

## UPRM Self Study Addendum Report

Clarification: UPRM offers three BS programs (Agriculture Education, Teaching Physical Education, and Math Education), post-bachelor alternate routes (professional development) to become a teacher in one of thirteen areas, and parallel-to-bachelor routes to become teachers in one of thirteen areas.

The thirteen areas: Agriculture, Art, Biology, Business, Chemistry, English, History, Math, Physical Education, Physics, Social Studies, Spanish, and Theater.

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?

See Evidence AE 1.a.1 PCMAS Basic Knowledge & Professional Skills Alignment to InTASC and AE 1.a.1.1 PCMAS General InTASC alignment message D Hernandez CB in the Addendum Evidence. The information about the alignment of the PCMAS Pedagogical Situations with InTASC mentioned in D Hernandez message was translated at the end of AE 1.a.1 evidence.

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

The College Board sends the UPRM EPP a preliminary list of PCMAS test results that shows individual scores for UPRM test takers who authorize sending their scores to the EPP. This usually represents 90-95% of UPRM test takers. These initial reports represent the main opportunity for the EPP to identify performance by program. In January, 2017 the College Board sent a complete list of the 70 UPRM PCMAS teacher candidates and their scores on PCMAS exams taken in March, 2016. The initial report provided scores for 64 UPRM teacher candidates. The AE 1.a.2 Disaggregated PCMAS Scores addendum lists the disaggregated scores by program as compiled from the 2016 College Board follow up report and the 2015 and 2014 initial reports.

Notes:

The total numbers shown in the Disaggregated PCMAS Scores addendum for 2015 and 2014 represent the number of individual UPRM General PCMAS Test takers who authorized reporting their scores. Hence these totals are smaller than those in tables based on the College Board aggregate report.

Of the 70 UPRM PCMAS teacher candidates who took PCMAS exams in March, 2016, 35 completed a bachelor's degree at UPRM in 2016, 29 completed a bachelor's degree at UPRM or elsewhere prior to 2016, 5 expect to complete a bachelor's degree at UPRM in 2017, and 1 withdrew from UPRM before finishing a bachelor's degree. This distribution is representative of the nature of teacher preparation at UPRM.

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

(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).

The SSR provides specific examples of how use of Specialty Licensure Area Data has led to changes in facilities and course requirements in response to question 2, *Based on the analysis of specialty licensure area data, how have individual licensure areas used data for change?*

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?

See AE 1.c.1: PCMAS Minimum Passing Scores in the Addendum Evidence.

(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?

The preparation for theater teachers program still exists. There has been one candidate who completed theater teaching practice during the past three years. The candidate graduated with honors from the University of Puerto Rico in Rio Piedras with a bachelor's degree in humanities with a concentration in drama in June, 2013. The candidate completed 27 credits in education courses at UPRM in the two following years with grades of A in all but the EDFU 3002 course (grade B). The candidate took and passed the general PCMAS exams in March 2015 with scores of 123 and 120 (passing scores were 92 and 87 respectively).

The candidate's teaching practice supervisor did not submit any observation forms or data. The supervisor, a former dean of academic affairs, taught the course ad honorem and is presently retired.

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

The UPRM Physics Department offers both a Physics program and a Physical Science program. Students enrolled in either program (as well as students enrolled in engineering programs) may take the Teacher Certification sequence to become eligible for certification as Physics teachers in Puerto Rico. As used in the report, Physics and Physical Science teacher preparation are the same.

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.

d) Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

(1) How do data in 1.1.5a provide evidence for specific program areas within the TPP?

The average, minimum, and maximum grades obtained by teacher candidates in specific courses as shown in 1.1.5a that are aligned to InTASC Learner and Learning standards in the syllabi provided on the EPP website. See Addendum Evidence AE 1.d.2 Learner and

Learning Course Syllabi or follow the embedded links to see alignment of course objectives for [EDFU 3001](#), [EDFU 3002](#), [EDES 4006](#), [EDFI 4005](#), [EDFI 4179](#), [EDAG 4005](#), [EDAG 4006](#), and [EDAG 4007](#) to InTASC Standards.

The data for the two EDFI courses: EDFI 4005 and EDFI 4179 apply specifically to the Physical Education program. The data for the three AGED courses: AGED 4005, AGED 4006, and AGED 4007 apply uniquely to the Agricultural Education program. Syllabi for the five courses have been added to the EPP website.

See Evidence AE 1.d.1: Learner and Learning Course GPAs by Program in the Addendum Evidence for further breakdown of Learner and Learning Course GPAs by teaching area.

(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?

See education course syllabi on the EPP website at <http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/syllabi> with the syllabi for all Teacher Preparation Program courses. The syllabi align course objectives with InTASC Standards. These were not included as a separate document in the Self-Study because the study reached the maximum 90 evidence items allowed.

See Evidences AE 1.d.2a TPP Course Descriptions, AE 1.d.2b EDAG Course, and AE 1.d.2c EDFI Course Descriptions for excerpts of these descriptions from the UPRM Undergraduate Catalog.

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

(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?

Agriculture Education uses classroom observation instruments that are aligned with the strongly communitarian goals of teaching agriculture in Puerto Rico. See AE 1.3.1a Formal Observation form EdAg 4019 for the Agriculture Education classroom observation instrument.

Theater, Physical Science (Physics), and Chemistry use the revised Classroom Observation Instrument. No data are available for the one theater teacher candidate who completed teaching practice during the past three years. That one candidate graduated with honors in humanities with a concentration in drama at UPRRP, then completed 27 credits in education courses at UPRM with a 3.89 GPA, and passed the general PCMAS exams with scores of 123 and 120 on which passing scores were 92 and 87 respectively. COI data for 4 Physics teacher candidates was included in 1.1.2b InTASC Standards in Observation Instrument. No COI data is available for the 3 Chemistry teacher candidates who completed their teaching practice during the past two years.

Physical Education uses an extended classroom observation instrument. Data exist, but has not been made available.

(2) Do data exist for Agriculture Education, Physical Education, Theater, Physical Science, and Chemistry for the TCWS?

Agriculture Education requires an electronic portfolio. See AE 1.3.2a EDAG electronic portfolio and evaluation for guidelines and evaluation form.

Physical Education, Theater, Physical Science (Physics), and Chemistry use the Teacher Candidate Work Sample. Only summary data has been made available for Physical Education teacher candidates. See Evidence AE 1.3.2b EdFi TCWS Scores. No data are available for the one theater teacher candidate who completed teaching practice during the past three years. TCWS data for 4 Physics teacher candidates was included in 1.1.2c InTASC Standards demonstrated in TCWS. No TCWS data is available for the 3 Chemistry teacher candidates who completed their teaching practice during the past two years.

(3) 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?

The former UPRM supervisor for Spanish teacher candidates submitted no Classroom Observation Instrument reports or data to the TPP during 2015 or 2016. The current UPRM supervisor for Spanish teacher candidates has been meticulous regarding proper documentation for teacher candidates as well as for herself.

(4) If Agriculture Education, Physical Education, and Theater do not use the COI, what is used instead?

Agriculture Education uses classroom observation instruments that are aligned with the strongly communitarian goals of teaching agriculture in Puerto Rico. See Addendum Evidence AE 1.3.1a Formal Observation form EdAg 4019.

Physical Education uses an extended classroom observation instrument. No data has been provided.

No classroom observation reports were provided for the one theater teacher candidate to take teaching practice during the past three years. That theater teaching practice supervisor has retired. The next theater teaching practice supervisor will be instructed and expected to use the revised COI.

(5) If Agriculture, Physical Education, and Theater do not use the TCWS, what is used instead?

Agriculture Education requires an electronic portfolio. See Addendum Evidence AE 1.3.2a EDAG electronic portfolio and evaluation.

Physical Education uses the TCWS. See Addendum Evidence AE 1.3.2b EdFi TCWS Scores for summary data.

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?

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

A validation and reliability expert is working on this matter for the COI data.

The EDES 4006 individual student data has been extracted from the NEO Classroom Management system (<https://decepuprm.neolms.com/>), separated by teaching area, and analyzed as it aligns to InTASC standards. See Addendum Evidence AE 1.4.1 EDES 4006 Service Learning Project Report. The validity and reliability study of this data will be available by the site visit date.

Note: Less than a third of the 153 EDES 4006 students from the past three semesters were enrolled in one of the three readily identifiable education programs: Physical Education, Agriculture Education, and Math Education. The remaining students were assigned an expected teaching area based on the bachelor's program in which they were enrolled at the time. For example, a computer science student is classified as a future math teacher while a horticulture student is classified as a future agriculture teacher. These students may or may not choose to pursue teacher certification.

The EDPE 3129 individual student data (300+ students) is being extracted from the NEO Classroom Management system to be separated by teaching area, and analyzed as it aligns to ISTE and InTASC standards. The validity and reliability study of this data will be available by the site visit date.

(2) Translate evidence 5.2.1a

Translated. See Addendum Evidence AE 5.2.1a Law 129 August 2016 (translated).

## 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."

The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) through the Institute of Professional Development, calls monthly meetings with the universities that have teacher preparation programs. During these meetings, issues that in one way or another affect the operations and organization of the Teacher Preparation Programs are discussed.

The procedure for the creation or discussion of the documents is the following: in the monthly meetings, working committees are formed where they create a draft which is later revised and turned into Law or a Policy Letter. Afterwards, deans, directors and coordinators of the Teacher Preparation Programs along with representatives from the Office of the Secretary approve the documents which are then signed into Law or Policy Letters.

The minimum amount of courses candidates should take at the university, the grade point average they should hold, the hours they should complete at the practicum, the amount of courses that can be offered at the university, the criteria used to select the cooperating teacher, etc. are all duly regulated and these regulations were crafted between the Puerto Rico Department of Education and the Institutions of Higher Education as is established in Law 129 of 2016 under Articles 3, 5, 6 and 7. (AE2.1 Translation of Law 129 of 2016)

### Article 3.

The public and private Institutions of Higher Education are empowered to collaborate with the Puerto Rico Department of Education to select the Teaching Practice Centers outside of the university campus.

### Article 5

Establishes that PRDE will collaborate with the public universities of Puerto Rico (UPR) to take over the costs of the bonuses disbursed to school directors, cooperating teachers in charge of the candidates at the Educational Practice Experience Centers.

### Article 6

Establishes that the PRDE alongside the Institutions of Higher Education will develop the rules and regulations that will govern the organization and operations of the clinical educational experiences no later than 90 days after the approval of this law.

### Article 7

Any problems or issues related to orientation and operations of the Educational Clinical Experiences Program not foreseen in this law, **shall be resolved upon mutual agreement** between the Secretary of the Puerto Rico Department of Education, a designated official and by the President or the relevant authorities at the Institutions of Higher Education.

(See AE2.2 Translation of PRDE Policy Letter 2012-2013)

### 2.1.3 Examples of PRDE Meeting Agendas & Invitations (2 examples included but more information is needed)

A recent example of collaboration between the PRDE and the IHE.

Article 2.6 of Law 129 of 2016 establishes that the Institutions of Higher Education assign a liaison as coordinator for the teaching practice. This coordinator will attend the monthly meetings called by the PRDE. At the beginning of each academic semester, the dates for the meetings are established with all of the coordinators and representatives of the PRDE (AE2. 3 Semester meetings with PRDE). When a decision that affects the regulations, operations or the organization of the Teaching Practice Centers must be made, the Deans of Education or the Directors of the Teacher Preparation Programs are summoned. They then make joint decisions with the personnel representing the Secretary of the PRDE.

On February 17, 2017, the Secretary of Education, Dr. Julia Keleher, invited Deans, Directors and Clinical Experience Coordinators to present the areas in need of professional development that the PRDE and requested the collaboration of the IHE. The different universities accepted the challenge to collaborate with the Secretary to produce plans for professional development for the teachers of Puerto Rico, with emphasis on those from the following areas: Vocational Schools, Bilingualism, Counseling and Social Work, and Special Education. The different IHE attending the meeting compromised to collaborate with the PRDE (AE2. 4: HEI collaboration with PRDE). On March 17, 2017, there was another meeting with the Secretary and working groups were formed around the areas mentioned above. The Secretary provided guiding questions related to Title II funds in order to search for possible answers and options (AE2.5: PRDE Agenda with T.II Questions). Public Policy will be created based on the ideas and suggestions provided by all of the IHE and the Secretary.

- a.** 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 experience.

As we indicated before, the PRDE, through Policy Letter 2-2012-2013, mandates that a process of collaboration exist between Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE). The requirements for the selection of the Cooperating Teacher appear on pages 6 and 7 of the translated document. Paragraph F establishes that the teacher must have taken 45 hours to become a certified cooperating teacher. The TPPs participate creating and revising all course syllabi (AE2. 6: Participation in the construction of a new cooperating teacher course). Right now, we are using the 2015 Cooperative Teacher Syllabi, which is also under revision. When a new Policy Letter is created, or there is a specific need for improvement, some themes of the course must be changed. This syllabus is a working document. (AE2.7: 2015

Cooperating Teacher Thematic Content Syllabi) Full document on site. Also, we offer the course at our institution and decide which teachers we will select as cooperating teachers. No one can impose a cooperating teacher on us.

On page 7, letter G, establishes that cooperating teachers must be familiar with the profile and professional standards. These standards were created through a mandate from the Secretary of Education in 2008 and for its creation, school teachers, directors, superintendents and university professors of the TPP were chose to work on it (AE2. 8 Puerto Rico Teacher Professional Standards) Full document on Site. It took one year to construct the policy.

On page 8, part IV titled: Duties of Directors at the Teaching Practice Centers, letter B establishes that school directors must participate in the selection of cooperating teachers with the coordinators and supervisors of the university teaching practice. They are also required to participate in all the processes of the formation of the candidate, including that they should carry out at least one classroom visit to observe the performance of the candidate (I) and be familiar with the evaluation document used for the evaluation (E). The candidate placement process alongside the cooperating teacher, coordinators and university supervisors is regulated as established in Policy Letter 2-2012-2013 (page 10, Letter D).

2.2.1 Candidate Placements and Cooperating Teachers (list of placements but does not address how partners assist in those placement decisions)

- 1. 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?**

**Role of each partner in cooperating teacher selections and evaluations**

- 2. Role of each partner in determining the placements, evaluations, and expectations for candidates**

At the end of every school semester and after analyzing the evaluations submitted by the candidates of their cooperating teachers, a letter is sent to the cooperating teaching requesting their services for the following semester. (AE2.9 letter for CT requesting services) After the cooperating teachers accept to work in the following next semester, a list of the candidates and practice centers along with the assigned cooperating teachers is issued.

The next step is to visit the Assistant Secretary or School Superintendent and present the list of candidates for the school district, the school placement and the assigned cooperating teachers. The Superintendent evaluates the list and approves or not each placement. If the Superintendent understands the Cooperating Teacher or School Director is not qualified for the assigned task, changes are made to address this.

Once the placement list is approved by the Assistant Secretary or District Superintendent, the letters are sent out to the school directors and cooperating teachers by the TPP through their candidates. In few occasions have the school directors requested that we remove a cooperating teacher from the lists. When this happens, we immediately remove the teacher from the list and find another cooperating teacher that the director will approve of.



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.

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)

All cooperating teachers are specialists within their own teaching fields and have the methodological expertise necessary to actively participate in the formation of candidates. They are all highly qualified teachers. It is over them that the largest responsibility of developing future teachers, fall, considering the fact that they have our candidates in their classrooms for four hours daily for a total of three hundred hours in the semester. The college supervisor meets with the candidate once a week for one to three hours, depending on how things work out with the candidate. All cooperating teachers collaborate with our candidates in planning, conducting classes, using assessment, evaluative and formative tools, using of Curricular Mapping and, working with classroom management. They also show candidates how to manage diverse groups of students in environments within and outside the classroom. They use the observation instrument, as well as the university supervisor. They deliver at least three evaluations of each candidate they attend. The results of the observations instruments are included in the evidences of standard one.

Cooperating teachers from the agricultural areas face a tougher challenge, since most school directors set a great number of the special education trend in the agriculture course. Agricultural education candidates must work with a higher number of exceptional children in the classroom. Cooperating teachers train candidates to adequately manage each student.

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)

Most Teaching Practice Supervisors in the areas of mathematics, sciences, English, Spanish, social studies, physical education, agricultural education, arts and theatre have a doctoral degree in their specialties. The professor who currently teaches business education holds a master’s degree in office administration and a doctorate in education in curriculum. Even though she does not have a specific doctorate in office administration she has been working for over thirty years as a secretary as well as a professor in business courses. Last year, she organized and successfully carried out successfully two full-day seminars designed for all business subject teachers in the Western educational region. All teachers participated in a six-hour professional development activity thanks to this professor.

(AE2.10: Workshop for Business Education Teachers)

A great percentage of our university supervisors have received their doctoral degrees from colleges in the United States. They bring into our University and our Educational Practice Experiences Program the diverse ideas that formed them up in their different fields of expertise.

Department	Professor	University
Agriculture Education	3	Ohio State University Cornell University

		Penn State University
Mathematics	2	Virginia Tech University Louisiana State University
Physical Education	5	Florida State University (4) Columbia (1)
TPP	3	Penn State University (2) University of Santa Barbara(1)

University Supervisors have vast knowledge in the content areas. Besides being specialists in the content area, they are specializing in other areas besides teaching. For example, some of the supervisors are thesis advisors or committee members and work with research bringing in new knowledge and experiences for their student-teachers. University Supervisors also present at conferences and conventions which allow them to stay abreast in their field and bring this to the weekly seminar meetings and incorporate this into the learning/teaching experiences.

Each year, the supervising professors from Physical Education Program organize a Summer Camp for blind students. At this camp, some of the candidates work voluntarily without pay, all acquiring unique experiences that enable them to work with such exceptionality. Blind schoolchildren from the Western region attend this special summer. The camp is called “Capabilities” and is organized by Dr. Margarita Fernandez.

<http://www.perkinselearning.org/scout/summer-camps-children-who-are-blind-or-visually-impaired>

Twice a semester, all supervisors meet as a group to discuss candidate evaluations and they bring ideas on how to effectively make changes to improve and enrich candidate experiences. This information is documented in the TPP annual report.

The Teacher Preparation Program is over 30 years old. Throughout the years, the documents used to evaluate student performance have changed. For many years, we used an instrument, and then revised the Program’s Conceptual Framework and also revised the future teacher profile that we envision following the INTASC standards, hence we changed the instrument. These instruments were constructed by university supervisors, who are also the methodology professors. They possess many years of experience visiting schools and forming the teachers our country and the world need. We also had the collaboration of cooperating teachers who read the instrument and provided feedback for improvement. (AE2. 11 Cooperating Teacher Assistants sheet 2014) On March 6, 2017, we had a meeting with Cooperating Teachers and Directors to discuss a new draft of the Rules that govern the Teaching Practice and at that meeting; teachers requested that they needed a workshop on how to construct a specification grid to improve test construction. (AE2.12 Directors and Cooperating Teacher Assistants sheet) This professional development activity for cooperating teachers is planned for April.

Throughout these activities, cooperating teachers and directors learn about the documents used to evaluate the student-teacher’s performance as well as provide feedback on how to improve them. The norms and expectations of student-teachers are established.

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

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

At TPP, all students begin visiting schools when they enroll in the EDES 4006 course, titled: the teaching of exceptional children. There, they carry out class observations at specific schools or special education centers. Candidates then must document their visits and their learning experiences and upload their documents in their digital portfolio. (Evidence on site visit)

Afterwards, while enrolled at the Teaching Methodology course, candidates are assigned to new schools with different scenarios for another minimum of fifteen or more hours. Some candidates enjoy this experience too much and decide to spend more time in it. It is expected of them to undergo their practice at the school where they carry out their observations. Candidates also have to document their 15 hours of visits and the learning experiences. They upload their documents in their digital portfolio under the Teacher Work Sample. (Evidence on site visit).

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?

Since the TPP offers Cooperating Teacher Courses, there is information on new cooperating teachers who are available and these are added to the list of current cooperating teachers. TPP has a pre-selection of the schools and teachers for student-teacher placement which is taken to the Assistant Secretary or Superintendent for approval. Afterwards, it is taken to the different schools.

Student-teachers can choose the town where they prefer to carry out their practice. **TPP takes into account several factors and is who finally decides where each student is placed either for observations or teaching practices.**

Sometimes we cannot place the candidate where they want, and then they become upset hence it shows in their evaluations.

The reasoning used behind placing candidates in the same school they carried out their observations during their methodology is so students can become familiar with the candidates and feel comfortable as a group when the candidate steps in during the second semester as their teacher. Most candidates carry out their teaching practice during the spring semester and this makes transitioning a bit more difficult for students. We believe that seeing the candidate beforehand in the classroom during the observations, will enable students to become familiarize with them therefore allowing for a smoother transition.

Several factors are taken into consideration when placing candidates in the practice centers. The first factor is if the student has a means of transportation and can travel to

places far from the university. If the candidate does not have a means of transportation, i.e., a car, the candidate in an Educational Practice Experience Center is placed near the university where there is a qualified Cooperating Teacher in their subject area willing to work with them. If the candidate does possess a car, then they can be placed at a school which is farther away. If a candidate carries out the observations in one school and later runs into financial hardships, the necessary accommodations need to be made in order to better serve the candidate. In some instances, the candidate only registers in the Teaching Practice and does not have the financial solvency to cover lodging, then again, we place the student in an Educational Practice Experience Center close to where they live. Once again, this withstanding there is a Cooperating Teacher in the content area and that University Supervisors have enough free hours to travel to farther distances. Candidates in Agricultural Education must be placed according to the availability of Agricultural Schools distributed throughout Puerto Rico. Agricultural Education is not taught at all schools. This program avoids assigning candidates to schools at their hometowns in order to avoid familiarity or favoritism.

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?

Except for candidates from physical education, agriculture education, arts and theater who can be placed at the elementary level, the other candidates are placed in intermediate schools (6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup>) or high schools (9<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup>).

The main difference between elementary and secondary level are the ages of the students. In Puerto Rico, we have the same diversity in all levels. Most of the students in the public school system in Puerto Rico come from low income families. During the 2013-2014 academic year, of 408,226.0 students registered in the 1,442 schools in Puerto Rico, 314,397.0 students, 77%, came from families whose income was below poverty level.

<https://data.pr.gov/Educacion/N-mero-de-estudiantes-bajo-el-nivel-de-pobreza-en-/p3xw-8bp4/data>

Of the 410,950 students registered in the public schools during the academic school year of 2014-2015, close to 320,979 were at a financial disadvantage.

<http://www.univision.com/noticias/pobreza/el-78-de-los-estudiantes-de-escuelas-publicas-de-puerto-rico-viven-bajo-el-umbral-de-pobreza>

Another element they have in common is that 98% of the students are Latin, Puerto Ricans and also come from Christian families.

[http://intraedu.dde.pr/evaluacion/RC2017/Perfil\\_Estatal.pdf](http://intraedu.dde.pr/evaluacion/RC2017/Perfil_Estatal.pdf);  
<http://welcome.topuertorico.org/fastfacts.shtml>

These elements allow us to create a very similar Puerto Rican student profile. There is not much diversity that can be seen at first sight. The diversity we find in schools are more cognitive. Students who come from middle class families of professionals, possess richer experiences which allow them to stand out in class. Another element that must be taken into consideration is the increment in the amount of student with exceptionalities. During 2013-2014, 30% of the total amount of students in Puerto Rico, were classified as special education. This too can be considered as an element for diversity in our schools.

<http://www.estadisticas.gobierno.pr/iepr/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=H-ABOicDeOI%3D&tabid=39&mid=590>

The aforementioned is to explain that no matter the school where candidates are placed, be it urban or rural, elementary or secondary, all candidates will have very similar experiences with their students. High schools are fed with students who come from intermediate and elementary schools from all areas. This secondary school is where all students converge regardless of their social condition.

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

1. 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?

The exit interview is carried out by the TPP Director and it is a group conversation. Students provide feedback of their experiences at the Teaching Practice Centers, of their Cooperating Teachers as well as of the University Supervisors. If more than one student has negative comments of the same teacher or supervisor, they are asked to explain further and provide details. The TPP Director consults with the TPP Personal Committee, takes notes and makes a decision. All decisions made are motivated to improve the operations of the TPP and candidate performances and experiences.

2. Special education field placement: Is the special education field placement required by all programs? Is this placement tied to a specific course?

2. 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.

Several questionnaires were created in 2009 with the purpose of exploring TPP candidates' perceptions about the program. First, the End-of-Program survey was created, then data was gathered and, after the overall analysis was done, we decided to bring up other surveys that were more component specific.

At the end of each term, questionnaires are given to candidates undergoing their practicum course. Then data is analyzed and reviewed in order to know what is satisfactory or where to make program improvement decisions. We only considered the excellent and good point results and divided them by the amount of participants.. This final result is a percentage. Our expectation is to always be within the 80% average. The remaining numerical results are ignored because of our understanding that they do not reflect program goals we are demanding.

This data is then presented to the faculty at the end of each semester and we then make adjustments and program decisions. Each semester we strive to change our seminars, or even not to offer as many, since our candidates do not want to interrupt their school class schedules in order to attend them. At the program exit, colloquium opinions are gathered in order to add new seminars for candidates entering the next semester.

Supervisors also work with additional subject matters while at their weekly meetings. (AE2.13 results of the candidate perceptions questionnaires).

The last results of the Cooperating Teacher perception questionnaires have been presented to Cooperating Teachers at a meeting on March 2017 and they respond to the data observed. The general average was very good, 90%, however there are criteria which evidence room for improvement.

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

At different meetings with the PRDE through the Professional Development Institute, possible topics for the Cooperating Teacher course syllabus were discussed. Then a committee worked on it and presented it for approval at a meeting with teaching practice coordinators and supervisors. Every time the Department of Education requests that the cooperating teacher syllabi be revised, the special topics need to be discussed with the cooperating teachers.

The Agricultural Education Program has a permanent Consulting Committee which is responsible for creating all documents and observe the execution of their contents. This consulting committee is composed of the Agricultural College Dean, the director, the coordinator, a faculty member, a college student and the Department of Education Agricultural Program General Supervisor.

3. Information about CRUISE structure, research and professional development offerings  
The University Resource Center for Research and Educational Services (acronym in Spanish CRUISE) serves as a liaison, information and dissemination center, as well as a base of operations for collaborative education projects inside and outside the Campus. CRUISE develops educational research and education community professional development proposals. It conducts educational research projects and provides

professional development for in-service and pre-service teachers as well as for k-20 students. These projects use current teaching-learning research findings to provide teachers and schools effective means to evaluate and improve teaching strategies. CRUISE has operated since 2002 with a total budget for those 15 years of \$3,256,000 from external funds from more than 12 initiatives. (For more info see <http://uprm.edu/p/cruise>)

Structure: CRUISE has a board of directors. The current BOD consists of Dr. C. Bellido, Dr. K. Wayland, and Dr. J. Ferrer. It has a part-time secretary (student) and employs graduate and undergraduate students as needed to operate existing projects. At present it has three graduate students and seven undergraduate students working with mNET (a teacher preparation project in collaboration OSU in its final unfunded year), the Program Impact Study Project, and PAEMST (voluntary). At the moment, CRUISE is not offering any professional development because it is concentrating its efforts on completing the Program Impact Study Project. The directors and interested colleagues are developing proposals for future projects: an NSF STEM+C proposal, a Puerto Rico Department of Education proposal for recertifying teachers, and a Puerto Rico Department of Education proposal for improving schools.

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.

d. 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?

Although Law 129 empowers TPP to send candidates to carry out observations and later their teaching practice, the TPP is responsible to find the best Educational Practice Experience Centers.

We receive feedback from Cooperating Teachers each time a university supervisor visits the candidates. The university supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher discuss every detail of the candidate's progression. If the Cooperating Teacher thinks the candidate is not well prepared to become a teacher, they will discuss this issue with the supervisor. Supervisors will use their own judgement to make decisions after discussing the situation with the TPP Director. Sometimes a candidate must be removed from the school. The problems a Cooperating Teachers can identify regarding our candidates is very important to us. We analyze the situation, if there is an absence of content knowledge, or if it is an absence of professional skills or dispositions, we then use this experience to enhance what is needed for the next candidates' seminars.

We want to know the perceptions our Cooperating Teachers have about the Program, the candidate and also about the university supervisor. We added a second part in the previous questionnaire where the Cooperating Teachers can express themselves about the university supervisors. (AE2.14 Cooperating Teacher perceptions questionnaire with data)

Feedback from the candidate perception questionnaires created by TPP and the Student Opinion Survey (institutional one) are used to make decisions regarding which professors teaching methodology and university supervisors are complying with their responsibilities required by the TPP.

We also consider the opinions of the supervisors and candidates to determine which Practice Centers are the best and which we should not use for future placements since the cooperating teachers are not doing the work we expect of them.

Likewise, candidate provide feedback of School Directors. Some directors visit the classroom and provide the support they need while others are not seen throughout the whole semester. All of these criteria are taken into consideration to improve our candidate's experiences in the field.

2. What evidence exists that P-12 partners are involved in creating and revising data driven assessments?

At the end of each semester, the TPP faculty, including those who teach methodology and supervise the teaching practice, are called to meeting to show the results of the questionnaires. The findings are discussed and alternatives are offered in order to implement the necessary changes. These findings then become part of the annual report. The annual report is published on the UPRM CAEP web page.  
[http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/reports\\_submitted](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/reports_submitted)

The data is also presented to Cooperating Teachers and School Directors in meetings. Some offer alternatives which are put into practice.

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.

Who oversees field placements and partnerships?

At the Agricultural Education Program, the Consulting Committee regulates the appointments of candidates to schools.

In the Physical Education Program, the associate director in conjunction with the practice coordinator, and practice supervisors meet to decide where students will be assigned. Experienced supervisors know the schools, directors and cooperating teachers thus make sound recommendations and their opinions are respected.

At TPP there is no practice coordinator, however the director along with all practice supervisors will make decisions on where to assign all candidates. The TPP secretary also takes part in this decision making process since she is the one who first meets all candidates when they submit their applications. She prepares a preliminary list with the



locations taking into consideration the number of practice centers available with cooperating teachers within each specialty area. Then a special meeting is held with all supervisors and the list is presented for evaluation and final decisions regarding placements are made.

After all those steps are carried out, TPP presents the list of the candidates, their cooperating teachers and the Educational Experience Practical Centers to the Auxiliary Secretary or Superintendent for a final approval. After the approval, it is taken to the Educational Experience Practical Center Director who finalizes candidate placements.

### Standard 3. Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity

#### A. Preliminary Analysis of Evidence

##### 1. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

- a. Component 3.1 - The EPP reported in the SSR that there were four recruiting activities; however, a strategic recruitment plan was not provided

##### 1. How are recruitment results recorded, monitored, and used in planning and modification of recruitment strategies?

Admissions applications submitted to TPP are evaluated by the TPP Academic Orientation Officer. Then a meeting with the Director is carried out and a final decision is made. The application returns to the Registrar's Office where the official admission is granted and a copy is sent to TPP. The Academic Orientation Officer proceeds to include the candidate in the TPP data base.

Throughout the database, you can observe which programs at our Campus apply most frequently to the TPP curricular sequence. For example, tables in **evidence AE3.1** illustrate that the majority of students applying for admission to TPP come from the programs of Biology, Psychology, English and Social Sciences.

Nevertheless, this is different to the needs of our country, where above all, teachers of mathematics, physics and special education are in great need. The Mathematics Education Program uses the University Recruitment system and benefits from institutional promotion. TPP has submitted a variety of special education courses which will be offered in the coming semesters.

##### 2. How has the recruitment plan and its implementation moved you toward the goal of greater candidate diversity and academic achievement?

TPP has students from all programs on Campus which provides us with an abundance of diverse candidates with diverse experiences. The student population at UPRM is 99% Latino ; 73% of the applicants to TPP are female which is a higher percentage compared to 27% who are male. TPP's strength comes from the fact that all of our candidates are first and foremost specialists in their areas or fields of concentration. Discussions in the fundamental courses are not only interesting but rich with such a variety of thinking, perspectives and experiences.

##### 3. How do you monitor the influence of employment opportunities on enrollment patterns?

At this historical moment in time, the PRDE is not recruiting many teachers, but the TPP is approached constantly every semester from School Districts in the United States which are recruiting our candidates from all of the content areas as long as they are bilingual as well.

Through our recruitment plan, we propose giving more exposure to our Program since we have seen a steady decline in the amount of students that applied for admission. From 2014-2015 to 2015 to 2016 there was a difference of 45 applications less for admissions.

#### AE3.1 Recruitment plan provided from TPP and EDAG

Can you provide disaggregated data on applicants, those admitted, and enrolled candidates by relevant demographics including race/ethnicity, and/or sex?

The total amount of candidates admitted for academic year 2013-2014 was ninety-four (94), and they were all Latino. Of these, sixty-eight (68) were female and twenty-six (26) were male. Twenty-eight (28) students came from twenty five (25) different programs where they held their first major, while sixty-six (66) already had a college degree and were completing the education academic sequence at the Teacher Preparation Program.

The total number of candidates admitted for academic year 2014-2015 was one hundred thirty-five (135), two of which were white Americans and the rest Latinos. Of these, ninety-eight (98) were female and thirty-seven (37) were male. Seventy-five (75) came from twenty three (23) different programs where they were studying their bachelor's degree major, while sixty (60) already held a previous degree and were completing the education academic sequence.

Total amount of candidates admitted for the academic year 2015-2016 was ninety (90), except for one candidate from an American father and a Latina mother, the remaining candidates were Latino. Of these, sixty-seven (67) were female and twenty-three (23) were male. Thirty-seven (37) came from seventeen (17) different programs, while fifty-three (53) already held an academic degree and were applying for the education academic sequence.

#### AE3.2 TPP Statistical information candidate admissions by major, sex and ethnicity

Component 3.2 - Evidence from 3.2.1a does not support the narrative in the Self Study Report that describes the average GPA of each admitted cohort

The tables included in AE3.3 present the index average of: admissions, majors, professional and General Point Average (GPA) from students who completed the Teacher Preparation Program, Math Education, Physical Education and Agricultural Education requirements. The data was obtained directly from the students' academic records and from the Office of Investigation and Institutional Planning.

During the official visit, CAEP members and evaluators can confirm this information from each candidates' academic record. There is a possibility that TPP requirement completions may not coincide with the participant's graduation date, since many of our students take our course requirements as an alternate route alongside their own major areas, i.e., most of them make a lateral major for our program adjunct to their own degree requirements while others have simply graduated earlier and they only take the required education courses.

The Puerto Rico Department of Education is the agency that issues the teacher certification as is established in its Teaching Personnel Certification Regulations of 2012 (p.16) which, in order for a candidate to request a teaching license, they must have a 2.80 minimum average for both GPA and academic specialty. However, since the academic year 2016-2017, the minimum average has been raised to 3.00.

We can infer from the data summarized in the table that our candidates have the index entry average of 3.0 or more and that they complete their baccalaureate degrees with a 3.00 or higher as well.

AE.3.3 Tables with different index (entry, major, professional and GPS) segregate by years and majors.

Component 3.3 - Evidence 3.3.3a, the Dispositions of Teachers instrument, is a ranking tool not an assessment measure

- b. Component 3.6 - Evidence 3.6.1 does not specifically address the candidate's understanding of codes of ethics, professional standards of practice, or knowledge of relevant laws and policies.

The Puerto Rico Professional Standards for Teachers are discussed in the methodology courses as well as in the Teaching Practice courses. The components regarding educational ethics are discussed in Philosophical Foundations of Education. In order to ensure that candidates exhibit an ethical and professional behavior during their teaching practice, we evaluate them using observation instruments. The first graphs correspond to data from instruments used in 2014 and the next graphs correspond to the data from the evaluations forms used in 2015-2016 which was the instrument that was revised. The criteria which measure ethical and professional behavior are in items 23 to 25 in Part V of the instrument and are called Professional Responsibility.

General graphs that illustrate how our candidates perform regarding Professional Responsibility are presented in evidence 1.1.2b on page 1 of the evidences presented in the self-study. The averages fluctuate between 2.95 on a scale of 4.00 for 2014; 3.74 for 2015 and 3.83 for 2016. What this illustrates is that our candidates show on average a level of competence (3.5/4.00) in this category.

The averages reached by candidates in the different concentrations in the Program are shown in evidence 1.1.2c on page 11.

## 2. Title: Clarification of the use of the Dispositions of Teachers instrument

- Create an instrument to document candidates' entry level interview to the Teacher Preparation Program.
- Determine candidates' teaching dispositions and the personal qualities they possess when they are admitted to the program and when they complete their educational clinical experience at the Practice Center (TPP).
- Determine, in general, which is the most important teaching disposition candidates must develop as teachers according to candidates who were admitted to the TPP and who completed the clinical teaching experience.

a. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

Participants:

Students in the Teacher Preparation Program at the University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez.

- 21 students of EDFU 3001, Section 030 ( 1<sup>st</sup> semester 2016-2017) (First instrument with 21 dispositions)
- 10 methodology students of English and sciences (21 dispositions)
- 10 first-year students of various disciplines which include: Spanish, English, Plastic Arts, Chemistry, History, Physical Education and Mathematics. (21 dispositions)
- 10 students EDFU 3001, section 030 (1st 2016-2017) (8 dispositions)

Fall 2016 Dispositions of Teachers instrument results

Results:

Who motivated you or was your role model to become an educator?

- Mother, father, grandparent or a family member
- School teachers of different subject areas
- University Professors
- Scientists who show command in their content area
- No one in particular, I think I can combine my subject matter with the education courses since I do like to share my knowledge.

What skills and qualities should an educator possess?

- Trust oneself
- Responsible
- Humbleness
- Command of subject matter
- Possess Vocation
- Understanding
- Show authority
- Model the required characteristics
- Patience
- Empathy
- Charisma
- Passion
- Command of technology
- Leadership
- Administrator
- Love, tenderness
- Role Model
- Honesty
- Organization
- Creative
- Flexibility and adaptability
- Deal with situations
- Possess group control
- Respectful

- Friendly

What qualities do you possess that will make you a good teacher?

- Explain well
- Attentive and focused
- Patient and with a genuine interest to serve others
- Patient
- Creative
- I am dynamic
- Leadership, good time management
- Passion
- Empathy
- Leadership, capable of managing situations, responsibility
- Desire to teach
- Interact with others
- Intelligent
- Good voice volume
- Charismatic
- Perseverant
- I can see beyond people's attitudes
- I am direct,
- I am sincere,
- I am honest.
- I am responsible
- I am human, I feel love towards my students
- I love working with children and youngsters
- I am strong yet subtle.
- I am bilingual
- I am organized
- Ability to simplify things
- Disposition to help

If you become a teacher, what strategies, methods and teaching techniques would you use?

- Cooperative Learning
- Use of technology (videos, presentations)
- Laboratories
- Pop Culture
- Theory then practice
- Total Physical Response
- Essay Writing Method
- Differentiated instruction strategies
- Scientific Investigation
- Social themes

- Various readings in English
- Continuous Assessment
- Creative and interactive activities to meet student needs
- Socialized Discussions
- Positive reinforcement
- Teach like a Champion Techniques

How would you work with a student with a learning style that is different from yours?

- Individual teaching
- Prepare classes directed to various teaching styles.
- Look for information about learning styles to plan accordingly.
- Offer the content in different ways.
- Identify students' different learning styles.
- Implement laboratories, presentations, videos and readings.
- Be flexible and modify the class.

How would you provide equal opportunities to students with any type special learning need?

- Reasonable accommodation
- Adapt the material
- Inclusive classroom environment
- Integrate effective teaching methods.
- Provide differentiated instruction
- Use an evaluation method according to their exceptionality.
- Individualized instruction.

What does being a good teacher mean to you?

- How you treat others, be humble and generous.
- Provide them with significant and challenging experiences.
- Be a role model for them.
- Have empathy with students.
- Provide an adequate learning environment.
- Provide respect and caring dispositions to students.
- Know students in order to find an effective teaching method.
- Be a guide in student's development. Be a good influence.
- Motivate students.
- Recognize that each student is different.

What challenges are teachers facing at this point in time in Puerto Rico and the world?

- Lack of money
- Technology
- Dysfunctional families
- Growing scientific movement that leaves teachers behind.
- Lack of respect towards our profession.

- Bipartisan influence in the educational system.
- Lack of communication among teachers and the school community.
- Lack of professional development for teachers.

What contributions or initiatives would work for the educational system in PR?

- Proposals to receive educational material.
- Prepare lab manuals for the class.
- Integration of technology.
- Work with the population of students with exceptional needs.
- Promote the recruitment of specialist in the subject areas.
- Programs between schools so students can visit other schools and learn of other realities.
- Integration with universities for advance courses.

## II. Second Part

### 21 Dispositions of the first instrument

- Professionalism
- Positive Attitudes
- Oral Communication
- Written Communication
- Prepare adequately for teaching
- Interest and collaborate with others.
- Self-efficiency
- Have emotional intelligence
- Be reflective
- Flexibility/resistance
- Be respectful
- Focus on student needs
- Have a professional appearance.
- Provide feedback.
- Read non-verbal language.
- Be punctual
- Self- control
- Ethical behavior and civic responsibility
- Social conscious and empathy
- Leadership
- Respect for diversity

First group: 20 participants

Questionnaire with 21 dispositions

- 7/20 indicated that the **positive attitudes** is the most important disposition they should have or develop future teachers.

**Definition presented:** Positive attitudes



- Is happy, transmits happiness, tranquility and joy. Share ideas and listen to students, do not judge, debate ideas and not students in their personal character. Do not mock incorrect answers.

#### Reasons for the selection of the most important dispositions

- There are many teachers with a lot of knowledge but no respect towards their students or their work. It is very important for students to feel the support of their teachers. (Plastic Arts)
- I understand that a **positive attitude** is contagious. With a smile and being happy, you can fix your peers day. Also, there should always be respect for others and be positive regarding controversial topics and different points of view. (Social Sciences)
- Having a positive attitude creates a stable, comfortable environment and of respect because when you have them you promote an environment of interest in students. (Plastic Arts)
- Students perceive teacher motivation and their will. This is essential to have a successful class. (Physical Education)
- Children read your attitude. An unhappy person cannot teach. (Hispanic Studies))

#### Different Selections:

- 5/20 Focus on student needs.
- 4/20 Professionalism.
- 2/20 Prepare adequately.
- 1/20 Be punctual.
- 1/20 Respect for diversity.

#### Least important disposition

- 11/20 indicated that **having a professional appearance** is the least important disposition a future teacher should possess.

#### **Definition given:** Present a professional image.

- Be clean and wear adequate attire that does not distract student learning. Avoid tattoos and body rings.

#### Reasons for least important dispositions:

- This does not measure the cognitive level and how you teach.
- It is important that you visualize yourself as a teacher and the way you dress should not distract, but a good teacher focuses on education, helping and teaching. (English)
- It does not mean that it is less important, but I think the color of the hair, tattoos, rings or even the makeup that the teacher uses has nothing to do with the quality of their teaching. Certainly, the teacher must shower and keep themselves clean, but the rest is irrelevant. (English)
- I think it is part of professionalism (Mathematics)

- It is not that a professional appearance is not important, but in my opinion, there are other aspects which are much more important that must be taken into consideration to be a good educator.

## 8 Dispositions

Instrument validated

- Professionalism
- Oral and written communication
- Teaching and learning process
- Emotional Intelligence
- Ethical behavior and civic responsibility
- Community of learners
- Offer feedback
- Leadership

Second group: 10 participants from the first education course

- 4/10 indicated **Professionalism** is the most important to have and should be developed in future teachers.

**Definition presented:** Professionalism

A characteristic of an educator who carries out the work with expertise, dedication, seriousness, honesty and efficiency.

Reason for selecting the most important disposition:

- It is the foundation of any work. (Microbiology)
- I selected professionalism because I think is it the most important; if we are professional in what we do, it will turn out well because we are doing things correctly. (Biology)
- We should always project professionalism in all aspects since students can see and example to follow and if you do it well, they will do it well also. (Civil Engineering)
- It summarizes all of the essential characteristics a teacher should possess as a professional. (Civil Engineering)

Others selections

- 2/10 **Teaching process**
- 2/10 **Ethical and responsible behavior**
- 1/10 **Leadership**
- 1/10 **Oral and written communication**

Second group: Least important disposition

- 8/10 indicated that the **Community of Learners** is the **least important disposition** that a future teacher should possess or develop.
- **Definition presented:** Community of learners

## Reasons for selecting the least important disposition

- In order to have communication, teachers and students need all of the characteristics aforementioned.
- I think that in order to be a teacher, you do not have to participate in activities, but you should have great communication with your students in your classroom.
- It is important but they are things that later there will not be time to do them although they are important.
- Group participation is important but not more than the other 7 categories. Putting people together in groups is not always effective.
- Reasons:
- I understand it to be a set of all that is presented here. (Civil Engineering)
- It is not obligatory in order to be considered to be a good teacher. These things are applicable and are secondary to strengthening your role as a good teacher and as example to students. (Physical Sciences)
- It is convenient to be informed of the needs of the community's needs, as long as it does not take time from class preparation. (Surveying)

### 1. Use of the results of the Dispositions instrument

We were surprised that the disposition of least importance to the candidates was the Community of Learners when this disposition should be the most important so that school teachers can join forces to reach the objectives laid out.

We will be offering seminars on this topic. We believe it is very important to work to change how this disposition is perceived. It clearly points towards how our students' beliefs in individualism.

### 2. How will the rankings of dispositions by candidates be used in determining a candidate's progression or change in their teaching dispositions?

It is important to verify that candidates understand what dispositions a good teacher possesses. It is just as important to follow candidate's progress or a change in attitude since they will take these desirable dispositions of what a good teacher is to their teaching career.

## Standard 4. Program Impact - Addendum

### 2. 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.

The Mixed Methods Research is currently in process. Data will be available by the visit. A research plan sans data was submitted because at the time of the self-study there was no state or school district data available regarding student learning impact. This situation was anticipated and described in the CAEP Accreditation Handbook 2016 on page 51: *For providers that do not have access to state P-12 student learning data and providers that are supplementing state or district data with data on subjects or grades not covered, the following guidance applies:*

- *This type of provider study could be phased in. For example, initially the provider would create an appropriate design; then conduct a pilot data collection and analysis; and then make refinements and further data collection.*
- *The provider could maintain a continuing cycle of such studies, examining completer performance in different grades and/or subjects over time.*
- *The provider could develop case studies of completers that demonstrate the impacts of preparation on P- 12 student learning and development and can be linked with teacher data; some examples follow:*
  - *Provider-conducted case studies of completers*
  - *Completer-conducted action research*
  - *Descriptions of partnerships with individual schools or districts*
  - *Description of methods and development of any assessment used*
  - *Use of focus groups, blogs, electronic journals, interviews, and other evidence*

The UPRM EPP was following the recommendations provided in the CAEP Accreditation Handbook, in Margie Crutchfield's webinar on Standard 4: Its language, suggested evidence, and questions to address ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WO\\_4f3tfN9s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WO_4f3tfN9s)), in the CAEP Evidence Guide, and in the CAEP Guidelines for Plans; Phasing in Accreditation Evidence. An excerpt from the Guidelines for Plans follows:

#### *“CAEP GUIDELINES FOR PLANS - PHASING IN ACCREDITATION EVIDENCE*

*CAEP's accreditation procedures include phase-in plans that allow educator preparation providers (EPPs) submitting self-study reports through calendar 2017 some additional time to collect the appropriate evidence/data. While these plans are in effect, CAEP's Site Visitors and accreditation reviews will accept them, together with any implementation steps that have occurred by the time of the site visit, as if they were evidence.*

*These Guidelines for Plans are to help EPPs understand CAEP's expectations for phase-in plans submitted during the transition period that begins in 2015. They provide*

*additional detail on the CAEP Evidence Phase-In Schedule found in the CAEP Accreditation Manual–Version 2 (p.83-84). These Guidelines also describe important aspects of the Site Visitors’ investigation of plans as well as options that the Accreditation Council will consider in reaching accreditation decisions.”*

(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.

The plan for Program Impact Study was developed, because the Puerto Rico Department of Education did not publish or share the Pilot Teacher Evaluation Study data. A representative of the PRDE promised to share said data with all the universities in Puerto Rico. Recently we learned that the office in charge of the Teacher Evaluation Study was disbanded after the change of the political party in power.

(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.

The reliability and validity of the Abbreviated Teacher Work Sample will be developed as part of the Program Impact Mixed Method Research. A validation and reliability expert is working on this matter for all the instruments in the project.

b) 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?

The Pre and Post subject test analysis of student learning in the Abbreviated Teacher Work Sample (ATWS) will provide evidence of UPRM prepared teachers’ impact on student learning. For a detailed description of the requirements of this part of the Mixed Method Research Plan see evidence AE 4.1.3 Revised UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instruments, pages 16-19.

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

We expect to have ATWS data for Spring 2017 available for the BoE Visit in May 2017.

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

Neither UPRM nor any UPR campus has received data from the PRDE pilot study. We recently learned that the PRDE office in charge of conducting the pilot Teacher Evaluation Study and developing a systematic teacher evaluation process was disbanded.

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

With the proposed mixed methods research UPRM EPP anticipates ascertaining how its recent alumni are impacting their students learning and growth. The proposed research will help the UPRM EPP identify strengths and weaknesses of the teachers it prepares as manifested by the alumni and their school ecosystem. 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 with respect to student learning. The proposed analysis will include comparisons of alumni across diverse licensure areas and school types. The completer interviews and the EPP Alumni Survey will be used to document completer satisfaction (4.4). The employer interviews and the EPP 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).

The research process itself will undergo periodic formative evaluation in order to make adjustments that allow the program to collect and maintain consistent data and data cycles for continuous improvement over the next seven years. The UPRM EPP will share and discuss the collected information with faculty and stakeholders at the beginning of the next academic year. Subsequently, faculty "data days" (extended working meetings) and Assessor Committee meetings will be held to present the data with an initial analysis in order to make data driven decisions to optimize the program the following semester that the data is collected. Suggestions and comments from research participants will be given deliberate attention in the data analysis and in planning improvements.

The in-depth look at alumni performance provided by the proposed research, taking into consideration their school ecosystem is expected to produce and foster future educational research. The proposed research should prove fruitful territory for UPRM to contribute to the knowledge base of higher education reforms. The results of the mixed methods study will be published in the <http://uprm.edu/eppcaep> page as well as in a peer reviewed journal and presented in professional education conferences.

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

The UPRM University Educational Research and Service Resource Center (Spanish acronym CRUISE) has separated money for the teacher stipends from its external funds account. CRUISE has developed and operated research and professional development proposals that have generated over three million dollars in funds over the past 15 years. For details see <http://www.uprm.edu/cms/index.php/page/1816>. Sustainability of the teacher stipends and program impact studies depends on the ability of the UPRM EPP and CRUISE to generate funds.

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

Rather than the originally planned three-day workshop, the 6 professors (4 from the TPP, 1 from AgEd and 1 math professor) held monthly meetings during the fall semester and during the spring semester to develop, discuss, prepare, and refine the data collection process. All but one of the professors who will act as teacher observers has used the Candidate Teacher Work Sample for the last 10 years. The participating alumni all have used the longer version of the ATWS during their practice. The ATWS contains parts of the longer version of CTWS, so the observers and the alumni are all familiar with the instructions and the rubrics involved.

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

The Candidate Teacher Work Sample uses portions of an established instrument. The ATWS contains parts of the longer version of CTWS.

3. 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.

Potential UPRM prepared teachers from recent (1 to 5 years) cohorts were contacted and asked to respond to a short survey. Those teachers contacted who indicated an interest in participating in the Program Impact Study were provided an orientation about the study as well as initial discussion with a classroom observer. Participating teachers, their school directors, and students all sign standard consent forms.

During a series of training sessions and after careful deliberation by the Program Impact Study team (the professors who will serve as observers) it was decided that The Danielson Observation would not be used to evaluate observed classes. The reasons the team decided to do this were: 1) It is not possible to complete the Danielson rubric based on a single class observation; 2) Much more evidence and work is required from the participants than previously anticipated (plans, tasks, project rubrics, exams, multiple observations inside and outside the classroom, and follow up interviews); and 3) To make fair evaluations with the Danielson Observation Rubric would require observing the teachers for at least a full semester. So the team decided to adapt the Classroom Observation Instrument for the Improvement of Teaching Practice of the TPP with which all are familiar. The principal reasons were: 1) This is an observation tool that permits the observer to score performance based on a single observation supported by one interview; 2) Being shorter reduces interpretation biases among observers who are already familiar with it; and 3) The results of these observations will be directly comparable with the results from teaching candidate practitioners providing a better opportunity to analyze post-graduation progress. The revised instrument was titled the Classroom Observation Instrument for In-Service Teachers.

The class is observed and recorded so the observer can make an accurate evaluation. The Tripod Student Surveys are filled out by two groups of the participant alumni teacher's students during a visit subsequent to the 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
  - (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?

The evaluator training used the Classroom Observation Instrument for In-Service Teachers in collaborative peer sessions among the classroom observers/evaluators. For the Tripod Student Surveys the Met Project guidelines were followed (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2012). Asking Students about Teaching: Student Perception Surveys and Their Implementation. MET Project Policy and Practice Brief. Retrieved from

[http://www.metproject.org/downloads/Asking\\_Students\\_Practitioner\\_Brief.pdf](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/Asking_Students_Practitioner_Brief.pdf)).

Validated versions of the elementary or secondary Tripod Student Survey (4.2.2) will be used to gather data from alumni teachers' students, depending on the grade level taught by the alumnus. Two groups of the alumni teachers' students will be asked to complete the Tripod Student Survey. Information on the validity and reliability of the Tripod Student Survey can be found in Asking Students about Teaching: Student Perception Surveys and Their Implementation, MET Project Policy and Practice Brief by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2012.

- (2) What data will be presented and how will the data from Danielson's Observation Rubric be used for program improvement?

The Classroom Observation Instrument for In-Service Teachers results obtained during the Program Impact Study will be examined for commonalities that indicate particular strengths that program can build on and weaknesses that the program needs to address. Individual strengths will be noted to seek specific preparation that may have helped these individuals be more efficient practitioners than their colleagues. Individual weaknesses will be noted to consider what might have been added to their preparation to help them reach their more successful colleagues' levels of effectiveness. Program improvement suggestions generated during analysis and team discussion of rubric results will be discussed with participating teachers in follow up interviews. While team discussions will include cooperating teachers and practice center directors, other cooperating teachers and practice center directors will be given an opportunity to react to program improvement suggestions generated as well as to contribute their own ideas.



(3) How will the data from The Tripod Student Surveys be used for program improvement? Data from the Tripod Student Surveys will be analyzed and discussed in the same manner as data from the Classroom Observation Instrument for In-service Teachers. The data from the surveys will provide students' perceptions of their teachers (UPRM EPP alumni) and to some extent corroborate the results of the Classroom Observation Instrument. The surveys and the Classroom Observation Instrument is expected to reveal strengths and weaknesses of UPRM prepared teachers and signal course or field experience matters that need attention. Differences between the surveys and the Observation Instrument may indicate issues that affect learning but escape student perception. Differences may also reveal issues that students perceive and affect their learning, but pass undetected in classroom observation.

(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).

The CAEP Accreditation Handbook 2016 recommends the Case Study method on page 51. The target of 8 to 10 teachers falls within the capabilities and resources of a small program like the UPRM EPP. Until the Puerto Rico Department of Education implements a teacher evaluation procedure and reports results to Puerto Rico's teacher preparation programs, the UPRM EPP will need to repeat the Program Impact Study periodically. When and if the PRDE implements an island wide teacher evaluation scheme that provides teacher impact on learning data, the UPRM EPP can shift its Program Impact Studies to matters of particular interest not addressed by that scheme.

(5) Are data available from Fall 2016 for Danielson's Observation Rubric and the Tripod Student Surveys?

We had planned and expect to have data from all the instruments for Spring 2017 and available for the BoE Visit in May 2017. Note: As explained elsewhere, we will be using the Classroom Observation for In-Service Teacher Instrument rather than the Danielson Observation Rubric.

#### 4. 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  
Employer Interview Protocol (4.3.1)

UPRM TPP faculty members serving as observers worked through peer training sessions to conduct interviews using the Employer Interview Protocol and the Teacher Interview Protocol. Observers will meet after conducting interviews to discuss procedures and evaluation of the interviews to further reduce bias and assure inter rater reliability. Classroom observations and interviews will be correlated with self-report measures (surveys) and student achievement with respect to learning objectives (ATWS).

The Employer Survey was sent by email to all the Directors of alumni who reported they were working in a school and teaching practice center directors. When the alumni surveyed failed to include their director's email, the information was retrieved either by searching at the school web page or calls made directly to the school.

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

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:

c) 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).

The data is still being collected. We expect to have data of the Program Impact Mixed Method Study instruments for Spring 2017 available for the BoE Visit in May 2017.

2) Teacher Performance Evaluation Data from PRDE.

Neither UPRM nor any UPR campus has received data from the PRDE pilot study. We recently learned that the PRDE office in charge of conducting the pilot Teacher Evaluation Study and developing a systematic teacher evaluation process was disbanded.

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

Law 129 is now translated and included in the evidences of the Addendum as AE 2.5.1a Law 129 August 2016 Translated

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

PRDE Policy Letter 2-2012-2013 is now translated and included in the evidences of the Addendum as AE 2.2 Policy Letter 2-2012-2013

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

Please see AE 5.2.1a Qualtrics Classroom Observation Instrument Validation translated. It includes the new COI form as the last 19 pages.

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.

Please see evidence of the meetings attendance sheet and agendas in [http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/meetings\\_and\\_committees](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/meetings_and_committees)

d) 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?

In Standard 1 we wrote:

*Candidates enrolled in a bachelor's must meet specific content course credit and GPA requirements at transition points 2 and 3 to continue the TPP curricular sequence (see 3.1). Alternate route candidates, those who completed a bachelor's degree at UPRM or another institution, must meet content course and GPA requirements specific to the licensure area to be admitted.*

See original evidence 2.2.2 *TPP Transition Point- UPRM Undergraduate Catalog 2016-2017* under standard 2 for current GPA requirements in the Teacher Preparation Program. See original evidence 3.2.2 *Admission Program Progression by Transition Point & InTASC* under standard 3 for GPA requirements at program transition points. See Addendum Evidence *AE5.b.1b TPP Admission Data* for admission register showing the use of GPA requirements.

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?

Each one of the Mixed Methods Research instruments are aligned to InTASC and PRDE Professional Standards. The result will be analyzed in terms of InTASC and state professional standards. For an example of this type of analysis, see evidence 1.1.2b - InTASC Standards in Observation Instrument and 1.1.2c. - InTASC Standards demonstrated in TCWS.

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

1) Has the data from the employer surveys been dis-aggregated by programs?

Past data was not disaggregated, but the revised surveys and interview protocols include that information.

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?

In May 2015 the UPRM EPP conducted a pilot test of the Employer Satisfaction survey with items aligned to the 2013 InTASC Standards and the *Puerto Rico Department of Education Teacher Professional Standards* (PRDE-TPS) as well to the UPRM EPP Candidate Proficiencies. Due to the low response rate by school directors (3 of 20) the Pilot Study Survey, the three responders were asked to comment on the survey structure, instructions and purpose, item ambiguity, language, and alignment with InTASC and state standards. These follow up response were used to improve the survey structure, instructions and purpose, reduce item ambiguity, clarify language, and align items better with InTASC and state standards. Specific questions on promotion, retention and teacher area were added to the revised version (see 4.3.2a).

3) Are data available from the UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instrument? If so, has the data been analyzed?

We are in the process of collecting data that we hope to have ready for the visit. After the submission of the Self Study, the Program Impact Mixed Methods Plan was revised and expanded to include the Classroom Observation Instrument for In-Service Teachers (see Addendum Evidence AE 4.1.3 Revised UPRM TPP Program Impact Mixed Methods Study & Instruments)

4) How are GPAs, which are the university norm for measuring student progress, considered relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable?

In Standard 1 we wrote:

*Candidates enrolled in a bachelor's must meet specific content course credit and GPA requirements at transition points 2 and 3 to continue the TPP curricular sequence (see 3.1). Alternate route candidates, those who completed a bachelor's degree at UPRM or another institution, must meet content course and GPA requirements specific to the licensure area to be admitted.*

See original evidence 2.2.2 *TPP Transition Point- UPRM Undergraduate Catalog 2016-2017* under standard 2 for current GPA requirements in the Teacher Preparation Program. See original evidence 3.2.2 *Admission Program Progression by Transition Point & InTASC* under standard 3 for GPA requirements at program transition points. See Addendum Evidence *AE5.b.1b TPP Admission Data* for admission register showing the use of GPA requirements.

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?

See Addendum Evidence *AE5.b.1b TPP Admission Data* for admission register showing how the TPP has used GPA requirements for admission.

In Standard 1 we wrote:

*Candidates enrolled in a bachelor's must meet specific content course credit and GPA requirements at transition points 2 and 3 to continue the TPP curricular sequence (see 3.1). Alternate route candidates, those who completed a bachelor's degree at UPRM or another institution, must meet content course and GPA requirements specific to the licensure area to be admitted.*

See original evidence 2.2.2 *TPP Transition Point- UPRM Undergraduate Catalog 2016-2017* under standard 2 for current GPA requirements in the Teacher Preparation Program and how these are used as prerequisites for enrolling in Methodology and Teaching Practice. See original evidence 3.2.2 *Admission Program Progression by Transition Point & InTASC* under standard 3 for GPA requirements at program transition points.

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?

See [http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/end\\_of\\_program\\_survey](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/end_of_program_survey) and [http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/meetings\\_and\\_committees](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/meetings_and_committees).

7) Are teacher evaluation data from the Department of Education (PRDE) available? If so, has the data been analyzed?

Neither UPRM nor any UPR campus has received data from the PRDE pilot study. We recently learned that the PRDE office in charge of conducting the pilot Teacher Evaluation Study and developing a systematic teacher evaluation process was disbanded.

8) Is there evidence to support that the Data Day Retreat was held in the fall of 2016?

Due to institutional financial limitations the data was discussed in a series of departmental meetings during the 2016 fall semester instead of the planned Data Day Retreat. A Data Day will be held in the 2017 fall semester to discuss data collected in the Program Impact Study. See [http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/meetings\\_and\\_committees](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/meetings_and_committees) for a list of departmental and committee meetings.

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?

That data is being collected as part of the Program Impact Study. Meetings will be held after the data is collected.

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?

See original evidence 5.1 Effective Quality Assurance System that Monitors Progress Using Multiple Measures in which the process is described in detail. Also available (<https://wordpress.uprm.edu/uprmcaep/standard-5provider-quality-continuous-improvement-capacity/5-1-effective-quality-assurance-system-that-monitors-progress-using-multiple-measures/>). How data is used is explained in the Transition Points tables.

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?

See original evidence 2.2.4 Meetings with Cooperative Teachers, Directors and Supervisors to Evaluate the Observation Rubric (<https://wordpress.uprm.edu/uprmcaep/standard-2-clinical-partnership-practice/2-2-partners-co-select-prepare-evaluate-support-and-retain-high-quality-clinical-educators/#1478274403154-f4df2d1c-ce77>).

The Conceptual Framework was developed in 2006 and revised in 2010. The evidence of those meetings was included in the NCATE exhibits.

## Cross-cutting Themes of Diversity and Technology

### DIVERSITY

B. 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?

Yes, see Addendum Evidence AE 1.4.1 EDES 4006 Service Learning Project Report

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

No.

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

We will ask Dr. David Collum at Missouri Baptist University for this data.

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

Yes, please refer to [http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/clinical\\_practice\\_centers](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/clinical_practice_centers)

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).

The courses listed in evidence 1.5.4 are required for all candidates including AgED and PE. The curricular brochures listing these and other required courses are available at: [http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/brochures\\_ppm](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/brochures_ppm)

- Evidence 1.5.2 provides data on the use of technology from the COI; however, data are not disaggregated by program.

In process.

- 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.

In process

- 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.

Examples are provided in evidence 1.5.1 including links to student work (page 1), data are provided in evidence 1.5.1 on pages 6 and 7. All candidates are required to take this course. The curricular brochures listing these and other required courses are available at:

[http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/brochures\\_ppm](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/brochures_ppm).

- 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
  - 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.
  - 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
  - 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.

In process

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

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

The College Boards does not provide disaggregated sub-score data about the PCMAS. It provides only limited aggregated information about sub-scores. There is no sub-score for using technology effectively for teaching.

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

Yes, examples are provided in evidence 1.5.1 with links to student work (page 1). Data are provided in evidence 1.5.1 on pages 6 and 7. All candidates are required to take this course. Can view the courses in the curricular brochures at:

[http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/brochures\\_ppm](http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/brochures_ppm)

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

All data regarding the simSchool are collected and analyzed by Dr. David Collum at Missouri Baptist University. We will ask for the data pertinent to our students before the visit. Preliminary reactions by UPRM teacher candidates were negative.



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

A. Area for Improvement

1. No AFI(s) found.

II. Response to the Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)

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

1. 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.

For reasons explained in the Addendum to Standard 4, the study is using the Classroom Observation Instrument for In-Service Teachers rather than the Danielson Framework. The UPRM University Educational Research and Service Resource Center (Spanish acronym CRUISE) has separated money for the teacher stipends from its external funds account. CRUISE has developed and operated research and professional development proposals that have generated over three million dollars in funds over the past 15 years. For details see <http://www.uprm.edu/cms/index.php/page/1816>. Sustainability of the teacher stipends and program impact studies depends on the ability of the UPRM EPP and CRUISE to generate funds.

Potential UPRM prepared teachers from recent (1 to 5 years) cohorts were contacted and asked to respond to a short survey. Those teachers contacted who indicated an interest in participating in the Program Impact Study were provided an orientation about the study as well as initial discussion with a classroom observer. Consent forms prepared by the UPRM TPP have been signed and collected from the participating alumni teachers, their school directors, and the parents of their students. All consent forms were collected prior to classroom observation visits and interviews. See the consent forms at <http://uprm.edu/p/eppcaep/documentos - instrumentos y consentimientos>

2. 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).

3. 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.

Note: For reasons explained in the Addendum to Standard 4, the study is using the Classroom Observation Instrument for In-Service Teachers rather than the Danielson Framework.

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

Potential exists.

## 5. 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.

The timeline for the Program Impact Study cycle over the next 7 years, its role in the EPP assessment plan, and the overall assessment plan have undergone a series of revisions that are pending discussion and approval at the next faculty meeting. The revisions should be finalized by the date of the site visit. A timeline and assessment plan will be available by the date of the site visit. The last paragraph in the Selected Improvement Plan states:

*The budget includes \$68,386.33 for compensation and release time for 8 faculty members. The budget for three student assistants is \$8,700.00 and \$10,000 for administrative personnel compensation. The budget for marginal benefits for the above personnel is \$8,516.54. The budget for training costs including lodging and food is \$21,681.53. The budget for resources, materials and equipment is \$6,500.00. The budget also includes \$1,500.00 for participant stipends. The total budget for the first year 2016-17 comes to a grand total of \$125,284.40.*

The UPRM Institutional Review Board duly approved the Program Impact Study on January 23, 2017. See Addendum Evidence AE.SIP.1 IRB Approval Program Impact.