



Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation

Site Review Report

CAEP Site Review Team:

Dr. Linda R. Barley
Coletta Parsley
Dr. Jodi L. Kupper
Dr. Karen A. Verbeke
Dr. Tracy Mulvaney

State Consultant:

N/A

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Staff Observer

Bethani Studebaker
Dr. Lynze Greathouse

Selected Improvement Pathway

**UNIVERSIDAD DE PUERTO
RICO DE MAYAGUEZ**

Teacher Preparation Program

PPM-DECEP

PO Box 9000

Mayaguez, PR 00681

November 13, 2024 12:00 a.m.

CONFIDENTIAL

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
1140 19th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
Website: caepnet.org
Phone: 202.223-0077

Site Review Report

Section I. Introduction

Overview of the EPP and program offerings: (focus on differences between what was stated in the Formative Feedback Report and what was verified on the site visit.)

The EPP's Institutional Overview reflects the information provided in the SSR and Addendum and reiterates that UPR-Mayaguez is a Sea, Land and Agricultural grant status institution of higher education. Highlights include Agriculture Education, UPR-Mayaguez' dedication to STEM Education, and Content-based learning instruction. The EPP is proud to report a 92 percent pass rates for its 161 total EPP enrollments.

Summary of state partnership that guided the visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or a CAEP-only visit)

CAEP-only.

Special circumstances of the site visit review, if any. (Example: No unusual circumstances affected the visit.)

Originally planned for spring 2024, the EPP was granted a rescheduled onsite visit for fall 2024 (November 13-15, 2024).

Section II. Standard R.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

The provider ensures that candidates develop an understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and facilitates candidates' reflection of their personal biases to increase their understanding and practice of equity, diversity, and inclusion. The provider is intentional in the development of their curriculum and clinical experiences for candidates to demonstrate their ability to effectively work with diverse P-12 students and their families.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

* Task(s)

Data disaggregation by race/ethnicity	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	All data sets presented in evidence.
1.	B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed
(1)	SSR narrative that addresses data analysis.
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	Data needs to be disaggregated and results need to be analyzed.

Component 1.2**A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**(1) 2. **B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed**(1) **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**(1) **Component 1.3****A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**(1) 3. **B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed**(1) **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**(1) **Component 1.4****A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**(1) 4. **B. Excerpt from Self-Study Report (SSR) to be clarified or confirmed**(1) **C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**(1) **Action:****2. Analysis regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 1 :****a. Narrative analysis of findings**

As presented in the SSR and Addendum, the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS) (1.1.4) data analysis for the period of 2020-2023 reveals positive trends -- as evidenced in the TCWS (across various licensure areas). Ninety-nine percent of candidates demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the 10 InTASC standards distributed across four categories (1.3.3 PCMAS Data): Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility. The PCMAS data reported by program/level.

UPRM candidate performance data in the last three years reveals noteworthy trends in relation to the five Learner and Learning items assessed through the Classroom

Observation Instrument. The analysis demonstrates a consistently high level of achievement, with an impressive 91% to 96% of candidates attaining or surpassing the designated proficient level, represented by scores of 3 (Competent) and 4 (Exemplary). This consistent success underscores the effectiveness of the educational practices and learning environment fostered at UPRM, highlighting the institution's commitment to maintaining a standard of excellence in preparing candidates for their roles in education.

Per Evidence 1.1.5, The evidence describes a positive trend in the University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez (UPRM) candidate performance over the past three years, where 91% to 96% of candidates consistently reached or exceeded the proficient level on the five Learner and Learning items assessed through the Classroom Observation Instrument.

Per Evidence Additionally, the analysis of TCWS performance (2023.1.1.4) highlights candidates' ability to engage in self-reflection, particularly in identifying and addressing biases. This aspect underscores the candidates' commitment to continuous improvement and awareness of their instructional practices. Overall, the findings from the TCWS data analysis indicate a high level of competence and consistency among teacher candidates, with a focus on inclusivity and professional growth.

Onsite evidence noted that validity and reliability would be established for at least three of the EPP created assessments in 2024-2025 (Onsite Evidence Educational Philosophy Essay Rubric EDFU-4019; Onsite Evidence Teacher Candidate Dispositions Survey Transition Point; Onsite Evidence Focal Interview with Directors of the University). The EPP initially identified seven EPP-created assessments. There was no evidence of using the CAEP Criteria for their EPP-Created Assessments and Surveys.

b. Analysis of Program-Level data

The EPP addresses the InTASC, syllabi, assessment, crosswalk identify the InTASC stand (domain) being assessed. As reported, 93% of UPRM Teacher Education students pass the PCMAS on the first try; this is a point of pride of the EPP and UPRM.

Per the EPP, scores ranged as follows: score 1 (emerging), score 2 (developing), score 3 (Competent), and score 4 (Exemplary). The evidence includes the domains, alignment with CAEP, InTASC, and DEPR. TCWS, 99% of UPRM candidates demonstrated a 99% comprehensive understanding of of the 10 InTASC Standards. Content areas: Social Studies, English, Science, Spanish, Art/THeater/Commercial, PE, and Math. Mean scores for all teacher candidates (2020-2023): Learning and Learner (3.0), Content Knowledge (2.95), Instructional Practice (3) and Professional Responsibility (2.95)

c. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

- 1.1.4 Teacher Work Sample Data
- 1.1.5 Teaching Practice Observation Instrument Data
- 1.3.3 PCMAS Data (by program/level only)

d. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each**Area for Improvement**

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation:

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II. Standard R.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice**1. Tasks completed by the site team:*** **Task(s)**

R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Although the evidence overview sheet is in English for several pieces of evidence for R2.1, the actual evidence is in Spanish. Please provide an English translation of the following evidence documents for R2.1: 2023.2.1.1, 2023.2.1.4, 2023.2.1.13, 2023.2.1.14
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
1	
(1)	The EPP provided minutes from October 19, 2023, meeting with an educational administrators focus group and from an October 24, 2023, Accreditation Advisory Committee Meeting. Provide evidence of additional meetings with these groups and/or other partnerships with P-12 to denote ongoing collaborative processes for co-construction and decision making to improve teacher candidate preparation that is reviewed periodically.
(2)	Explain how does the EPP ensures that all partners are involved in the development, maintenance, and modification of the partnership.
(3)	The EPP mentioned research regarding the agriculture education program as a mutual benefit. Provide additional evidence to demonstrate the co-construction of mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements for clinical preparation across all teacher education programs.
(4)	Clarify how the EPP demonstrates collaboration with P-12 partners ensuring diversity of clinical settings for students across all teacher education programs.
(5)	Describe how the EPP uses program-level data to demonstrate what has been learned from the evidence for R2.1, and what conclusions and interpretations have been made across all teacher education programs.

R2.2: Clinical Educators**A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**

- (1) Although the evidence overview sheet is in English for several pieces of evidence for R2.2, the actual evidence is in Spanish. Please provide an English translation of the following evidence documents for R2.2: 2023.2.2.1, 2023.2.2.3, 2023.2.2.4 (p. 5-9).

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- (1) Regarding SSR Evidence 2023.2.2.6, the overview states, "Based on the discussions during these visits, professional development plans are created and implemented to provide necessary support and guidance for the practicum students and educators." Provide evidence to reflect those ongoing discussions, analysis of data from the visits, and examples of the PD plans.

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

- (1) Describe how the EPP provides evidence of using the data from the teacher candidate evaluation of the clinical educators (SSR Evidence 2023.2.2.4) or other relevant data to evaluate clinical educators, both provider and school-based, and to determine their impact on candidate success.
- (2) How does the EPP demonstrate that clinical educators have a positive impact on teacher candidate development and diverse P-12 student learning?
- (3) How does the EPP provide evidence of engaging partners in ongoing, data informed decision-making and ongoing candidate support regarding clinical educators?

R2.3: Clinical Experiences

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

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

- (1) The EPP reported working with the PR DOE and P-12 schools to design clinical experiences (SSR, p. 20). The evidence presented appears to document a variety of field experiences through syllabi, information tables, student success stories, and PD training. How were the clinical experiences designed in collaboration with partners as required for R2.3, and what data do you have to demonstrate this ongoing collaboration?
- (2) How do you demonstrate that clinical experiences are being implemented as designed and that teacher candidate progression is consistently monitored and supported across all program areas?
- (3) How do you determine that the clinical experiences identified on syllabi related to technology applications and meeting the needs of diverse learners have ensured that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on diverse P-12 students' learning and development? What data do you have to demonstrate this?

Action:

- 1 R2.1 Partnerships for Clinical Preparation: Parts of this task were addressed in the Addendum while other parts were clarified by stakeholders during the virtual onsite interviews.
- 2 R2.2 Clinical Educators: Parts of this task were addressed in the Addendum while other parts were clarified by stakeholders during the virtual onsite interviews.
- 3 R2.3 Clinical Experiences: Parts of this task were addressed in the Addendum while other parts were clarified by stakeholders during the virtual onsite interviews.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 2 :

a. Summary of findings

For R2.1: Partnerships for Clinical Preparation, the EPP provided a letter from the Director of the Vocational School supporting the recommendations from the Fall 2023

focal group meeting (Addendum Evidence 2023.2.1.10a). Decisions made during the meeting were to enhance teaching methodologies, streamline observational visits, support teacher induction and continuous improvement, and address professional development. In addition, the EPP submitted minutes from a focal group meeting attended by stakeholders but facilitated by the PRDE (Addendum Evidence 2023.2.1.7a).

Therefore, evidence demonstrates mutually beneficial collaboration among the EPP, the PRDE, and P-12 partners, which was verified with stakeholders during the virtual onsite interviews. P-12 mentor teachers and a superintendent agreed that they have benefited from the well-trained program completers who have been hired within their schools. In addition, EPP leadership and faculty indicated that they have benefited from the mentor teachers who have provided support for their teacher candidates. Other collaboration efforts have included participation in induction programs for newly hired teachers and the sharing of instructional tools among teacher candidates and cooperating teachers. Therefore, the collaboration among stakeholders and the University for the clinical preparation of teacher candidates is mutually beneficial, and continuous improvement efforts appear to be shared.

For R2.2, the EPP verified the selection process for clinical educators during the virtual onsite interviews. University supervisors are identified by deans and program directors, and they must have both content and education degrees or have formally served as P-12 teachers. Cooperating teachers must meet requirements established by the PRDE and must be trained through an online certification course, which is valid for five years. After five years, there is a recertification course that must be completed. The EPP indicated that all cooperating teachers must have final approval by the superintendent. In addition, the EPP presented a Revised Protocol for Addressing Professional Development Needs of Clinical Supervisors (Addendum Evidence 2023.2.2.9a). According to the virtual onsite interviews, the protocol was revised based on feedback from the supervisors.

During the interviews, the initial candidates and the EPP verified that teacher candidates evaluate both the university-based and school-based clinical supervisors as part of an exit survey. The University Supervisors clarified that they receive data from the survey and use the data for targeted improvements. The cooperating teachers clarified that the University Supervisor frequently discusses candidates' progress with them, but they do not receive any direct feedback from the candidates on their experiences. However, the EPP confirmed that they use the data from the evaluation of the cooperating teachers to make decisions about which cooperating teachers they should continue to use; therefore, the data are not shared directly with the cooperating teachers, but it is used in decision making. During the interviews, the EPP indicated offering workshops during the field experiences and practicum based on the cooperating teachers' feedback during informal meetings with supervisors; therefore, current workshops are in the areas of behavior management and working with special education students. During the virtual onsite interviews, the EPP reiterated the importance of frequent conversations during informal meetings and focal group meetings in decision-making.

For R2.3: Clinical Experiences, the EPP provided additional evidence to indicate

collaboration with partners to design and implement clinical experiences (Addendum Evidence 2023.2.2.1a). The EPP, University Supervisors, cooperating teachers, and other P-12 stakeholders verified the importance of discussions during focal group meetings as well as frequent informal conversations regarding clinical experiences. Evidences such as meeting minutes (Addendum Evidence 2023.2.1.7a), letters of support for recommended changes (Addendum Evidence 2023.2.1.10a), and stakeholder interviews indicated participation in discussions and decisions about needed changes. For example, one P-12 administrator commented that the University took the advice of the district partners regarding candidates spending too many hours with one teacher. As a result of the recommendation, the candidates are now required to observe different grade levels and different types of teachers.

While there are multiple sources of evidence to demonstrate that the EPP has developed mutually beneficial partnerships to ensure high-quality clinical practices for teacher candidates, there is a concern regarding a systematic process to collect, analyze, and report data, which is reflected in Standard R5.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Q88385_2023.2.1.6a_Coconstruction_and_Collaboration_with_the_Puerto_Rico_Department_of_Education

Q88385_2023.2.1.7a_Second_Sessions_of_Focal_Groups_Coconstruction

Q88385_2023.2.1.10a_Collaborative_Endorsement_of_Educational_Enhancements_at_UPRM_EPP

Q88385_2023.2.1.10b_Collaborative_Endorsement_of_Educational_Enhancements_at_UPRM_EPP

Q88385_2023.2.1.16_Streamlining_Observational_Visits

Q88385_2023.2.1.17_Continuous_CoConstruction_Collaborative_Efforts_Between_UPRM_EPP_ (1)

Q88385_2023.2.2.1a_Revised_Protocol_for_Placement_of_UPRM_EPP_Students_in_School_Setting

Q88385_2023.2.2.9a_Revised_Protocol_for_Determining_and_Addressing_Professional_Development (1)

Q88385_2023.2.3.4_Field_Placement_Requirements_in_Alignment_with_Courses

Q88385_2023.2.3.5_Syllabus_of_EDES_4006_Nature_and_needs_of_the_Exceptional_Learner

Q88385_2023.2.3.9a_UPRM_EEP_Meeting_Demonstrating_Considering_PRDE_and_Completers_Satisfaction

Q88385_2023.5.1.1_UPRM_Teacher_Preparation_Assessment_System_Procedures

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Q88385_2023.2.2.11a__Curriculum_Vitas_of_Dr._Jose76

Q88385_2023.2.3.3__UPRM_EPP_Teacher_Candidates_and_Completer_Sucess_Stories

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each**Area for Improvement:**

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II. Standard R.3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support

The provider demonstrates the quality of candidates is a continuous and purposeful focus from recruitment through completion. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation and that the EPP provides supports services (such as advising, remediation, and mentoring) in all phases of the program so candidates will be successful.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:*** Task(s)**

Minimum Cohort Average GPA of 3.0	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Provide aggregated cohort GPA data that documents the 3.0 mean GPA is established for each cohort for at least one of the established transition points.
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	
(1)	"The PRDE eliminated the minimum GPA requirement in 2022".
C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews	
(1)	Describe how the EPP monitors the requirement of a mean cohort GPA of 3.0 for at least one transition point in the program.
(2)	With the removal of a required GPA by the PRDE, how does the EPP [still] require both an overall and content minimum 3.0 GPA at Transition #2?
(3)	Interview EPP leadership, admissions and retention committee members, and P12 partners.

Candidate Complaint Process
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

2

- (1) Provide documentation or clarification of processes or procedures related to how a candidate complaint is considered and resolved (handbook, program requirements, etc.).
- (2) Documentation of how recent candidate complaints were considered and resolved (meeting minutes, communication, etc.).
- (3) Provide evidence of candidate documentation of complaints; the resolution of the complaints, and report of many candidate complaints the EPP has received in the past several years and how they were resolved.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed**C. Questions for EPP concerning additional evidence, data, and/or interviews**

- (1) Provide examples of candidate complaints and their resolution? Clarify the number of complaints received and resolved in the past three years.
- (2) Provide minutes or other documentation related to how the board has recently considered and responded to candidate complaints.
- (3) Provide evidence of the process by which a student who submits a complaint can access information regarding the status of their complaint.
- (4) Interview candidates.

3

Disaggregation of Data by Socioeconomic Status and Race**A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration**

- (1) Provide disaggregated data and analysis of data, based upon socioeconomic status and race, for the Teacher Candidate Work Sample, the Teaching Practice Observation Instrument, and the PCMAS.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- (1) "From this disaggregated data analysis it has been observed that there are no significant differences in completion rates or academic performance among different demographic groups within the UPRM EPP grouped by gender, teaching discipline, socioeconomic status or race".

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

- (1) Provide disaggregated analysis of data for each of the three culminating assessments (Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Teaching Practice Observation, and PCMAS) by demographic factors of socioeconomic status and race?

Action:

- 1 The EPP provided GPA data for each cohort of candidates that documented the mean GPA score for each cohort met the minimum GPA requirement of 3.0. The EPP also provided a Program Progression by Transition Point document that identified the requirements for progression, as aligned to the InTASC Standards.
- 2 The EPP provided information that outlined the process students take to submit a complaint, which includes a website that provides for electronic submission of the information. Interviews with candidates and completers confirmed that the process was shared with them as part of each course syllabus, which was required by the program, and that an individual existed at the University who served as a student advocate for their concerns/issues. On-site interviews attested that candidates were aware of the process and that information related to complaints is included in each course syllabus. Interviews also confirmed that a Student Advocate is available at the University to support students in the complaint process.
- 3 This task was not addressed in the Addendum, but in the introductory meeting with the EPP, they reported 93.7% of the University's students are Hispanic and 147 of 161 teacher candidates (91.3%) are Hispanic. Data provided as part of on-site evidence included the race/ethnicity of candidates by cohort, with the latest cohort reflecting two of 38 candidates were non-Hispanic. Lack of data disaggregation by race/ethnicity is perceived to be limited by the significant percentage of UPRM students who are Hispanic.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 3:**a. Summary of findings**

Component R3.1

The EPP recruits diverse candidates using a variety of activities. Each summer, the EPP participates in the annual Summer Academic Camp held by the UPRM, which hosts junior and senior high school students across Puerto Rico, to engage with them and introduce them to a potential career in education. The EPP also secured a NOYCE Teacher Scholars Program grant to strategically recruit STEM teachers who are fluent in both Spanish and English. The established goal is to prepare 39 STEM teachers across the five-year program and place them in high-need school districts. As of 2022-2023, this grant program helped to recruit 24 future science educators and 11 future math educators.

The EPP has developed a recruitment plan that outlines the planned activities and events for each year's outreach and engagement to attract new candidates (3.1.8). Over the past three years, the EPP's candidates have reflected both the demographic and socioeconomic diversity of Puerto Rico. They represent over 50% of the towns in Puerto Rico and come from all regions across the island. Regarding race/ethnicity, Puerto Rico is approximately 98% Hispanic. Overall, the University reports 93.7% of its students are Hispanic, and the EPP reported that 147 of 161 candidates (91.3%) are Hispanic. Therefore, the EPP reflects diversity slightly above the institution and the island itself.

The EPP reports that it is committed to meeting the needs of employers who regularly hire their candidates upon program completion. This includes a focus on relevant competencies desired by employers, ensuring candidates complete professional practica, regular collaboration with local schools and educational regions, continuous updates of program curriculum, ongoing professional development for alumni, and networking and recruiting events.

Component R3.2

The Transition Points for candidate admission, progression, and completion are described in greater detail within the UPRM Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures (5.1.1, pp. 14-38). While the EPP noted that the Puerto Rico Department of Education removed the requirement for a minimum GPA for certification in 2022, it appears the EPP continues to require both an overall 3.0 GPA as well as a 3.0 GPA in their major coursework in Transition Point #2: Enrollment in Theory and Methodology Course.

The EPP monitors candidate enrollment and pre-requisites each semester. The EPP states that these transition points for admission and progression are shared with candidates to advise them of the requirements for completion. Once Transition Point #3 is met, the advisor is asked to verify the GPA and grade requirements as part of the candidate application to Transition Point #4: Program Completion. The EPP Monitoring in Transition Points (2023.3.2.1) document lists the requirements that candidates must meet and the progression of the candidate for being approved based upon each.

The EPP shared an artifact (3.2.1) that provides the average GPAs for each program track by academic year and provided aggregate GPA data for each cohort of new candidates, broken out by gender, in Addendum artifact 1.1.3. Each cohort's mean GPA exceeded the 3.0 minimum requirements established for Transition #2. While

some program GPA means did not meet this threshold, the EPP shared that exemptions were made for the time frame reviewed by CAEP, due to the impacts of COVID-19, social unrest, and the University strike, which were perceived to have significant impacts on student success.

Interviews with both initial candidates and completers confirmed these transition points and requirements are commonly known. Each group confirmed the course requirements, with specific grades, as well as an overall GPA expectation of 3.0. Completers also confirmed that the final clinical experience is 180 hours, but that many remain after the hourly requirements are met, so that they can complete the remainder of the K-12 semester. Completers also discussed the completion of a Teacher Work Sample and a Portfolio as part of program requirements.

The EPP states that candidates have multiple options for providing feedback and/or complaints. Email or meetings with key personnel can occur for general information or questions. Candidate complaints or appeals begin with either the course professor or the academic advisor (for non-course issues). Candidates can also engage with their cooperating teachers and supervisors if the issue pertains to a placement, then move it on to the Practice Coordinator of the EPP Directors as needed.

The Teacher Education Assessment board then considers the issues. Should further assistance be needed, the candidates can engage with the Academic Dean and/or present their complaints through the Student Opinion Survey. Candidates also complete an end-of-program evaluation on program quality, advising, field experiences and program alignment with conceptual framework. Addendum documents, including artifact 3.3.3, provide information related to the process by which a student can address/submit complaints. The steps for submitting a complaint are outlined in the EPP Student Handbook, and students can access the website to submit their complaints electronically.

Interviews with initial candidates and completers confirmed that each course syllabus includes information and contact information for submitting a complaint, and that the University provides an individual (Student Advocate) who supports students who have complaints that go beyond the program/department levels. Faculty confirmed that this syllabus information is required by the EPP to support students, and that the information is available to student in greater detail in the Handbook, should a student need to better understand the process.

The EPP did not provide examples or information on recent specific student complaints, or meeting agendas/minutes that would reflect how the Teacher Education Assessment board resolves issues. This appears to be due to no recent student complaints being submitted.

Component R3.3

The EPP ensures preparedness for certification through evidence from multiple sources. These include final course assessments, as well as the Teacher Candidate Work Sample and the Teaching Practice Observation Instrument, which are both aligned to InTASC Standards. The analyses of both of these instruments are provided in artifacts 1.1.4 and 1.1.5.

The data analysis for the Teacher Candidate Work Sample (1.1.4) includes disaggregated data by each program track, as well as gender. The results of the analysis reflected similar levels of competencies between males and females. The percentage of students who fully MET the target for each InTASC domain ranged from low to high 90s, indicating candidates across programs were demonstrating the established competencies.

The data analysis for the Teaching Practice Observation Instrument (1.1.5) also includes disaggregated data by each program track, as well as gender. The results of the analysis reflected similar levels of competencies between males and females, but it did not reflect similar competencies across program tracks, for each InTASC domain. These results may be impacted by low n's for several of the programs, but nonetheless do indicate varying levels of preparation across program tracks. Overall, mean scores reflected candidates who met or exceeded the Competent level of performance.

Finally, data were provided from candidates who completed the State Teacher Examination (PCMAS 1.3.3), which is administered by the College Board in March of each year. Data for this assessment were only disaggregated by level (elementary or secondary) and by program. Data from the PCMAS Surveys were referenced, with high percentages of alumni satisfaction reported.

For each of these three assessments, no analysis of race/ethnicity was provided. The EPP provided race/ethnicity data on their candidates from the last three cohorts, broken out by program, with the most recent 2022-2023 cohort reflecting 38 students, of which two (5%) were non-Hispanic. Overall, the University reports 93.7% of its students are Hispanic, and the EPP reported that 147 of 161 candidates (91.3%) are Hispanic. Therefore, their lack of providing disaggregated assessment data by race/ethnicity may be due to the significant percentage of UPRM students who are Hispanic.

When asked about preparation to meet the needs of diverse learners, both initial candidates and completers referenced coursework and experiences that assisted them in their development to meet the needs of special education students, students from various socioeconomic backgrounds, and students with varied gender identities. When asked about preparation based upon race/ethnicity, they responded that while more than 90% of P-12 students are likely Hispanic, the variance in skin tone of is a diverse aspect of race/ethnicity that is addressed in their consideration of their student needs.

Interviews with K-12 District personnel and EPP faculty and staff confirmed that as new educator competencies are identified, either through engagement with school personnel and/or changes by the Department of Education, the curriculum is updated. Existing courses may be updated and/or new courses may be developed and added as required coursework. A recent example was new expectations for working with students with special needs, which informed the curriculum and added a new course for candidates.

Faculty and University Supervisors also attested to the candidates' preparation for meeting the needs of diverse learners, and how both program coursework and clinical experiences promote the consideration of contextual factors and student characteristics in developed instructional plans and student assessments.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

2023 1.1.3 Education Specialization Courses and Graduation GPA by Gender and Discipline.pdf
 2023 1.2.1 Program Progression by Transition Point InTASC.pdf
 2023 3.3.2 Teacher Certification Regulations PRDE No. 9375 April 28 2022
 2023 3.3.3 Candidate Complaint Process.pdf
 2023 3.3.4 Changes on Catalog about 3.0 GPA.pdf
 2023 3.3.5 Sample Admission Letter UPRM.pdf
 Diversity Data by Academic Year and Specialization of Completers 2020-2023.pdf

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

NA

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II. Standard R.4: Program Impact

The provider demonstrates the effectiveness of its completers' instruction on P-12 student learning and development, and completer and employer satisfaction with the relevance and effectiveness of preparation.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

* **Task(s)**

R4.1	
A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration	
(1)	Provide English translation of El Protocolo de Entrevista para Evaluar el Rendimiento del Maestro and satisfacción del director escolar.
(2)	Provide data disaggregated by year gathered using the El Protocolo de Entrevista para Evaluar el Rendimiento del Maestro and satisfacción del director escolar.
(3)	PCMAS (March-21) confirm the years reported.
(4)	Provide disaggregated PCMAS data by data and discipline
B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed	

- (1) Confirm the years reported in Pre-Post Test Statistics by discipline

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

- (1) Clarify the items in PCMAS that evidence completer effectiveness in P-12 classrooms.
- (2) Interview with EPP leadership, faculty and assessment leaders.
- (3) Provide English translation of the Evaluación del Docente: Maestro Ocupacional que ofrece cursos no condecentes a certificados.
- (4) Interview EPP faculty, assessment committee members, employers.

R4.2

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Provide English translation of the Focal Interview.
- (2) Confirm the number of directors interviewed.

2 B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

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

- (1) Provide data from the focal interview.
- (2) Disaggregate data by year.
- (3) Interview UPRM directors, school building leadership, and EPP leadership.

R4.3

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Provide English translation of the document.
- (2) Provide English translation of the single response.

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

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

- (1) Interview program completers.

Action:

- 1 R4.1.1: Provide English translation of El Protocolo de Entrevista para Evaluar el Rendimiento del Maestro and satisfacción del director escolar. Interviewees provided overall translation of the document and its purposes. R4.1.2: Clarify the items in PCMAS that evidence completer effectiveness in P-12 classrooms. Classroom effectiveness was not addressed in the addendum; interviews with faculty, mentor teachers and university supervisor confirmed how classroom effectiveness is assessed in the PCMAS. R4.1.4: Effectively uses a four-point survey: Above Standard, Standard, Below Standard and Unsatisfactory.
- 2 R4.2: Translations of the Focal Group meeting. The EPP provided an English Translation of the questions used in the Focal Group. Neither minutes, resolution nor actions were provided. Interviews with P-12 leaders and employers shared their reflection on the purpose and experience of the focal group.
- 3 R4.3: Exit Interview (and Translation). The EPP provided an English Translation of the questions used in the Exit. Neither minutes, resolution nor actions were provided.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 4 :

a. Summary of findings

As addressed in the SSR, Addendum and Onsite interviews, the EPP shared data

reporting completer effectiveness; note: the EPP provided limited evidence, satisfaction of the employers (though the evidence reported a limited number of respondents, and satisfaction of completers.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

Evidence 2023.3.1.7 NOYCE Teacher Program Enrollment of Math and Science Teacher Candidates.docx

Evidence 2023.4.1.2 PCMAS RESULTS.docx

Evidence 2023.4.1.3 Pre and Post Statistics.docx

Evidence 2023.4.1.5: Supervisors evaluation of completers (always redact the student's name)

Evidence 2023.4.2.2: Legal Framework and Guidelines

c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard

Evidence 2023.4.1.1 Interview Protocol to Evaluate Teacher Performance and Satisfaction of the School Director.docx

Evidence 2023.4.1.4: Circular Letter 2019-2020 Teaching Evaluation

Evidence 2023.4.1.6: Evaluation Statistics

Evidence 2023.4.2.1: Attendance of Focus Group Directors

Evidence 2023.4.2.3: Focal Interview with Directors of the University of Puerto Rico (document in Spanish)

Evidence 2023.4.3.1: Focal Group Teachers Attendance

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each

Area for Improvement:

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP provided limited evidence of employer satisfaction with completer preparation. (component R4.2)	The EPP provided limited evidence of employer satisfaction.
The EPP provided limited evidence that completers were satisfied with their preparation. (component R4.3)	The EPP provided limited evidence of completers' proficiencies to apply pedagogical and content in P-12 instruction.

Stipulation

Stipulation	Rationale

Section II. Standard R.5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement

The provider maintains a quality assurance system that consists of valid data from multiple measures and supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based. The system is developed and maintained with input from internal and external stakeholders. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements, and highlight innovations.

1. Tasks completed by the site team:

*** Task(s)**

Task 1: QAS

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- Candidate Assessment data is collected at four key transition points within the EPPs. These four transition points are 1) Admission and interview to the Teacher Preparation Program; 2) Enrollment in the Theory and Methodology course and progression interview; 3) Admission to Practicum; and 4) Program Completion.
- (1) The TPPs will conduct a Mixed Method Program Impact study annually beginning in the fall of 2016 to acquire more information about the completer impact on P-12 students.- p. 52

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- "UPRM EPP Assessment System Procedures Revised 2023 (#63) serves as the guide in which the EPP describes unit endeavors to assess its operational processes. This guide was created in 2009 and revised periodic" p. 47
- (1) "To enhance the consistency of our data collection, we are considering the implementation of a centralized platform where faculty members input rubric scores and annotations, allowing the EPP to access readily analyzable Data". p. 52

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

- Please describe which data is stored using Microsoft Office 365 and Google Applications. How has access to these data? Please provide meeting minutes from a recent Assessment Board meeting.
- (1) Can the faculty, staff, candidates, and stakeholders articulate their role and engagement in the Quality Assurance System?
- (2) Please provide a demo of how the Advisory and Assessment Board working documents are stored and accessed by stakeholders (MS Sharepoint?) (#63- p.11)
- (3) Please describe and provide evidence of an example of the QAS in action including the tool used, the data collected, the analysis completed, the review and discussion of the data by stakeholders, the conclusions/interpretations that were made and the use of the results for program improvement.
- (4)

Task 2- Data Quality

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- To ensure consistency and accuracy, the EPP Director conducts workshops and orientations for teacher candidates, cooperating teachers and school directors, university supervisors and methodology professors each semester- p. 53
- (1) All assessments are reviewed to evaluate potential bias towards any subgroup of candidates- p. 54
- (2) #63 p. 12- Agreement of narrative among coders- The unit performed instrument calibration exercises at faculty meetings in which members compared their scoring, discussed the variability of same, and established scoring parameters to reduce variability.
- (3)

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

- "Content professors from each teaching licensure area were asked to revise the alignment of the program assessment system with the CAEP, state education, and professional organization standards".- p. 53
- (1) "School and university faculty members discuss the instrument changes among
- (2)

2		themselves and with the candidates". - p. 53
	(3)	"All rubrics currently used to assess knowledge, skills, and dispositions were constructed using feedback, paying careful attention to fairness, accuracy and freedom from bias".- p. 53
	(4)	"We utilize a validated measurement instrument, has undergone rigorous prior validity testing. The validity is further reinforced through an expert review of the questions used in the focus groups".- p. 54
	(5)	"To ensure reliability, we created a protocol for questioning participants so procedures and methods we used are consistent across all data collection points and participants. In addition, we train the people involved in data collection to ensure they follow the same protocols and procedures consistently. Also, we use peer review to seek input from experts in the field to evaluate the reliability of your methods and procedures".- p. 54
	.	

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

- | | |
|-----|--|
| (1) | Please provide evidence of the unit calibration exercises at faculty meetings to establish norming (#63 p. 12). |
| (2) | Please provide evidence of the confirmation of the validity and reliability for each of the following EPP created assessments and surveys
Faculty Evaluation (University faculty/Clinical School Faculty).
End of Program Surveys
Alumni Surveys
Employer Surveys
Educational Philosophy Project Progressions Interview rubric
Classroom Observation Instrument for Teaching Practice Evaluation |
| (3) | Please provide more information and evidence of the statement " Assessments were reviewed by a school psychologist with research experience..." on p. 13 of the Teacher Preparation Assessment System Procedures (#63). |
| (4) | What procedures does the EPP take in design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure its validity? Please provide evidence of these procedures in action. |
| (5) | What procedures does the EPP take in design, collection, analysis, and interpretation of data to ensure its reliability? Please provide evidence of these procedures in action. |
| (6) | How do the EPP-created surveys meet the CAEP Criteria for EPP Created Surveys? |
| (7) | #63, p. 11 states, "To ensure consistency and freedom from bias, the assessment instructions and scoring guides were reviewed by faculty to identify and eliminate problems such as missing content information, vague instructions, poorly worded questions, or poorly reproduced copies that might obscure understanding". Please provide the tool and process used to implement this confirmation of validity and list the assessments that were reviewed with this tool and the stakeholders involved. |

Task 3- Stakeholders

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- | | |
|-----|--|
| (1) | .Annually the Teacher Education Assessment Board (#63 page 44) reviews the instruments, analyzes collected data, and the system itself to improve the program, the data collection and analysis, and the assessment process using available technology to increase efficiency. (p. 47) |
| (2) | the Advisory Committee, where not only data is shared, but also feedback and brainstorming of potential solutions. (p. 55) |

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

"Annual faculty data days (#63) and Assessor Committee
--

- (1) meetings have been held to present the data with an initial analysis to make data driven decisions to optimize the program". p. 55

3

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

- (1) Annual Faculty day was convened in 2021 (# 66). Can the EPP share the minutes/notes summary from a more recent Faculty Day? Does this event include data analysis/discussion for program improvement?
- (2) Please translate #66 into English.
- (3) Are the Assessor Committee meetings (p. 55) the same as the Assessment Board? How often does the Assessment Board meet?
- (4) Please provide evidence of Assessment Board meetings- with a focus on program data analysis.
- (5) Please provide an overview of stakeholders who analyze program data for program improvement.
- (6) Please provide an example, with evidence, to document varied stakeholders' analysis and discussion of data for program improvement. Please clarify how this example led to program changes.

Task 4- Continuous Improvement

A. Evidence in need of verification or corroboration

- (1) Various surveys, including the End of Program Survey, are conducted to improve UPRM EPP and unit operations. Feedback has led to facility upgrades, like enhanced technology resources and the creation of the Resource Center for Investigation and Educational Services (CRUISE), which facilitates educational research and professional development. (p. 56)

B. Excerpt from SSR to be clarified or confirmed

4

- (1) "Data analysis has led to specific course requirements, particularly after identifying gaps in candidates' content knowledge." (p. 56)

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

- (1) Can you provide an examples of how candidate statistics and demographics are utilized for annual institutional reports influencing funding allocation. (p. 57)
- (2) What examples of changes in courses, clinical experiences, or other candidate experiences represent the effectiveness of continuous improvement efforts?
- (3) Please provide an example of a significant program improvement that resulted from stakeholders' data analysis. Please share the data and who was involved, as well as the program impact.

Action:

1

Task 1 - Transition points were confirmed through multiple interviews. It was reported that an impact study was conducted after the pandemic. Most recent EPP data sharing was limited to EPP administrators; they are working toward better access to their data system, currently accessed through PPM and EDAG websites and for this review on GoogleDrive. Few examples were given to indicate changes made in EPP programming based on feedback from observations and student teaching and included additional training in special education, behavior management, and technology. No evidence was presented to show changes were based on data collection and analysis.

2

Task 2 - It was reported through onsite interviews that the EPP meets with stakeholders each semester to report, discuss, and provide feedback on various aspects of the QAS. No evidence was provided to support the development of instrument calibration, changes in instrumentation, and creation and testing of validity and reliability. Onsite evidence noted that validity and reliability would be established for at least three of the EPP created assessments in 2024-2025 (Onsite Evidence Educational Philosophy Essay Rubric EDFU-4019; Onsite Evidence Teacher Candidate Dispositions Survey Transition Point; Onsite Evidence Focal Interview with Directors of the University). The EPP initially identified seven EPP-created assessments. There was no evidence of using the CAEP Criteria for their EPP-Created Assessments and Surveys.

3	Task 3 - The onsite evidence provided consisted of the minutes of six meetings conducted between August 2021 and January 2024 (two in 2021; two in 2022; one in 2023; one in 2024). The minutes contained no discussion of assessment data at four of the meetings. The final minutes in 2024 stated, "Data regarding program performance and student outcomes were presented. The TPP's efforts to innovate and modify the program based on assessment results, as well as the feedback from the Puerto Rico Department of Education, were discussed." No specific examples were included. In onsite interviews it was reported that Cooperative Teachers meet once each month or once a semester with UPRM facilitators to discuss students' progress. Also reported was that focus groups meet to seek feedback. There was no other evidence to document these meetings.
4	Task 4 - The EPP confirmed the seven EPP-created and three proprietary assessments. Evidence provided did not show systematic and consistent assessment of performance against the EPP's goals. There was evidence through virtual onsite interviews of sharing of information each semester by Cooperative Teachers and EPP personnel and with the Student Teachers as well. Data from these meetings was not provided. Programmatic changes were identified based on results of the student teaching experience and based on Department of Education initiatives, including additional courses/training in special education, behavior management, and technology. No evidence was provided to show regular, systematic review, analysis and interpretation of QAS data for continuous improvement.

2. Summary regarding completeness and accuracy of evidence related to Standard 5:

a. Summary of findings

Note: The 13 pieces of onsite evidence presented at this visit were presented after the Evidence Deadline; some of the evidence was presented in Spanish and was therefore unable to be translated for the Onsite CAEP Team. See copy of the email sent to site visitors with copies of the onsite evidence.

R5.1 - Quality Assurance System

The EPP has identified a Quality Assurance System that includes both three proprietary and seven EPP-created assessments along with additional assessment tools to document operational effectiveness. The QAS includes four transition points for students. In addition, assessments are in place to evaluate faculty and program impact. The EPP reported that it stores assessment tools and data in MS Office 365 but access during the onsite virtual visit was through Google Drive; the EPP is making changes to the data storage system to create a more centralized platform.

Based on the interviews and other evidence, access to data was limited to a few UPRM administrators (i.e., EPP Director, EPP/CAEP Coordinator). It was unclear how the EPP provided information from the QAS for review and decision making (Onsite Evidence Evidence of Groups/EPP Committees and Evidence of Meetings) as the only information discussed based on information gleaned from the interviews was feedback about the student teachers and certification test data (Onsite Evidence of Groups/EPP Committees and Evidence of Meetings; Onsite Virtual Interviews: District Liaisons and Cooperative Teachers; District Partners). Some of the EPP data, specifically the Employer Survey, is only shared with the Department of Education (Onsite Virtual Interviews: Employers).

R5.2 - Data Quality

Although the EPP stated in both the Self-Study and Addendum that it ensured that its data are valid and consistent (reliable), there was no evidence that this implemented, based on documented evidence and interviews; no evidence was provided to demonstrate that the EPP's scoring procedures aligned with the CAEP Criteria for Evaluation of Assessments. The rubrics for the Educational Philosophy Essay, Teacher Candidate Dispositions Survey, Classroom Observation Instrument for Teachers, Focal Interview with Directors of the University, and Interview Protocol for Alumni Teachers were shared as evidence. However, there was no description of how these rubrics were developed. In the case of the Teacher Candidates Dispositions Survey, it was written to elicit responses from the teacher candidate as to their perception of the importance of a particular disposition (i.e., Very Important, Important, Less Important) instead of being evaluated by an external reviewer such as their Cooperative Teacher or University Supervisor. No evidence was provided to support the development of instrument calibration, changes in instrumentation, and creation and testing of validity and reliability. Onsite evidence noted that validity and

reliability would be established for at least three of the EPP created assessments in 2024-2025 (Onsite Evidence Educational Philosophy Essay Rubric EDFU-4019; Onsite Evidence Teacher Candidate Dispositions Survey Transition Point; Onsite Evidence 2023.4.2.3 - Focal Interview with Directors of the University). There was late evidence presented related to the TPP Teaching Practice Instrument validation from 2017, with a rubric. This did not match the title of current assessments and had no explanation as to how this was developed and calibrated (Onsite Evidence - UPRM Classroom Observation Instruments Validity and Reliability Studies).

R5.3 - Stakeholder Involvement

The process the EPP uses to involve stakeholders in the QAS is in formal and informal meetings based on virtual onsite interviews (Onsite Interviews: District Liaisons and Cooperative Teachers; District Partners; Employers). According to these off-campus stakeholders, some meetings are informal follow-up conversations and others are regularly scheduled meetings. These primarily involve follow up feedback to student observations, student teaching, and employment. Based on this feedback additional training for UPRM students in the EPP has been implemented in the areas of working with special education students, behavior management, and technology. The Department of Education (State entity) has requested UPRM to create professional coursework for teachers in Puerto Rico based on new State regulations (Onsite Virtual Interview: District Partners). There was a lack of supporting documentation to show stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, and in the continuous improvement process.

R5.4 - Continuous Improvement

The EPP shows evidence of assessing performance through both its proprietary and EPP-created assessments at four transition points in the program (Onsite Evidence: UPRM Addendum Table for Evidence Revised Standard 5; 8 COE Related Documents). However, within these documents and onsite virtual interviews there was no evidence that specified procedures for gathering, inputting, analyzing, interpreting, and using information from the QAS to make program improvements. Interviews revealed course and training changes based on student performance (i.e., classroom observation and student teaching), but there was no documentation provided to support this (Onsite Virtual Interviews: Assessment Committee; District Liaisons and Cooperative Teachers; District Partners; Employers). These changes included additional coursework and training in special education, behavior management, and technology. The UPRM is also providing training for other higher education institutions in the system in teacher education at the request of the Department of Education (State entity) as shared by their representative (Onsite Interview: District Partners). Conclusions and interpretations that have been made about EPP improvements have been reported qualitatively onsite.

b. Evidence that is consistent with meeting the standard

-
- 1) Onsite Evidence EPP Data Storage and Sharing from Questions and Answers Virtual Visit 2024
 - 2) Onsite Evidence 2023.4.4.1 - Interview Protocol to Evaluate Teacher Performance
 - 3) Onsite Interview - Assessment Committee
 - 4) Onsite Interview - District Liaisons and Cooperative Teachers for Candidates
 - 5) Onsite Interview - District Partners
 - 6) Onsite Interview - Administration/Leadership Team

7) Onsite Interview - Initial Employers**c. Evidence that is inconsistent with meeting the standard**

- 1) UPRM Addendum Table for Evidence Revised Standard 5
- 2) Onsite Evidence at Groups/EPP Committees and Evidence of Meetings
- 3) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - EPP Assessment Instruments - Validity and Reliability Table
- 4) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - Educational Philosophy Essay Rubric
- 5) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - Teacher Candidate Dispositions Survey
- 6) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - 2023.1.1.1 Classroom Observation Instrument for Teachers
- 7) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - Interview Protocol for Alumni Teachers
- 8) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - 2023.4.2.3 - Focal Interview with Directors
- 9) Onsite Evidence - COE Related Documents - UPRM Classroom Observation Instruments Validity and Reliability Studies

3. Recommendations for new areas for improvement and/or stipulations including a rationale for each Area for Improvement

Area for Improvement	Rationale
The EPP provided limited evidence that the QAS had operational effectiveness of relevant data supporting the program, EPP decision making and program improvement. (component R5.1)	The EPP provided limited evidence of a systematic process for collecting, analyzing, and reporting verifiable data for supporting the program, EPP decision making, and program improvement.
The EPP provided limited evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in program design, evaluation, and the continuous improvement process. (component R5.3)	While the EPP described stakeholder involvement in continuous improvement, little documentation was provided. Multiple committees were identified as functioning and contributing to the QAS system, but the EPP provided a lack of supporting documentation.

Stipulation	Rationale
The EPP provided no evidence confirming the validity and/or reliability of the EPP created assessments. (component R5.2)	The EPP provided no evidence of the steps taken to establish instrument validity, reliability, and resultant data.
The EPP provided no evidence documenting the regular, systematic, and continuous improvement of performance against goals, related modifications and/or innovations and assessment effects on EPP outcomes. (component R5.4)	While the EPP noted examples of continuous assessment of performance and resulting program changes, no documentation was provided to support regular and systematic data-driven changes.

Section III. Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any
Area(s) for Improvement cited from previous accreditation review, if any

Area for Improvement:	Rationale:
While multiple measures are part of the data review, the preponderance of evidence indicate the EPP quality assurance system lacks continuity across all programs and consists of measures that are not applied consistently across programs. (ITP).	The EPP's QAS functions at the data collection level. Evidence of data review and data-driven improvement of programs and the entire EPP are inconsistent.
The EPP does not regularly and systematically review the quality assurance system, investigate differences among programs, use data or evidence to make continuous improvement and test innovations across all programs (ITP).	The EPP's QAS functions at the data collection level. Evidence of data review and data-driven improvement of programs and EPP functioning are inconsistent.

Sources of Evidence
List of interviews and participants

Please see the following:

Greetings Visit Evaluation Team,
 Please find all the Onsite Visit Evidence in this Google Drive link
<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1i77sI6rrrCCsWDiUdMqoQzfaqRIj5vkS?>

usp=sharing

Due to problems in the AIMS portal, we are trying to share the evidence with you in this way. If you have any questions, please contact me. Have a great night and thanks for your patience and help!!

C. Bellido

List of exhibits reviewed /List additional sources consulted (website, etc.)

Onsite evidence: Please see the following:

Greetings Visit Evaluation Team,

Please find all the Onsite Visit Evidence in this Google Drive link

[https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1i77sI6rrrCCsWDiUdMqoQzfaqRIj5vkS?](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1i77sI6rrrCCsWDiUdMqoQzfaqRIj5vkS?usp=sharing)

usp=sharing

Copied from the ONsite Evidence.

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

11/18/2024 11:56:20 AM

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.