatisfactory ratings on the Dispositions test or not presenting satisfactory dispositions to teach are directed to career counseling; candidates not presenting a satisfactory level of performance are advised to take or repeat the appropriate courses. The UPRM assessment board uses PCMAS results to identify strengths and weaknesses in the existing curricula (Evidence 5.1.1). For example, methodology and student teaching courses were revised in response to an analysis of PCMAS content test results. Also, due to lower passing rates by social

studies candidates, special history courses are now required before social science candidates enroll in teaching practice.

Evidence from the results of the PCMAS, 2014-2016, shows that 87 percent of UPRM graduates passed (Evidence 3.5.1). The passing rate by year is as follows: 2014 - 86%, 2015 - 87%, and 2016 - 91%. UPRM had a higher percentage rate of passage than the 76% passage rate of all students who took the PCMAS. In addition, UPRM teacher candidates passed at a higher percentage rate in each content area than all students who took the PCMAS in each content area.

Evidence from the TCWS, spring 2014-spring 2016 (Evidence 1.1.2.c), from a sample of 78 candidates in nine licensure areas used in Transition Point 4 shows that 100 percent of this group of candidates demonstrated an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards in the four categories: Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice and Professional Responsibility. In addition, the TPP collected samples of the Classroom Observation evaluation instrument (Evidence 1.1.2.b) over three spring semesters, 2014-2016. The samples are the final evaluations of 99 candidates in eight licensure areas by their university supervisors. One hundred percent of the teacher candidates demonstrated target level understanding and performance in each of the four categories of the 10 InTASC standards.

According to the SSR, before recommending any candidate for licensure or certification, the TPP documents the candidate's understanding of the expectations of the profession, including codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, and relevant laws and policies. The SSR states that in the methodology and clinical experience courses, PRDE and InTASC standards are discussed and applied, and additional codes of ethics are required in the methodology science course. Professionalism and ethics are also discussed throughout the Philosophical Foundations of Education courses. Teacher candidates are required to take a seminar on the Nature and Needs of Exceptional Children where relevant laws and policies are addressed. Evidence that teacher candidates are applying professional standards and ethics can be found on the Revised Classroom Observation Instrument for the Professional Responsibility criteria (Spring 2015 & 2016), where 90 percent of teacher candidates scored the target "competent" or better (Evidence 1.1.2.b). Specifically, candidates scored 100 percent and 98 percent, respectively, on the following two items: 1) projects a professional, responsible and ethical image in their behavior, clothing, documents and participation of PPMES and practice center; 2) advocates, models, and teaches safe, legal, and ethical behavior including the use of information and technology. Although five questions from the PCMAS candidate survey were provided as evidence about teaching preparation and teaching experience (Evidence 3.6.1), the questions did not specifically address the candidate's understanding of codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, or relevant laws and policies.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1.
2.
3.
4.

5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1.
2.
3.
4.

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary.

Task

Title: Review a five-year recruitment plan, based on mission, with baseline points and goals (including academic ability, diversity, and employment needs)

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1)
- (2)

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

1.
- (2)

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

- (1)
 - (2)
-

(3) and modification of recruitment strategies?

(4) How has the recruitment plan and its implementation moved you toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement?

(5) How do you monitor the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns?

Title: Average admission index GPAs for cohorts

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Average admission index GPAs for cohorts 2013-2014 to 2015-2016

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

2. (1) "The 2013-2014 cohort of 84 candidates had an admission index average of 3.64; a specialization index of 3.50, a professional index of 3.61 and the cohort completed their bachelors with a general GPA of 3.19. The 2014-2015 cohort of 70 candidates had an average admission index of 3.74, a specialization of 3.67, a professional index of 3.70 and completed their bachelor's degree with a general GPA of 3.38. The 2015-2016 cohort of 63 had an average admission index of 3.66...GPA of 3.25."

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

(1) Can you provide evidence of the average admission index GPAs for cohorts for the past three years?

Title: Clarification of the use of the Dispositions of Teachers instrument

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) Fall 2016 Dispositions of Teachers instrument results

(2) Use of the results of the Dispositions instrument

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

3. (1) "In order to monitor our TPP candidates' teaching dispositions, we will administer this survey to candidates at three different points: 1) in their first year 2) during their methodology course; and 3) at the end of their clinical practice. This will provide the opportunity to observe candidates' progression and if there has been a change in their teaching dispositions."

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

(1) How will the rankings of dispositions by candidates be used in determining a candidate's progression or change in their teaching dispositions?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
It is not evident that a five-year strategic recruitment plan is in place.	Although four recruitment activities are held each year, it is not evident that they are part of a recruitment plan, based on a mission, with baseline points and goals, or that recruitment results are recorded, monitored, or used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

II: Standard 4. Program Impact

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The EPP provides the following evidence for Standard 4 components:

UPRM TPP has collected data since 2006 about the quality of the teacher candidates it prepares but has never completed follow-up studies of program completers. The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) developed a pilot study that tested evaluation instruments and methodology with 20% of the PRDE teaching force. UPRM TPP has requested this data but has not received a copy of the federal report based on that study. Therefore, at this time limited data was presented. Instead, the EPP presented a pilot study (Mixed Methods Research Plan 4.1.3) of how data was going to be collected on completers and employer satisfaction was submitted. The goal of the Mixed Methods Research Plan is to explore the impact of completer's preparation on P-12 student learning and development growth.

The EPP did provide the PRDE Presentation of the Teacher Effectiveness Study (4.1.1) as evidence for Standard 4.1. However, it was previously requested that this document is translated into English. At the time of writing this document (2/12/17), the PRDE Presentation of the Teacher Effectiveness Study was still not translated for CAEP review.

The only data provided by the EPP was the 2015 pilot studies of employer (4.3.3) and completer (4.4.3) satisfaction surveys. However, there was a very low survey response rate for employer satisfaction survey (i.e., only three school districts answered) and the completer satisfaction survey (36 alumni from May 2010-May 2015). Results of these one-time pilot studies were used to create the updated documents posted in the Mixed Methods Research Plan (4.1.3) to be used Fall 2016.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. 4.3.3 Employer Satisfaction Survey (Pilot)

2. 4.4 Completers Satisfaction Survey (Pilot)

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. 1. 4.1.3 Mixed Methods Research Plan (First used Fall 2016) that includes:

2. a. 4.1.3 Abbreviated Teacher Work Sample (ATWS)

3. b. 4.2.1 Danielson's Observation Rubric

4. c. 4.2.2 Tripod Student Surveys

5. d. 4.3.1 Employer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance

6. e. 4.3.2 UPRM Teacher Preparation Program Employer Survey

7. f. 4.4.1 Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance

8. g. 4.4.2 UPRM Alumni Survey

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

Title: Standard 4 Task 1

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) A description of a Mixed Methods Research Plan (4.1.3) was given but no data are reported.

(2) The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) presented a pilot plan to evaluate teacher effectiveness (1/2015), but results are not reported because the report has not been received from the PRDE.

(3) The Abbreviated Teacher Work Sample (ATWS; 4.1.3) was provided but more information is needed to determine the reliability and validity of this instrument.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Data from the 2015 pilot study.

(2) The Abbreviated Teacher Work Sample (ATWS; 4.1.3)

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

(1) Exactly what data from the Mixed Methods Research Plan (4.1.3) will provide evidence for component 4.1?

(2) Are data available from Fall 2016 for the ATWS?

(3) Are data available from PRDE initial pilot study?

(4) How will the data be used from the Mixed Methods Research Plan (4.1.3) for program improvement?

(5) Where will the funds for the \$100 stipend per collaborator come from for the ATWS and is this sustainable?

(6) Who will train the evaluators of the ATWS in the three-day workshop? What will the training include?

(7) Was the ATWS tested for reliability and validity prior to its use?

Title: Standard 4 Task 2

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) The Danielson's Observation Rubric (4.2.1) and The Tripod Student Surveys (4.2.2) are provided, but more information is needed to determine the logistics of both the Danielson's Observation.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

(1) Danielson's Observation Rubric (4.2.1)

(2) The Tripod Student Surveys (4.2.2)

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

2. (1) Who will train the evaluators of Danielson's Observation Rubric and The Tripod Student Surveys in the three-day workshop? What will the training include?
- (2) What data will be presented and how will the data from Danielson's Observation Rubric be used for program improvement?
- (3) How will the data from The Tripod Student Surveys be used for program improvement?
- (4) What justification exists for why only four schools with two alumni teachers each will be used for The Tripod Student Surveys (ie. target of only 8 to 10 teachers).
- (5) Are data available from Fall 2016 for Danielson's Observation Rubric and the Tripod Student Surveys?

Title: Standard 4 Task 3

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Employer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance (4.3.1) was provided but more information is needed to determine the logistics of the Employer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance.
- (2) UPRM TPP Employer Survey (4.3.3) was provided but more information is needed to determine the logistics of the UPRM TPP Employer Survey.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- (1) Employer Interview Protocol (4.3.1)
- (2) UPRM TPP Employer Survey (4.3.2)

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

- (1) What evidence exists that the UPRM TPP Employer Survey is reliable and valid?
- (2) What evidence exists that the initial pilot test of the Employer Satisfaction Survey was reliable and valid.
- (3) How will the data from Employer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance and the UPRM TPP Employer Survey be used for program improvement?
- (4) What justification exists for two rounds of emails of employer surveys?
- (5) Are data available from Fall 2016 for the Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance and the UPRM TPP Employer Survey?

Title: Standard 4 Task 4

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) The Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance (4.4.1) is provided. More information is needed to determine the logistics of The Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance.
- (2) The UPRM TPP Alumni Survey is provided (4.2.2). More information is needed to determine the logistics of the UPRM TPP Alumni Survey.
- (3) A pilot test of the Completers Satisfaction Survey (4.4) was provided (administered May 2015). More information is needed to determine the logistics of the Completers Satisfaction Survey.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- (1) The Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance (4.4.1)
- (2) The UPRM TPP Alumni Survey (4.2.2)

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

- (1) How will the data from the Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance be used for program improvement?
- (2) How will the data from the UPRM TPP Alumni Survey be used for program improvement?
- (3) What evidence exists that the UPRM TPP Alumni Survey is reliable and valid?
- (4) What evidence exists that the pilot Completer Satisfaction Survey is reliable and valid?
- (5) Exactly how will data from the Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance provide evidence for 4.4?
- (6) Are data available from Fall 2016 for the Completer Interview Protocol for Evaluating Teacher Performance UPRM TPP Alumni Survey?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement	Rationale
There is not sufficient evidence for determining the impact of completers on neither P-12 learning nor the candidates' satisfaction with the content and effectiveness of their teacher education preparation.	CAEP standards require the EPP to provide evidence from several measures for all tasks in Standard 4. No data (other than pilot study results) were presented at this time. Instead, a proposed Mixed Method Research Plan (4.1.3) be piloted in the fall 2016 was submitted.

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each

Stipulation	Rationale

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

1. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

A. Narrative analysis of preliminary findings

The EPP's quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that monitor a variety of outcomes, including candidate proficiencies and progress, completer achievements, and operational effectiveness. With regards to the candidate proficiencies, Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015, p. 7) states, "The collection of information on candidate proficiencies occurs on a continual basis. The unit's conceptual framework links course work to the assessment system to systematically monitor a candidate's progression through the program. Through coursework, field experiences, and clinical experiences, candidate progress are regularly reviewed, and the candidate advised accordingly." In addressing candidate progress Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015, p. 14) delineates multiple assessment measures at transition points across various programs. The measures include the following: 1) an admission index is based on high school GPA, CEEB verbal reasoning and math aptitude scores, 2) GPA of 3.0 or better in theory and methodology courses, 3) GPA of 3.0 or better in 21-hours of content major and 4) a grade of B or better in the Teaching Practice course, a score of 80% or higher on the final Classroom Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice evaluation and a score of 80% or higher on the Electronic Portfolio with Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

The Self-Study Report (SSR) mentions that employers assess EPP's program completers through a follow-up survey after graduation. Evidence #17.3 (4.3.3: Employer Satisfaction Evidence) states that surveys be distributed to employers annually at the end of the second semester. Evidence #17.1 (4.3.1: Employer Interview Protocol), Evidence #17.2 (4.3.2: UPRM TPP Revised Employer Survey) and Evidence #17.3 (4.3.3: Employer Satisfaction Evidence) provide support in how the EPP surveys employers on the performance of recent graduates by collecting data, yet Evidence #17.3 (4.3.3: Employer Satisfaction Evidence) does not provide disaggregated data by programs. The data results of the Pilot Survey in Evidence #17.3 (4.3.3: Employer Satisfaction Evidence) fail to indicate the number of surveys completed by employers or how the results are being interpreted. The SSR reveals that the EPP will conduct a study to explore the impact of UPRM TPP completer preparation on P-12 student learning and development growth, which is outlined in Evidence #15.3 (4.1.3: UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instrument). Information provided in the document outlines a plan for using seven data collection instruments that are aligned with seven principal research questions and reveals a timetable for implementation during the 2016-2017 academic years. Implementation of the study and instrument need to be verified at the onsite visit. The SSR also notes that Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) teacher evaluation data will be used to make decisions about current and future courses and programs, yet the PRDE hadn't made the data available to UPRM by the time the SSR was submitted. An update on the status of the data should be reported by the time of the onsite visit.

As stated in the SSR, operational effectiveness is measured through collaboration with multiple stakeholders from the university. The following entities show collections of unit operation data: the Agricultural Education Department (AgEd), the TPP office, the Division of Extension and Professional Studies (DECEP), the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIIP) and the Information Technologies Center (ITC). Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015, p. 8-9) explicitly explains how data are collected, analyzed, monitored and reported by selected committees. Specifically, the AgEd and TPP Directors collect operational data to plan course offerings, assign teaching duties, and coordinate clinical practice. The directors and their academic advisors use candidate performance data to guide candidates through their teacher preparation program or sequence. The directors also handle faculty evaluations and follow-up surveys. The Teacher Education Assessment Board reviews all of the available data relevant to the quality of the teacher preparation program. The Dean of Academic Affairs coordinates the discussion of the Teacher Education Assessment Board's findings with the pertinent faculties, departments, and personnel including the Arts & Sciences faculty, the TPP Permanent Committee, and the Teacher Education Executive Committee. Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015, p. 37) provides a schedule for continuous review with roles and responsibilities of system users for regularly and systematically using data to evaluate program efficacy and to initiate changes.

The EPP's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures and produces evidence that data interpretations are valid and consistent. The EPP states that Cumulative GPAs are the university norm for measuring student progress and are considered relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable, yet there is limited information supporting the justification of this declaration. The EPP also mentions that education courses and major GPAs are relevant, cumulative, and as requisites for methodology and teaching practice, clearly actionable, yet, again, there is limited evidence to substantiate this assertion. The construction and reliability of the e-Portfolio with the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) is discussed in Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015). The SSR also discloses how the construction of the Classroom Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice is reliable, which is corroborated in Evidence #20.1 (5.2.1: Classroom Observation Instrument Design and Use).

Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015) describes how the EPP regularly and systematically assess performance against its goals and relevant standards and tracks the results over time. The SSR states, "The EPP uses the Student Opinion Survey results to monitor and guide professor teaching effectiveness along with aggregating the End-of-Program Survey responses to identify needed courses, faculty performance, administrative process and/or physical facilities improvements." No specific evidence is provided that the results of modifications are monitored and adjusted as appropriate. Limited information in Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM

Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015) reveals how the results of the surveys are used to improve program elements and processes. According to the SSR, "The Mixed Methods Research Plan will collect more information about the quality of completer performance regarding national InTASC and state professional standards." No data were reported since this plan was to begin implementation in the fall of 2016. Some evidence of program change based on disaggregated data can be extrapolated from the Specialty Licensure Area Data document found on website, <http://uprm.edu/eppcaep>. Examples of data-driven changes include the following: remodeling its facilities to provide an additional computer center and to add "smart boards" and data displays to several classrooms; conducting technology integration skills workshops targeting candidates in methodology and teaching practice courses; and creating a new "Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice Improvement" that was adapted from Utah Valley University and replaced the former "Classroom Observation Instrument."

Evidence #15.3 (4.1.3: UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instrument) reveals how the proposed mixed methods research will eventually be able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of teachers and how alumni impact their students' learning and growth. Specifically, within the document, it reads, "Information obtained from direct observations, teaching-learning artifacts and teacher self-reports, as well as data from alumni students and employers, will be compared, correlated, and triangulated to form a comprehensive picture of the teachers' effectiveness on student learning." The SSR also states that the EPP will use collected data and PRDE teacher performance evaluation data, if made available, to make decisions about current and future courses and programs, which is a strong supposition. There is limited evidence that the EPP summarized, externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, and acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction.

In addressing how appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, school and community partners, and others defined by the provider, are involved in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence, Evidence #6.1 (2.1.1: Law 129) and Evidence #6.2 (2.1.2: PRDE Policy Letter) depicts how school partners, Teaching Practice Centers and the PRDE are required by law to meet and discuss matters related to clinical experience. Evidence #6.3 (2.1.3: PRDE Monthly Meetings with TPPs) identifies specific dates in which monthly meetings occurred. Additional information provided in the SSR indicates that Superintendents, practice center directors, and TPP and school clinical experience supervisors meet to evaluate the revised Classroom Observation Rubric and the TPP Conceptual Framework, yet there is no evidence to verify the occurrence of this meeting. There is limited, verifiable evidence that stakeholders were involved in decision-making, evaluation and continuous improvements regarding the quality assurance system.

B. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

1. Evidence #19.1 (5.1.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015)
2. Evidence #20.1 (5.2.1: Classroom Observation Instrument and Design and Use)
3. Evidence #17.1 (4.3.1: Employer Interview Protocol)

4. Evidence #17.2 (4.3.2: UPRM TPP Revised Employer Survey)

5. Evidence #17.3 (4.3.3: Employer Satisfaction Evidence)

C. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

1. Evidence #6.1 (2.1.1: Law 129) needs to be translated and verified.

2. Evidence #6.2 (2.1.2: PRDE Policy Letter 2-2012-2013) needs to be translated and verified.

3. Evidence #20.2 (5.2.1a: Qualtrics Data Classroom Observation Instrument Validation) needs to be translated and verified.

4. Evidence #17.2 (4.3.2: UPRM TPP Revised Employer Survey)

5. Evidence #17.3 (4.3.3: Employer Satisfaction Evidence)

2. List of tasks to be completed by the team, including follow up on evidence inconstant with meeting the standard. Use the following three prompts for each tasks. Add tasks as necessary

Task

Title:	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Data collection and analysis from Evidence #15.3 (4.1.3: UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instrument).
(2)	Teacher Performance Evaluation Data from PRDE.
(3)	Evidence #6.1 (2.1.1: Law 129) needs to be translated to be verified.
(4)	Evidence #6.2 (2.1.2: PRDE Policy Letter 2-2012-2013) needs to be translated to be verified.
(5)	Evidence #20.2 (5.2.1a: Qualtrics Data Classroom Observation Instrument Validation) needs to be translated to be verified.
(6)	Evidence #19.1 (5.5.1: UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures 2015) mentions the use of Data Retreat days and Assessor Committee meetings which need to be verified as taking place.
1.	B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed
(1)	The EPP states, "GPAs are relevant, cumulative, and as requisites for methodology and teaching practice, clearly actionable." How?
(2)	The EPP states, "The Mixed Methods Research Plan will collect more information about the quality of completer performance in terms of national InTASC and state professional standards." How?
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	Has the data from the employer surveys been dis-aggregated by programs?
(2)	How are the data from the Pilot Study in the Employer Surveys being interpreted? What is the number of surveys returned by employers in the Pilot Study?
(3)	Are data available from the UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instrument? If so, has the data been analyzed?

- (4) How are GPAs, which are the university norm for measuring student progress, considered relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable?
- (5) How are education courses and major GPAs relevant, cumulative, and used as requisites for methodology and teaching practice? What constitutes both as being actionable?
- (6) What evidence can be provided to substantiate that the Student Opinion Survey and End-of-Program Survey were used to monitor and guide professor effectiveness, identify needed courses, evaluate faculty performance, and address physical facilities improvements?
- (7) Are teacher evaluation data from the Department of Education (PRDE) available? If so, has the data been analyzed?
- (8) Is there evidence to support that the Data Day Retreat was held in the fall of 2016?
- (9) Is there evidence to support that Assessor Committee meetings were held to share and analyze data on how graduates impact the learning of P-12 students?
- (10) How does the EPP summarize, externally benchmark, analyze, share widely, and act upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future direction?
- (11) Is there documentation to verify that Superintendents, practice center directors, and TPP and school clinical experience supervisors met to evaluate the revised Classroom Observation Rubric and the TPP Conceptual Framework?

3. Preliminary recommendations for new AFIs including a rationale for each. AFIs related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Area for Improvement	Rationale

4. Preliminary recommendations for new stipulations including a rationale for each. Stipulations related to the Selected Improvement Plan are cited under Standard 5.

Stipulation	Rationale

III: Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

DIVERSITY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from Self Study-Report (SSR)

a. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to diversity

The EPP provides the following as evidence for the cross-cutting theme of diversity: Seminar on the Nature and Needs of Exceptional Children, the COI, the TCSW, information regarding candidates' background, and the simSchool teacher training platform.

Within the seminar on the Nature and Needs of Exceptional Children (evidence 1.4.4), candidates participate in field experiences in diverse settings and must complete a service learning project. Within this course, candidates must observe, plan for accommodations, and adaptations for exceptional children (SSR, p. 12). No data were provided for this assessment. Relative to the COI, evidence related to diversity items are provided in 1.4.1. From 2015 to 2016, 100% of candidates scored at the target level of Competent or better (Exemplary) on the two times relating to supporting diverse learners. Data were not disaggregated by program area. No data were reported for AgEd, PE, or theater. The simSchool Teacher Training Platform (evidence 1.5.3 and 1.5.3a) is lauded as a tool to increase preservice teachers' understanding of the educational needs of diverse learners (evidence 1.5.3); however, not data were provided to support this claim. The SSR indicates that candidates in the TPP participate in 15-hours of classroom observation in a special education classroom at either a public or private school before the student teaching clinical experience. It is unclear if this observation experience is tied to a specific course and if all EPP candidates complete this requirement.

b. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of diversity

1. The TCWS (evidence 1.2.2) has the potential to provide evidence for the cross-cutting theme of diversity, but no data were found in the aggregate nor disaggregate.

2. Evidence 1.4.4 - no data provided.

3. The simSchool project has potential to provide evidence for the cross-cutting theme of diversity; however, no data were provided.

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

1. Are data available for the service learning project within the Nature and Needs of Exceptional Children's course - by program area?

2. Are data available by program area for the TCWS items that align with diverse learners?

3. Are data available from candidates' engagement within the simSchool training?

4. Are data available documenting diversity of placements among all program areas during field experiences and practice teaching?

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

TECHNOLOGY

1. Preliminary analysis of evidence from self-study report (SSR)

a. Holistic evaluation of the completeness, quality, and strength of evidence related to technology

The EPP presents evidence the use of technology in education is a topic in courses (evidence 1.5.4). It is not clear from the SSR that the courses cited are required

for all candidates (including AgED and PE). Evidence 1.5.2 provides data on the use of technology from the COI; however, data are not disaggregated by program. The EPP also aligned the TCWS with the ISTE standards and data from the TCWS relative to technology are provided in evidence 1.5.2. Again, data are not disaggregated by program. The narrative also indicates that the Puerto Rico Teacher Certification Professional Skills exam provides evidence for the effective use of technology (evidence 1.5.2). The EPP also provides evidence (1.5.1) that candidates model and apply technology standards in EDPE 3129 - Using Microcomputers in the Classroom. No data are provided, and it is unclear if all candidates are required to take this course. The EPP also provides candidates with the opportunity to participate in a study that utilizes a simSchool Teacher Training Platform (evidence 1.5.3 and 1.5.3a). This experience provides candidates with an opportunity to work with a classroom simulator.

b. Evidence that adequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

1. Evidence 1.5.2 indicates that across four items on the COI that aligned with the use of technology, candidates score "competent" to "exemplary." Data from items relating to technology on the TCWS are also provided within evidence 1.5.2. The narrative indicates that 96 of 100 candidates from 2014 to 2016 fully meet the expectation of using technology, per the TCWS.

2. Evidence 1.3.3c provides evidence that technology is addressed within the PCMAS basic knowledge and professional skills test as there is an entire section on using technology effectively for teaching.

c. Evidence that inadequately demonstrates integration of the cross-cutting theme of technology

1. It is unclear if the data from evidence 1.5.2 and 1.3.3d represents candidates from all programs. Data should be disaggregated by program area.

2. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data and/or interviews, including follow up on evidence inconsistent with meeting a standard (if applicable)

1. Does the EPP receive sub-score data from the PCMAS? If so, are these data available by program area?

2. Are all candidates required to take EDPE 3129? Are data available for the laboratory assignment within this course?

3. Are data available from the simSchool project that could support the use of technology with candidates?

Recommendations for new AFIs and/or stipulations including a rationale for cross-cutting themes are cited under the relevant standard(s)

IV: Preliminary findings related to Area(s) for Improvement (AFIs) from previous accreditation decisions, if any

1. Area for Improvement

No AFI(s) found.

V: Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

1. Use the Rubric For Evaluating the Capacity and Potential of the SIP to provide analysis on:

A. The EPP's capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing the SIP

The EPP selected impact of completers as the area for selected improvement and has related this to Standard 4. The overall plan is to conduct a "mixed-methods research study to explore the impact of completer's preparation on P-12 student learning and development growth" (p.3, evidence 4.1.3). The EPP identifies six objectives that will be addressed by the study:

- 1) measure alumni effectiveness in their classrooms;
- 2) evaluate and adapt alternative methods for collecting information regarding alumni impact and program effectiveness;
- 3) review the information collected about recent alumni teachers;
- 4) use information gathered to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the program in terms of the effectiveness of its alumni teachers;
- 5) use collected data to identify gaps between the profile of the teacher candidate and subsequent alumni teacher classroom performance;
- 6) refine and improve systematic data collection and analysis.

The study includes multiple measures consisting of the following: classroom observation using Danielson's Framework, an abbreviated Teacher Work Sample, alumni and employer surveys and interviews, as well as the Tripod Student Survey. The faculty was to participate in training on all instruments in fall of 2016. According to the SSR, completers will be paid \$100 to participate in the study. It is unclear if the EPP will have to collect parent permission for the Tripod Student Survey or if the school or the completer will be responsible for securing permissions. Such details and an update on progress will be verified during the site visit to determine the EPP's capacity for implementing and completing the SIP.

B. The potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates

The SIP has potential to provide the EPP with data related to all elements of Standard 4. The plan provides a detailed description and alignment with Standard 4-elements for each instrument that will be used in the study (see pgs. 9-11 of SIP).

C. The proposed use of data and evidence

Data from the Abbreviated Teacher Work Sample (ATWS) will provide evidence for 4.1 - impact on student learning. The Danielson's Observation Rubric will be used to substantiate completer effectiveness across four domains - planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities (4.2). The completer interviews and the TPP Alumni Survey will be used to document completer satisfaction (4.4). The employer interviews and the TPP Employer Survey will collect evidence on employer satisfaction (4.3). The Tripod Student Surveys will target completer effectiveness (4.2), and the pre-post subject tests from the ATWS will focus on the impact on student learning (4.1). If the implementation is successful and the study is sustainable over the proposed seven-year period, the evidence from this study relative to Standard 4 elements could prove to be powerful for continuous improvement.

D. The potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards

Potential exists.

E. Overall evaluation of SIP

When reviewed as a whole, the plan shows promise. However, a timeline is only provided for the 2016-2017 year. In addition, no specific costs are identified in terms of staff/faculty time and/or other expenses identified (except for a \$100 stipend to completers) with implementation and data collection. The SSR indicates that the study has been submitted to the UPRM IRB (p. 26). The assessment plan is somewhat vague in that a description of collecting, monitoring, and analyzing data is not provided. The narrative of the SIP simply states that "the research process will undergo periodic formative evaluation in order to make adjustments that maintain the consistent data and data cycles for continuous program improvement over the next seven years." A specific assessment plan is not provided.

Evaluation of the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

This rubric is intended to be used as a tool by the site visit team to provide feedback to an EPP on the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP) and its progress, including

- (a) its capacity for initiating, implementing, and completing a SIP;
- (b) the potential of the SIP to have a positive impact on the EPP and its candidates;
- (c) the proposed use of data and evidence;
- (d) the potential of the EPP to demonstrate a higher level of excellence beyond what is required in the standards. An overall evaluation of the SIP is also provided.

Click [here](#) to open the rubric in a new window.

Comments from state on requirements, standards, and/or perspective