

# 2022 EPP Annual Report - Reviewer Feedback (Staff Review Report)

## Section 1 AIMS Profile & Section 2 Program Completers

**Overview:** These sections ask for a yearly update to the EPP's electronic profile information and number of completers to ensure relevant communication and actions from CAEP.

**Why are these sections important?** The assurance of accurate profile information (including confirming up to five points of contact, identifying EPP characteristics, and detailing programs offered) are crucial to CAEP being able to get in touch with you, as well as being aware of EPP characteristics for research and site team assignment purposes, and accurate scrutiny of disaggregated data from relevant programs by Program Reviewers and/or site visitors and Accreditation Councilors. Additionally, completer counts are important to accurate billing for accreditation activities.

**Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?**

✓ **CAEP asks for current listings of contact persons** due to potential turnover at the EPP that may prevent the most relevant individuals from receiving essential information. As the contact information confirmed in the EPP Annual Report is used for official accreditation-related communications, the EPP should take the opportunity to list up to two "EPP Heads" and up to three "CAEP Coordinators" to facilitate a consistent flow of information to appropriate individuals. Individual identified "EPP Head" should have authority over the EPP. This contact may receive time-sensitive communications related to the accreditation of the EPP. The individual(s) identified as the CAEP Coordinator should have a role in managing accreditation activities and may be carbon copied on communications to the EPP head.

✓ **CAEP asks for current EPP Characteristics** to generate official accreditation documents, provide context for site visitors and Accreditation Councilors, allow for disaggregation of information by relevant demographics for research purposes, and ensuring adequate representation in formal and informal feedback efforts.

- **Basic Information.** This section includes information that CAEP uses to generate official accreditation documents, including mailing address and EPP name.

- **EPP Characteristics and Affiliations.** This section provides contextual information for better understanding the EPP and its work including types of licensure/degree programs at the initial-teacher licensure and/or advanced-level, EPP type consistent with Carnegie Classification, Professional Development School levels, Religious affiliation, admissions test(s), language of instruction, teaching majors, institutional/regional accreditation, institutional memberships, and off campus/branch campus(es)/distance learning/alternative certification programs.

✓ **CAEP asks for current EPP Program Listings** to ensure current information for all programs offered by the EPP that fall within CAEP's scope, as well as those covered by current NCATE or TEAC accreditation. Please review, update, and/or add each Program Name, Level, Certificate Level for Degree(s), and Program Category Fields.

✓ **CAEP asks for current EPP Program Completers** to generate accurate billing information, as the CAEP Annual Fee structure is based on the number of completers - for both initial-licensure and advanced-level programs - and scaled to support smaller EPPs.

### 1.1 Update Contact Information in AIMS

1.1.1 Has the EPP listed contact information for the individual(s) designated as "EPP Head?"

Yes  No

1.1.2 Has the EPP listed the contact information for the individual(s) designated as "CAEP Coordinator?"

Yes  No

1.1.3 Has the EPP provided contact information for two distinct people for these roles?

Yes  No

### 1.2 Update EPP Information in AIMS

1.2.1 Does the EPP's basic information (including mailing address and EPP name) appear up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS.

Yes  No

1.2.2: Do the EPP characteristics and affiliations (including Carnegie classification, EPP type, religious affiliation, language of instruction, institutional accreditation, and branch campuses/sites) appear to be up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS?

Yes  No

1.2.3: Do the EPP's program listings (including program name, program review level, certificate level, program category, and program review option) appear up to date and accurately reflected in AIMS for all EPP programs that fall within CAEP's scope of accreditation?

Yes  No

ACEI and TESOL no longer conduct program reviews leading to SPA national recognition. Please select either State Review or CAEP Evidence Review of Standard 1/A.1 to gather program level data for Elementary Education and ESL programs listed in AIMS under Program Options. Once updated, please send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email (eppannualreport@caepnet.org) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

## Section 2. EPP's Program Completers [Academic Year 2020-2021]

2.1 Comparing the EPP's reported completer numbers from this year to last year, has the EPP changed fee brackets with CAEP? [No EPP action is required, unless the EPP finds the reported numbers to be in error.]

Yes  No

## Section 3 Substantive Changes

**Overview:** If a substantive change occurred during the Academic Year of the present EPP Annual Report through the date of the submission of this report, the EPP should provide an explanation. The explanation should provide CAEP with information about the nature of the change, a rationale for the change, an implementation timeline, and other any other essential information. Substantive changes to be reported include changes in the published mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP; in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP; addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited; addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited; a contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements; that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirement; in regional accreditation status; or in state program approval.

**Why is this section important?** Advising CAEP of substantive changes is one of the actions that must be taken to maintain accreditation or eligibility. Changes are reviewed to determine effects, if any, to accreditation status.

**Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?**

✓ CAEP, in accordance with Federal regulation (34 CFR Part 602 Subpart B (§602.22)), requires an EPP to inform CAEP of any changes to the educational mission, program, or programs of the EPP which may adversely affect the capacity of the EPP to continue to meet CAEP's standards. These changes must be communicated as part of the Annual Report or in a separate communication to the CAEP President, addressed to president@caepnet.org or the current mailing address for the organization. CAEP has the responsibility to determine what effect, if any, substantive changes would have on an EPP's accreditation

## Section 3 Substantive Changes

3.1 Did the EPP report any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP?

Yes  No

3.2 Did the EPP report any change related to the EPP entering a contract with other providers for direct instructional services (including any teach out agreements)?

Yes  No

3.3 Did the EPP report any change related to the state approval of any of its programs? If the EPP reported a substantive change in its state program approval status (since the last reporting cycle) does the item require additional follow up with CAEP?

Yes  No

3.4 Did the EPP report any change in the institution's regional accreditation status?

Yes  No

3.5 Did the EPP indicate any other change(s) since the last annual reporting cycle?

Yes  No

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

**Overview:** CAEP re-worked its approach to the Annual Reporting Measures. Instead of requesting data via a series of questions and CAEP-created standardized tables, CAEP has aligned its approach to CAEP Standards 4 and 5. In Section 4 of the 2018 EPP Annual Report, the provider is asked to publicly display data, pertaining to each of the Annual Reporting Measures (four of these measures are impact measures matching the four components of the CAEP Standard 4 for Initial-Licensure Programs and two of these match the two components of CAEP Standard 4 for Advanced-Level Programs), on its website. This approach respects an EPP's context by allowing context-specific data collection and hosting in a manner of the EPP's choice, as long as the presented data are appropriate measures and are accurate.

**Why is this section important?** Having accreditation standards and policies that require EPPs "to routinely provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement," is central to maintaining CAEP's CHEA recognition, CAEP's role as an accreditor, and EPP's demonstration of accountability to stakeholders and provision of transparent information to potential candidates.

**Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?**

✓ The requirement to widely disseminate and display the Annual Reporting Measures is located in Components 5.4 and A.5.4 of the CAEP Standards and a part of CAEP Policy (Policies 6.01, on Annual Reporting, and 8.01, on Consumer Information). EPPs accredited under the NCATE standards or TEAC quality principles were required to publicly display candidate performance data in previous EPP Annual Report years. The updated Section 4 includes and builds from that approach by including the Annual Reporting Measures. In alignment with Component 5.4, providers are also asked to summarize the data and trends represented in the provider's Annual Reporting Measures, which allows EPPs to prepare for writing a self-study report and to use the EPP Annual Report as a repository and source for working toward Component 5.4. Site visitors and Accreditation Councilors review EPP Annual Report submissions in evaluating your EPP's evidence toward Component 5.4. Annual Report Reviewers flag exemplars of best practices of displaying these data to enhance the tips and exemplars to be included in next year's EPP Annual Report Technical Guide.

EPP Weblink with CAEP (NCATE/TEAC) Accreditation Status and Reviewed Programs

Link: <https://ppm.uprag.edu/>

4.1 Did the EPP provide a weblink that displays its current accreditation status and an accurate list of programs included during the most recent CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) accreditation review?

Yes  No

In Section 4.1 of the annual report, the EPP provides a link to its website where the information does not clearly demonstrate the EPP's current accreditation status nor is it clear which Initial and/or Advanced Programs were part of the last accreditation review. Please update the webpage and send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email ([eppannualreport@caepnet.org](mailto:eppannualreport@caepnet.org)) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

### 4.2 Weblinks displaying evidence of CAEP Accountability Measures

Initial: <https://ppm.uprag.edu/>

Advanced: <https://ppm.uprag.edu/>

4.2.1 Did the EPP provide a direct weblink to its website where the EPP's display of data for the CAEP Accountability Measures is available to the public?

Yes  No

4.2.2: Are the CAEP Accountability Measures clearly identified and tagged? (Includes header identifying the CAEP Accountability Measures and sub-headings/tags to each of the four measures as defined by CAEP)

Yes  No

The information shared on the EPP's website are not clearly aligned and tagged to the four (4) updated CAEP Accountability Measures outlined for the 2022 annual reporting purposes. These include: (1) completer effectiveness and impact on P-12 student learning; (2) satisfaction of employers and stakeholder involvement; (3) candidate competency at completion; and (4) ability of completers to be hired in the area of licensure. These measures have been streamlined from the earlier eight annual reporting measures to align with the 2022 Revised CAEP Standards. For instance, completer satisfaction, employment milestones, student loan default rates are no longer required to be reported; however, information on stakeholder involvement is an important part of Measure 2. It is recommended that the provider update its website by clearly tagging information to the four accountability measures as outlined in the 2022 Annual Report Technical Guide available at <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/epp-annual-report-technical-guide-final.pdf?la=en>. Once the information is updated, please send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email ([eppannualreport@caepnet.org](mailto:eppannualreport@caepnet.org)) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

4.2.3: Do the data, tagged to each of the four CAEP Accountability Measures, appear to be collected using appropriate data collection instruments/procedures for the relevant CAEP Component?

Yes  No

Reviewers can provide feedback on the appropriate use of instruments for each accountability measures once the measures are clearly identified by categories and the instruments used are clearly defined. Once the information on the website is updated, please send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email ([eppannualreport@caepnet.org](mailto:eppannualreport@caepnet.org)) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

4.2.4: Are the data for the CAEP Accountability Measures reflect data collected in the 2020-2021 Academic Year? (\*If data are currently unavailable, does the EPP provide a placeholder statement that details why data are unavailable, and an expected timeline for when updated data will be shared?)

Yes  No

The data for the CAEP Accountability Measures do not appear to reflect data collected in the 2020-2021 Academic Year. Nor does the EPP provide a placeholder statement that details why data are unavailable, and an expected timeline for when updated data will be shared. Once the information is updated, please send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email ([eppannualreport@caepnet.org](mailto:eppannualreport@caepnet.org)) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

4.2.5: Has the EPP shared and explained the relevance of each of its data measures in a way that can be easily understood by the public?

Yes  No

4.2.6: Has data been disaggregated and shared at the program level? Did the EPP separate its Initial Level Program data and Advanced Level Program data for the CAEP Accountability Measures? [\*Relevant to EPPs that receive/will receive CAEP accreditation at both the initial and advanced level.]

Yes  No

Data do not appear to have been disaggregated by licensure levels (Initial/Advanced) and/or specialty licensure areas for the CAEP Accountability Measures. Once the information is updated, please send a confirmation to CAEP staff via email ([eppannualreport@caepnet.org](mailto:eppannualreport@caepnet.org)) within 30 days of the receiving the feedback.

## Section 5. Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations

**Overview:** This section asks EPPs to report on progress correcting any Areas for Improvement, Weaknesses, and/or Stipulations cited during the most recent accreditation site visit.

**Why is this section important?** Any citations earned by EPPs at the most recent accreditation visit represent parts of accreditation standards or principles that were not demonstrated sufficiently according to expectations represented by such a designation. Therefore, rectifying these deficiencies is essential to the quality of the EPP and the integrity of accreditation. This section allows for the EPP's annual reflection on progress -looking toward addressing gaps sufficiently within the required time - and CAEP's monitoring of the EPP during the accreditation cycle between in-depth self-study submissions.

**Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?**

✓ Accreditation is a check on work EPPs do daily - not just every seven years. Therefore, CAEP's role as an accreditor, in general and as part of being recognized by CHEA, includes monitoring EPPs between site visits, particularly when accreditation standards were not fully met. Under CAEP, Areas for Improvement describe a weakness in evidence for a CAEP Standard and/or component that should be remediated by the end of the accreditation term, while Stipulations describe one or more systemic concerns or serious deficiencies in evidence for a CAEP Standard and/or component that must be remedied to continue accreditation. Accordingly, this section allows EPPs and CAEP to check-in on progress to prompt EPPs to hopefully have fully corrected any deficiencies by the time of the next review, if not sooner as these represent aspects of EPP's program(s) that hinder ensuring development of effective candidates to meet the needs of P-12 students. Further, EPP Annual Report Reviewers review progress and offer prompts, as appropriate to steer EPPs in productive direction.

1

**CAEP: Stipulation (ITP)** related to **3 Candidate Quality, Recruitment, And Selectivity**

**The EPP did not provide a written recruitment plan to document evidence and results. (component 3.1)**

Our current recruitment plan for 2020-2021 establishes the following goals as it serves to attract more diverse and academic talented students: To focus on college bound high school students, transfers and reclassification as well as other majors seek teaching licenses. The face-to-face strategies consist of open house, school visits, expos, and career fairs. Recruitment event provide a forum of interchange include activities with our alumni association and university organizations. Our strongest cha have been the creation of an online presence through our social media website, a virtual open house, virtual catalogues, QR videos directed through university channels, where we actively target a larger geographical base. Additionally, we include power points, brochures and banners which can help generate greater and broader interest to a diverse audience. These goals would diversify the candidate pool by disseminating information to a broader audience through more direct varied virtual channels. Extending our offerings to online courses further reaches students from outside our region to event that can include off island candidates. Baseline and progress data are now available through statistics gleaned from the Department Dashboard files starting from 2present. Working together with the Office of Planning and Institutional Research (OPIR), we can track student enrollment, race, ethnicity and retention rates by gender and from year to year. Data has been compiled reflecting our inclusion of students with disabilities which has increased, though minimally. Our focus to address the community for hard-to-staff schools and shortage fields include collaboration with representatives of schools, university sponsored organizations, and our program of academic advisory which allows faculty to counsel and share with our majors. Professional development opportunities through our Academic Advisory Program and our curriculum committee, consistently emphasize our teaching opportunities education, multimedia and ESL. By reaching out to in-service teachers that are looking to be re-certified we can further expand specialized education. In comparison to America's P-12, our students are identified as 100% Hispanic, with 90% on financial aid from the public-sector with language mastery in Spanish/English. Our goals to improve retention and graduating rates are imperative despite a decline in total enrollment, our efforts consist of the values of the institution and the program with a strong sense of community, faculty support, and personal and professional counseling. The development of a mentoring program with cooperating teachers and the continuation of the dispositions survey clinical practice will serve to retain our candidates.

Regarding the need for teachers in the west region of the island, a series of job announcements (2019-2021) have been posted unofficially in our Facebook account that is shared by students, candidates, completers, English Department retirees, faculty members, and community members in general. A total of 26 job postings, from which 25 are concerned with the English as a second language, bilingual education, and elementary education.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

2

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to **4 Program Impact**

**The EPP has limited evidence of a plan to measure indicators of teaching effectiveness for its completers. (component 4.2)**

We have confronted low school participation rates are due to the chaotic nature of the school years. In 2018 the island

dealt with hurricane Maria. This natural disaster made it difficult for schools to return in session. In early 2020, schools were shut down due to earthquakes. During March 2019 all schools moved online due to the COVID 19 pandemic. The schools remained online throughout the 2020-2021 school year. Despite low participation from partner schools overall, we were able to compile data to inform our pilot case study (see teaching effectiveness: component 4.2 report submitted April 2021). We learned that our program is effective in producing high qualified teachers who are competent educators, satisfied with the quality of the EPP, and successfully pass the licensure exam to obtain their teaching certifications after completing the required coursework. The EPP is already implementing instruments and contacting schools in the region to obtain more participation from partner schools, the completers, and P-12 students. Some of the instruments have been shared in the CAEP Accountability Measures. (4.2 in this report) Completers have an instrument to express their satisfaction. During the last three years or so they have been completing it. Eight completers have shared their information with us. 37.5 are currently pursuing a higher education degree, 37.5 are working as teachers for a private institution, 12.5 have been hired by the Public System of Education and the other 12.05 is currently working in other fields.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

3

**CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to 4 Program Impact**

**The EPP did not provide evidence that program completers contribute to an expected level of student learning growth. (component 4.1)**

UPRAG's EPP started to implement a mixed methods research design to collect data to assess the program's effectiveness in preparing completers who are effective in the classroom. The study will collect data on (1) completer's impact on P-12 students' learning and development, (2) students' perceptions on their classroom experiences, (3) employer satisfaction, and (4) completer's satisfaction with their preparation. This data when analyzed will provide information UPRAG's EPP can use to improve and monitor the program's success. The study design process began with a pilot case study that allowed the EPP to test research protocols, data collection instruments, and sample recruitment strategies in preparation for the established study design. The pilot study was carried out with the data received from a partnership school where program completers teach. The instruments used for gathering data during the pilot study were the ones used by the partnership school. These instruments were Teacher Teaching Evaluation, Student Satisfaction Survey, and student grades. The student grades provided by the partnership school are the final grades obtained by the students in the completer's course. The final grades are an average of all summative assessments used in the course. The concepts taught and the skills developed are found in the Core Standards grade-level expectations according to the subject and grade. Two schools have started to complete some of these instruments of the mixed method study.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

4

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP) related to 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**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)**

Many of these explanations or processes were explained in our addendum October 2021

The providers' quality assurance system is comprised of multiple measures that can monitor candidates progress, completer achievements, and provider operational effectiveness and it is also currently preparing new instruments and programmatic events to keep the effectiveness at all levels. This evidence demonstrates that the EPP satisfies all CAEP Standards. The provider continuously monitors and improves the quality of its programs. The mission of UPRAG is to "provide educational alternatives within the arts, sciences, and technologies that respond to the economic, social and cultural needs of Puerto Rico, particularly those of the North-western part of the island. The knowledge base of the UPRAG EPP comes from the cognitive, constructive, and humanistic theories that guide field experiences and the UPRAG student profile. Six key elements (knowledge of disciplines and pedagogy, ethics, technology, assessment, life-long learning, and diversity) shape that theoretical framework that guides the development of knowledge, skills, and dispositions infused through the EPP-developed field and clinical experience, community service and interdisciplinary and research experiences. Our quality assurance program is designed to help us inform, modify, evaluate, and monitor the EPP operational effectiveness. UPRAG's EPP quality assurance system uses various assessment instruments to gather data as evidence to meet CAEP's standards. These meet the expectations for evidence quality. For example, the Teacher (completer) Teaching Evaluation Instrument data used for the pilot study was gathered from an assessment instrument used by the partnership school. The partnership school is an accredited institution that regularly uses the Teacher Teaching Evaluation Observation instrument to assess teacher performance in the classroom. The instrument assesses teachers' effectiveness in applying professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions when teaching and their effect on student's learning and development. They have been using this instrument, with needed modifications having been

made, for 10 years. It was first created by two educational specialists with doctoral degrees in education. It was last revised three years ago. The criteria on the instrument are aligned to the specifications of teacher's duties as stipulated by Puerto Rico's Department of Education (Public School System). To assure the instrument's data validity, during this pilot phase, the partnership school's Teacher Evaluation Instrument criteria were correlated to the (Candidate's) Student Teaching Evaluation used in UPRAg's EPP. The construct validity for the Teacher Evaluation Instrument has been established because the instrument criteria is focused on assessing teachers' effective use of professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

5

**CAEP: Areas for Improvement (ITP)** related to **5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**  
**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)**

Stakeholders are involved in the decision-making process of the Program and the instruments that have been designed and implemented are shown to them. Data collection instruments were assessed for construct validity and reliability. Professionals in the fields of education and stakeholders who work as directors in various schools have revised the instruments. Content validity have been established. The data will be collected from key school stakeholders including UPRAg EPP completers in service, the completer's students, and the completer's supervisors. UPRAg's CAEP Coordinator discusses findings, conclusions, and implications for the program with all stakeholders for the continual improvement and quality assurance of the program. The construct validity of the Student Perception Survey was checked against the EPP's Conceptual Frameworks list of proficiencies for candidates that are developed throughout the program, CAEP's standards and guidelines, and the PRDE professional standards. As mentioned before, these were evaluated by faculty members and stakeholders and their recommendations were incorporated

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

6

**CAEP: Stipulation (ITP)** related to **5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**  
**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 has designed a mixed methods study. It is in the process of being implemented. A few directors and parents have already completed some of the instruments that have been submitted to them.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

7

**CAEP: Stipulation (ITP)** related to **5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**  
**The EPP does not have evidence that the quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, cumulative and actionable measures that produces empirical evidence of data that are valid and consistent. (component 5.2)**

All the data collection instruments were assessed for construct validity and reliability. Professionals in the fields of education and stakeholders who work as directors in various schools have revised the instruments. Content validity have been established. Additionally, multiple sources of evidence will be used, and the study team members will be reviewing the study report. Reliability will be assured using the established study protocol and through the development of the study database. Also, value-added measures such as completer's students' grades will be asked to be provided by the partnership schools. These will be asked to provide the breakdown of the final student grades.

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

**CAEP: Stipulation (ITP) related to 5 Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement**

**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)**

To continue monitoring EPP UPRAg effectiveness, the program carried out a pilot study to demonstrate the completers' teaching effectiveness. A partnership was established with a school with completers working at both the elementary and secondary levels. This partnership underwent the initial phase of assessing the impact of its completers concerning P-12 student growth through an instrument of observation: Teacher Teaching Evaluation Observation and student's grades for one semester. The EPP study design is established as a structure with a systematic approach for data collection, analysis, and working to develop a routine for regular data collection and analysis. Findings will be used for decision-making, program growth, improvement, and dissemination. To summarize, findings from the data gathered demonstrated the following completers' success rates in applying professional knowledge throughout their teaching process: competence #1 and #2 (area IV), completers demonstrated an average of 96% effectivity. Completers demonstrated an average of 95% effectivity for competence #5 (area VI). Regarding skill development, a cross-cutting theme considered that a core area of the program is technology. Technology usage and integration are intended to be incorporated throughout the duration of the undergraduate studies with the purpose of its implementation once the completers teach their own courses. Technology use and integration skills are exhibited in Areas VII: Online Grading System Usage, IX: Course Information, and XII: Technology Tools, obtaining a 98% average. Completers model clarity of expression and communication in the L1 & L2 in language arts measuring a 96% as a general average in the following observed areas: I: Personal Qualities, II: Classroom Management, III: Professional Skill, V: Instructional Techniques, VI: Evaluation and Assessment, XI: Course Information. UPRAg EPP completers measured 87% in area III: Planning. Planning instruction, preparation of activities, selection of appropriate level resources is established as an area for improvement. UPRAg EPP Assessment 3 is the instrument used for evaluating Student Teaching in Clinical Practice. The guidelines and rubric were revised by education specialists and stakeholders. This committee created for document and material revision composed by Clinical Practice Supervisors and Professors teaching Methodology and Seminar courses. In Area VI: Evaluation and Assessment completers obtained a 95%. UPRAg EPP establishes clear standards for developing skills to evaluate and assess student's performance and the creation of teaching techniques and their application. As a benchmark, the University of Puerto Rico in Ponce (south region of the island) has an Educator Preparation Program. This exemplary program has been consistent in state licensure (PCMAS) with a 95% for years 2017-2018. The score for the three-year period reflects 3% exceeding the passing rate of the total number of institutions in Puerto Rico. Moreover, 100% of Completers' Employers expressed agreeing and strongly agreeing with 12 statements related to content knowledge area, critical, creative thinking and research skills, language and communication skills with students, family, and community members, knowledge of student and learning process, management of education environment, effective planning and S5.15 Questionnaire e Analysis S5.20 Attendance Verb Tenses and Agreement WoS5.19 Promo conversational workshop Fall 2S5.18 Promo Conversational Workshop SprinS5.17 Verb tenses and agreement Workshop Fall 2S5.16 Attendance to the Conversational WorkshoS5.21 Attendance to the Verb tenses and AgreemeS5.22 Notification of Scores Letter.pdf S5.23 State Licensure PCMAS Scores March teaching, ethics, professional commitment, effective use of resources and information technology, assessment techniques, and respect for diversity. (Employer Satisfaction Survey, UPRP EPP Website, 2018) Regarding state licensure, UPRAg EPP has obtained an 85% passing rate for 2015-2016, a 95% for 2016 & 2017, (2017-2018 no data available), starting at 5% lower than UPRP EEP, but leveling with a similar percentage of passing rate from the benchmarked institution and state institutional levels. Performance is similar and favorable in comparison to the benchmarked institution. Regarding Licensure in the Specialization Area (Teaching of English Language), the average percentage obtained was 95 from 2015 to 2019, while the state average for those years is 77%. The trend or pattern exhibited by the candidates shows a 10% of increase in General PCMAS and a 5% in the Specialization Area. From UPRAg EPP Employer Satisfaction Survey has 27 criteria that are subdivided into five competencies. These reflect candidate proficiencies, competencies, and expected indicators of the profession. The five competencies are the following: Pedagogical Capacity, Dispositions, Responsibilities in the Performance of the Job Duties, Interpersonal Relations with School Community, and Impact on P-12 Student Learning. An emphasis is given to assess candidates' impact on students' learning. Considering the innate characteristic of this Case Study being a pilot, this instrument will be administered for the second and third time with 2021 and 2022 alumni. Three sets of data will be analyzed studying the standard deviation from the resulting data with the purpose of identifying if the instrument measures consistently and what it was originally intended to measure. Following implementation of the instrument and its data compilation, a culture of revision is being promoted among faculty. (Geerinck, A., 2019)

Has the EPP summarized its activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the area cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report? [As a reminder: The EPP will continue to report its action and progress on addressing its AFI(s), weaknesses and/or stipulations until the EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Site Review.]

Yes  No

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

**Overview:** In this section of the EPP Annual Report, EPPs no longer respond by accreditation pathway. Instead of responding to pathway requirements, all providers have an opportunity to share continuous improvement efforts and processes relating to the CAEP Standards.

**Why is this section important?** The prompts in Section 6 are aligned with Standard 5 and Component 5.3, allowing providers to use the EPP Annual Report to catalog data and narrative over time in a way that prepares the provider to respond to Component 5.3 in the self-study report. Component 5.3 provides a chance for EPPs to put data related to the rest of CAEP's Standards to work to systematically change programs to improve outcomes for candidates and ultimately the P-12 students they will serve. Not only is the application of appropriate data to make and monitor informed changes a requirement of CAEP's Standards, but it is also a regular behavior and value of high-performing organizations; noticeably, the Baldrige Criteria and improvement science research inspired Standard 5.

**Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?**

✓ Quality assurance systems and data-informed continuous improvement are essential, foundational requirements for CAEP accreditation. This section instantiates an ongoing culture of evidence, while allowing CAEP to see some of the work done between accreditation cycles. Further EPP Annual Report Reviewers identify models of data-informed improvement so that CAEP may further collaborate with the field to spread continuous improvement initiatives.

6.1.1 Has the EPP shared its continuous improvement initiatives , AND (if applicable) provided CAEP with an update regarding the EPP's progress on its advanced level phase-in plans and/or initial level transition plans?

Yes  No

6.1.2 If the EPP indicated that it would be willing to publicly share its efforts towards continuous improvement, is there a particular effort that could be highlighted by CAEP? [This information is for internal CAEP use and does not require additional action from the EPP.]

Yes  No

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

**Overview:** : The report preparer checks the box to affirm that they are authorized to complete the report by the and enters their name, position, phone number, and email address. The report preparer checks the box to acknowledge their understanding of the CAEP Policies pertaining to the EPP Annual Report.

**Why is this section important?** The final section of the report requests information on the report preparer and asks the preparer to affirm that he or she is authorized to complete the EPP Annual Report and demonstrate that he or she understands and agrees to CAEP's policy on data ownership, annual reporting, and misleading or incorrect statements.

**Why does CAEP ask for this information, and what do we do with it?**

✓ As submission of the EPP Annual Report is a condition of maintaining current accreditation or eligibility status, collecting the authorization of the preparer is needed to officially represent the EPP, as well as protect the EPP and CAEP. This section must be completed before the EPP Annual Report is officially submitted. CAEP visits this information if any questions of authenticity arise or to aid in contacting the EPP, if needed.

8.1.1 Semester of EPP's next CAEP Accreditation Visit: Fall 2021

EPP Questions:  
No.

8.1.2 CAEP Response to EPP Questions

Yes  No

8.2 The EPP report preparer indicated that they were authorized by the EPP to complete the 2022 EPP Annual Report and that the details provided in this report and linked webpages were up to date and accurate at the time of submission.

Yes  No