



**Council for the
Accreditation of
Educator Preparation**

ACCREDITATION ACTION REPORT

Department of Education
University of Puerto Rico-Aguadilla
Aguadilla, Puerto Rico

Accreditation Council October 2019
Accreditation Application Date: 5/22/2006

*This is the official record of the Educator Preparation Provider's accreditation status.
The Educator Preparation Provider should retain this document for at least two accreditation cycles.*

ACCREDITATION DECISION

Probationary Accreditation is granted at the initial-licensure level. Standard 5 was determined as not met by the Accreditation Council. This accreditation status is effective between Fall 2019 and Fall 2021. The provider must demonstrate that Standard 5 is met and all stipulations cited have been corrected within two years to continue accreditation. A probationary accreditation site visit will take place no later than Spring 2021.

SUMMARY OF STANDARDS

CAEP STANDARDS	INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL	ADVANCED-LEVEL
STANDARD 1/A.1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 2/A.2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 3/A.3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 4/A.4: Program Impact	Met	Not Applicable
STANDARD 5/A.5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Not Met	Not Applicable

Rationale for Standard 5 at the initial-licensure level being determined as Not Met:

All components of Standard 5 were identified as areas for improvement or warranting stipulations. The EPP acknowledges a lack of data and absence of written documentation of candidate and completer performance and continuous improvement efforts. Additionally, no plans were provided to address continuous improvement.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

Areas for Improvement: Identified areas for improvement are addressed in the provider's annual report.

Stipulations: Stipulations are addressed in the provider's annual report and must be corrected within two years to retain accreditation.

INITIAL-LICENSURE LEVEL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND STIPULATIONS

STANDARD 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP did not provide a written recruitment plan to document evidence and results. (component 3.1)	The EPP does not have a recruitment plan that specifically meets the identified needs of the region and does not monitor implementation and results of recruitment since no data were provided by the EPP.

STANDARD 4: Program Impact

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	The EPP has limited evidence of a plan to measure indicators of teaching effectiveness for its completers. (component 4.2)	Although a plan was presented, the plan was not detailed enough to yield meaningful data from observation instruments or student surveys to demonstrate completers effectively apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP did not provide evidence that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth. (component 4.1)	No evidence was provided that the EPP has a specific plan to collect data of completers impact on student learning growth, such as value-added measures, student growth percentiles, student learning development objectives, or state-supported P-12 measures.

STANDARD 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement

	Areas for Improvement	Rationale
1	There was limited evidence that the provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tests innovations, and uses results to improve program elements and processes. (component 5.3)	The implementation plan did not provide details of strategies, steps, and a schedule for collection of data. The implementation plan was missing crucial details, including a timeline that defines the steps to be taken by the EPP in a timely manner and the ways in which the EPP will use results to improve program elements and processes.
2	The EPP provided limited evidence of diverse stakeholder involvement in decision making, program evaluation and selection, and implementation of changes for improvement. (component 5.5)	The EPP's Continuous Improvement Plan did not provide details of strategies, steps, or a schedule for meeting with stakeholders and involving them in program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.

	Stipulations	Rationale
1	The EPP does not have an articulated quality assurance system to collect valid data from multiple measures that monitors candidate progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness. (component 5.1)	The EPP does not have a quality assurance system capable of providing data output that enables quality control and continuous improvement. There is no evidence provided how data are collected, analyzed, monitored, reported or used for continuous improvement.
2	The EPP does not have evidence that the quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, cumulative and actionable measures that produces empirical evidence of	There is no evidence of reliability or validity of assessments, instructions and use of assessments, or that data results are aligned with demonstrated quality.

	data that are valid and consistent. (component 5.2)	The EPP Created Assessments do not meet the CAEP minimum level of sufficiency.
3	There are no measures of completer impact that are externally benchmarked, analyzed, shared widely, or acted upon in decision-making related to programs, resource allocation, and future directions. (component 5.4)	Although surveys have been created to assess satisfaction of employers and completers and data have been collected, these results are not widely shared or used for continuous improvement purposes. There is no other evidence that measures have yet been developed to measure completer impact, including to assess P-12 student growth.

AREA(S) FOR IMPROVEMENT OR WEAKNESS(ES) from previous legacy accreditor review (NCATE or TEAC)

Removed:

Area for Improvement or Weakness	Rationale
(1) [NCATE STD2]Although programs are involved in the collection of data, the unit does not systematically analyze and aggregate those data for unit improvement and operations. [ITP]	This is consistent with current stipulations identified in CAEP Standard 5.

INFORMATION ABOUT ACCREDITATION STATUSES

Accreditation for seven (7) years is granted if the EPP meets all CAEP Standards and components, even if areas for improvement (AFIs) are identified in the final report of the Accreditation Council.

- **Areas for Improvement (AFIs)** indicate areas which must be improved by the time of the next accreditation visit. Progress reports on remediation of AFIs are submitted as part of the Annual Report. AFIs not remediated by a subsequent site visit may become stipulations.

Accreditation with stipulations is granted for 2 years if an EPP meets all standards but receives a stipulation on a component under any standard. Failure to submit a response to the stipulation within a two (2)-year time frame results in revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two (2)-year period results in revocation or probation.

- **Stipulations** describe serious deficiencies in meeting CAEP Standards and/or components and must be brought into compliance in order to continue accreditation. All stipulations and relevant evidence are reviewed by the Accreditation Council. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation results in probation or revocation of accreditation.

Probationary Accreditation is granted for two (2) years when an EPP does not meet one (1) of the CAEP Standards. Failure to submit a response to the stipulation within a two (2)-year time frame results in revocation. Failure to correct the condition leading to the stipulation within the specified two (2)-year period results in revocation.

SCOPE OF ACCREDITATION

The scope of CAEP's work is the accreditation of educator preparation providers (EPPs) that offer bachelor's, master's, and/or doctoral degrees, post-baccalaureate or other programs leading to certification, licensure, or endorsement in the United States and/or internationally. (2018).

CAEP does not accredit specific degree programs, rather EPPs must include information, data, and other evidence on the following in their submission for CAEP's review:

All licensure areas that prepare candidates to work in preschool through grade 12 settings at the initial-licensure level and advanced-level that lead to professional licensure, certification, or endorsement as defined by the state, country, or other governing authority under which the EPP operates and for which the state, country, or other governing authority has established program approval standards.

Depending on an EPP's submission, accreditation may be awarded at one or both of the following levels: Initial-Licensure Level and/or Advanced-Level.

1. **Initial-Licensure Level Accreditation** is provided at the baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels leading to initial-licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers.
2. **Advanced-Level Accreditation** is provided at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels leading to licensure, certification, or endorsement. Advanced-Level Programs are designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial-licensure program, currently licensed administrators, or other certified (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts. CAEP's Advanced-Level accreditation does not include any advanced-level program not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts; any advanced-level non-licensure programs, including those specific to content areas (e.g., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.); or Educational leadership programs not specific to the preparation of teachers or other school professionals for P-12 schools/districts.

Information on accreditation status, terms, and any conditions provided within this directory is specific to the accreditation level(s) described above. CAEP-accredited EPPs are required to distinguish accurately between programs that are accredited and those that are not.

NOTE: Neither CAEP staff, site visitors, nor other agents of CAEP are empowered to make or modify Accreditation Council decisions. These remain the sole responsibility of the Council itself.

End of Action Report