



Cincuenta años de transformación académica y compromiso social.

EPP UPR Cayey Stipulation Report (February, 2019)

revised for the CAEP Annual (April, 2019)

The CAEP Council decision in 2018 granted the EPP of University of Puerto Rico in Cayey accreditation having met requirements for all five standards.

Only one stipulation was indicated:

The EPP did not provide evidence of having conducted validity and reliability measures on assessments and it did not detail a plan to do so. (Component 5.2)
The EPP-created assessments do not rely on relevant and verifiable evidence so that interpretations of data are valid and consistent.

The EPP understood by the terms of the preceding rejoinder of June, 2017, that this recommendation was already removed since further evidence was presented. The rejoinder (June, 2017) stated that:

Stipulation: CAEP site visit report March 2017	Answer to rejoinder June, 2017
EPP-created assessments are evaluated below the minimal level of sufficiency	
Rationale	
The EPP did not provide evidence of having conducted validity measures on its assessments and it did not detail a plan to do so	2.c. Evidence that is <u>now</u> consistent with meeting the standard -Per the rejoinder exhibits entitled “Standard_4,_SIP,_and_5_Narrative” and “Content_validity_Narrative” it is evident that validity measures have since been completed for the EPP created assessments.

Notwithstanding the EPP wishes to address to CAEP all the available information concerning reliability and validity measures that were worked out for the instruments before and after the site march,2017, visit. It is possible that not enough verifiable data was presented. The EPP, to its best understanding, believes that the rubrics in use have valid and reliable constructs that describe the teaching profession. The rubrics, after, creation, debate and consultation, reflect the foundational beliefs of the program as well as the



views and frameworks of the teachers in the surrounding community. They have incorporated recommendations of the SPA reviewers in the process of accreditation and received commendations by the first NCATE site visit team. The EPP has tried to draw meaning and significance of all the processes related to the construction and refinement of the rubrics. Probably this process will need to be retaken in the future, but the rubrics are the product of a learning community, that has seen, validated and modified the rubrics. At the moment of submitting the self-study some of the recorded conclusions of meetings and processes were not available. In a pragmatic way, the rubrics have been adjusted and readjusted, used and tested and revisited according to multiple reflections across the years. Clinical experience coordinators, NCATE coordinators and SPA reviewers, as well as teachers and supervisors, were responsible to read, use and offer recommendations. This Content was reviewed by experts. Three years before the CAEP visit, the process of revising the rubrics was retaken. The reliability analysis by means of an Alpha Cronbach was postponed until 2016, due to different factors. It could be said that content validity was set since the origination of the rubrics. In terms of Action Research all this history has to do more with reflexive validity. Hours of reflection and redoing to calibrate the instruments are constituent of its validity. This aspect of reflexive undertaking by professors harmonizes with the EPP vision of creating reflexive practitioners. Ghanizadeh, A. & Jahedizadeh, S. (2017) quote Barton & Ryan (2014) stating that researchers in the domain of higher education conceived reflective thinking as integral to the development of professional disciplinary practices. The praxis of a reflective educator is to think on his/her own practices, freely referring to Stenhouse, including the creation of rubrics. The process of validating the rubrics has had both quantitative and qualitative data and approaches in a multi method approach. Many insights of faculty and teachers have been confirmed by the statistical analyses. The term confirmability is inherent in qualitative paradigms, Lincoln, Egon & Guba (1985) in Golafshani (2003). The recommendations of experts both professors and teachers has as underlying principle what Patton(2001) in idem states: "the researcher is the instrument"; having the concept of credibility relying on the researcher. The text already submitted has been revised and modified for clarity in this 2019, submission. It is evidence of having conducted the processes in reference.

The evidences or exhibits annexed to this document are; Meetings to inspect instruments from April to May 2017 and the initial 2015 validating process project draft. The validity history for the four main rubrics, the STR, the Teaching Unit, the TWS and the Community Service and the Inter rater reliability meeting evidence are presented. The reliability measures taken for the four main rubrics are also included. In addition it has to be mentioned again that all the rubrics were aligned with INstac and with each one of the SPAs dimensions, which constitutes another validating measure.

EPP Rubrics :Amended 2019 version of the Content Validity and Reliability Report for the Rejoinder 2017
Rationale with a plan

Answer to the following :

5.2 The provider's quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent

CAEP REPORT Stipulation Rationale

EPP-created assessments used in the quality assurance system are below the minimal level of sufficiency.

The EPP did not provide evidence that their quality assurance system relies on relevant, verifiable, representative, cumulative and



actionable measures, and produces empirical evidence that interpretations of data are valid and consistent. Namely, the EPP did not provide evidence of having conducted validity measures on its assessments.

Instrument	Alpha Cronbach (fall,2016)
Community Service Rubric	0.91
Teaching Unit	0.859
Teacher Work Sample	0.895
Student Teaching Rubric	0.93

In the Addendum sent to CAEP, previous to the visit, validity and reliability issues were explained in an exhibit titled, *STR revision and validating the STR Report*. According to the Visit Report the evidence was sufficient for reliability but insufficient for validity. The EPP needed to have written a wider narrative. The EPP constituents met, after the visit, and decided to detail each rubric's content validity process as it was to their best understanding. The EPP believes that the rubric describes the domains or dimensions of typical teacher performances according to the competencies defined. The items are representative of the tasks that are expected to be observed in teacher candidates. This assessments, even though validated in the past, underwent progressive reexaminations in seven years. Faculty has always deemed as important to find consensus among professors and teachers. The input from the partners in schools helped in establishing the content validity. The EPP decided after the site visit to reanalyze the content and circulate among teacher faculty (panel of experts) the rubrics with two new columns with new questions with the teachers' recommendations. These are the balance or proportion of dimensions and the essentialness of indicators to establish if they are conducive to describe the desired behaviors (Crutchfield, 2016 retrieved 2017, and CAEP Evidence guide, 2015). This is the new plan for an in depth new process of validation after CAEP's conscientious site visit feedback. According to Gracia (retrieved 2017), concerning validity issues, one should determine whether learning expectations are adequately and representatively sampled within and/or among assessments in the system. The following procedure is recently recorded evidence of processes done before. A group of eight teachers in the Aibonito Bilingual high school ascribed to UPR Cayey met for a conversation over the EPP's



assessments(May, 2017). This population had the particularity of being composed of bilingual UPR Cayey completers and non UPR completers. This is a significant sample of teachers that are partners of the Clinical Experience. They were divided in small groups to examine each rubric with the questions in table 2; New Task. After an oral description of the instruments each group worked. The aim was to examine the descriptors and establish how precise teachers' behaviors were described. The next step was to share the rubrics until each group has seen them all. At the end a plenary session, implemented as a conversation, took place. Two teachers served as cross note takers (see evidences of meetings April-May 2017). The tables with the teacher's recommendations was sent to faculty (May 2017). Allen, Sandra and Knight, John (2009) refer to McNamara (1996) as suggesting that collecting information from experts is vital to develop, determine, and test the rubric's specifications and scoring procedures. They also mention that Stevens and Levi (2005) believe that collaboration is a way to discuss shared goals.

The rubrics are administered at different transition points. Anecdotally it needs to be reported, that recently there were two Teacher Candidates in Secondary Spanish (2017-2018). The two candidates; E_____ and M_____, male and female, designed teaching units at the target level in the course preceding the clinical experience. They both obtained exceeding scores according to the teaching rubric for the clinical experience. As completers, they performed at the highest level in their licensure's examination. Evaluations and scores correlate. A formal study of the predictive validity of the rubrics and the licensure test should be undertaken. Logs of candidates' performances should be compiled from supervisors in the clinical experience that usually teach the methodologies in order to address correlations.

table 1

Date	Source	Data	Action
March 28,2017	CAEP exit report	The instruments needed validity report. Content validity was recommended.	Faculty met with school partners (April 18,2017)and decided to present the report with a new validation plan
April, 2107	NCATE and CAEP documents	There were actions already taken	Rewrite the report and devise a new plan
May 2017	CAEP coordinators, Accreditation support from the Dean's Office	Formulate a more accurate report and design further actions	Write the report
			Contact an available school to set the review of instruments Instrument assessment May 16,2017 in a school in Aibonito P.R.
			Visit and converse with partners in a bilingual school as a way to review



			the instruments to avoid English language difficulties with the text (panel of experts). May 16, 2017 in a school in Aibonito, P.R.
May-June 2017	Responses of faculty and partners review of documents		Collect and analyze qualitative data of those groups
	Validation report		Share with faculty and partners
			Take decisions
			Send report to CAEP via AIMS
August 2017 or January 2018			Pilot revisions if necessary and request translations
January, 2019			Due to gaps product of the hurricane crisis, versions of the rubrics with the last recommendations and translations have been awaiting.

Instruments

Student Teaching Rubric

History The instrument was originally created back in 2007. Faculty held multiple meetings examining its former rubric and comparing it to rubrics in the literature and rubrics in different Puerto Rican Universities. In consensus format, number of items, areas or dimensions and a bank of possible indicators aligned with the EPP’s competencies were submitted to a committee. A secretary was assigned to faculty in charge to elaborate the elements into a coherent adequate template. Drafts of the initial rubric were shared with faculty for peer review. Panels of experts in conversational groups give opinions on each one of the indicators and sections. As a result a long, wordy initial rubric was produced and piloted throughout the different districts where teacher candidates were placed. The assessment was piloted prior to official administration and data was collected in spring 2007. After this pilot a new version of the rubric was widely used and tested. Cooperating teachers of p-12 schools were the panel of experts that reviewed the instrument. This process was reported in the NCATE Institutional report of 2010.

Re-validating the Student Teaching Rubric The process of re-validating the Student Teaching Rubric started with a master realignment of the generic rubric to all SPAs and to InTasc. After minor revisions a basic essential outline was devised in February 2015 as a plan for the rubric. Through meetings, personal communications and emails from March to April 2015 the rubric was revised. Faculty with the support of the Assistant Dean for accreditation made recommendations in terms of structure, content and format. The alignment to the InTASC standards and particular SPAs were revised according to each section or dimension of the rubric. The intention was to check that the alignment was not arbitrary. After each adjustment the rubric was widely circulated for input and reflection.



A column was added to see how each item could align across SPAs. The rubric needed to be more manageable for use and according to CAEP standards(UPR Cayey personnel attended a CAEP conference). Suggestions from the Vice-presidency of Academic Affairs were received in terms of aligning the rubric to one used in another UPR System EPP. UPR Mayaguez translated, with permission, a validated rubric. It was found that there were repetitive items or with complexities that did not allow for an adequate scoring. The scale was changed in three occasions during the process. The scale was finally changed (from the first row to the second):

OUTSTANDING (3)	ACCEPTABLE (2)	IN PROGRESS (1)	UNACCEPTABLE (0)
------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------

OUTSTANDING (3)	ACCEPTABLE (2)	IN PROGRESS (1)
------------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

The rationale underlying the former change of the scale was that at this level unacceptable was not a category at this transition point of the candidates. There have been enough instances to develop abilities and skills. Then the reflections moved to the notion that a higher standard should be established in order to augment the rigor necessary at this point of exit. The following scale was implemented, that deems to have a higher level of discrimination:

Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meeting Expectations (3)	Developing (2)	Emergent (1)
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

UPR Mayaguez Student Teaching Rubric and that of UPR Cayey were compared in order to calibrate the content and following the intention of making uniform the way in which the candidates are assessed. Elements in common were recognized and it was concluded that the attributes of the profession were assessed. The rubric needed to be a matrix that incorporated for each SPA the adequate technical vocabulary. Each program could freely add addendums to reflect those contents or dispositions that the main rubric could not contemplate.

The next steps sought to incorporate our school partners in the process. The rubric with a questionnaire was sent to schools with the candidates in the clinical experience. A group of cooperating teachers made recommendations but did not reflect a need for major changes. During the faculty inter reliability test in May 2016 the recommendations made by teachers were discussed. Emphasis was given to qualitative data. The interactive process served as a way to reach consensus in terms of content. After that, the revised Elementary and secondary Rubrics were put in place fall, 2016. The following questionnaire was sent to Cooperating Teachers (see exhibit Validity 2015):

The Statistical analysis for Reliability Conclusions (conducted in fall 2016): The EPP conducted an Alpha Cronbach analysis that acted as a corroboration or confirmation of reflective insights and changes made as a result. Changes made after the meetings with faculty and teachers in 2015 did not significantly diverge from the statistical analysis.



The EPP had the rubric revised after qualitative input and the preceding one analyzed by means of a statistical procedure. The Cronbach Alpha made from the version used before, yielded a 0.93. All the dimensions in the rubric were above 0.35. When confronting both rubrics, the one revised qualitatively and the one with the quantitative analysis, it was found that items that were recommended for their elimination in the Alpha were already discarded in the qualitatively analyzed version. The lowest Alphas in dimensions were .51 and .52 and .54. All these sections were rebuilt in the peer and teachers revision. The next step needs to be to conduct a new Alpha analysis with data from the qualitatively revised 2016 version. That is when a significant number of Ns is accumulated. This step has been postponed. Nevertheless this process has revealed strengths in the currently used rubric.

After the site 2017, visit a group of eight teachers in the Aibonito Bilingual High School ascribed to UPR Cayey met for a conversation over the EPP's assessments. This population had the particularity of being composed of UPR Cayey completers and non UPR completers while being bilingual. They were divided in small groups to examine each rubric with the questions in table 2; New Task. The intention was to re conduct content validity measures. After a description of the instruments each group worked. The aim was to examine the descriptors and establish how precise teachers' behaviors were described. The next step was to share the rubrics until each group has seen them all. At the end a plenary session, implemented as a conversation, took place. Two teachers served as cross note takers. The table no.2 has in its right column the recommendations of the teachers in the work groups. **One of the significant recommendations was to define with examples the level *exceeds* in the scale.**

New Task 2017 Plan EPP Rubrics' Content Validity after the Visit

Please analyze the following table and answer the questions in the last two columns. Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance? (This is sometimes referred to as content validity ;Tally # of times a learning target is referenced in an alignment document and divide by total number of items in the assessment to calculate the proportion of assessment items that are aligned with a particular standard ,CAEP Evidence guide, 2015). Are they useful or are they really representative?



table 2 STR CAEP 1,2,3 & 5

InTASC Standards	Competencies Measured by Sections of the Rubric	Indicators	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion. Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assess the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
INTASC Standard #4: Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content	(1) In depth knowledge of the basic concepts, processes and skills of the discipline that they intend to teach	1. The concepts selected by the candidate correspond to the grade-level	17% 5/30	1.
		2. The candidate models and illustrates processes and principles that are specific to the subject area..		2.
		3. The candidate's questions reflect different levels of thought.		3. use the verb evidence instead of reflect
		4. The candidate incorporates the standards of the subject area in the instructional process.		4. Indicate an amount of standards in order to evidence exceeds.
		5. The candidate involves the students in the process of applying the acquired content		5. Each one of the adverbs of the flour levels in the descriptors need examples or definitions.



				The words skillfully, successfully and satisfactorily.
<p>INTASC Standard #5: Application of Content. The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</p>	<p>(4) Integration of concepts and paradigms of their discipline with other disciplines</p>	6. Planning shows an effective knowledgeable integration of concepts	<p>10% 3/30</p>	6. Should be divided in concepts, procedures and applications.
		7. The contents transcend the immediate		7. Recommended: “integrates examples, situations, problems and solutions that relate to everyday life”
		8 Ethical behaviors		8. Explain the <u>norm</u> in the indicator.
<p>INTASC Standard #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p>(5) Effective verbal and non-verbal communication skills that promote active learning in the classroom</p>	9. Uses nonverbal communication to support the content,	<p>17% 5/30</p>	9. Add: uses signals ,gestures.
		10. Technical oral and written expression is clear, correct and precise		10. This should be divided into sections. Instead of appropriate tone of voice; heard in all the classroom.
		11. Candidate’s attitude promotes an interactive dialogue		11.
		12. Different means to present content		12.
		13. Establishes an appropriate environment for learning		13.
<p>INTASC Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher uses</p>	<p>(6) Know, understand, respect and respond to interaction and create</p>	14. Contextualizes, knows students: Incorporates the social and communal contexts	<p>17% 5/30</p>	14.



understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high stand	settings for learning environments that promote active learning of the students, social interaction and self-motivation	15. Appropriately serves Special Education population		15. Appropriate should be substituted by reasonable accommodation and differentiated instruction.
		16. Discourse is free of prejudice and stereotypes.		16.
		17. Demonstrates knowing the profile of the students when addressing their differences		17.
		18 Collaborative relationships with families, school colleagues, and agencies		18.
INTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	(7) Is familiar with and selects the essential elements of the instructional design and implements a variety of teaching strategies and technology that satisfy the needs of the students and promote learning and understanding of the content.	19 The structure of the plan	7%	19.
		20 The lesson plan aligns with the goals and standards of the discipline	2/30	20.
INTASC Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher	7) Is familiar with and selects the essential elements of the instructional	21 The learning and technological resources are diverse and support learning	10% 3/30	21. How many resources is exceeding?



understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.	design and implements a variety of teaching strategies and technology that satisfy the needs of the students and promote learning and understanding of the content.	22. Uses specific methodologies and a variety of		22. How many methodologies is exceeding
		23. Uses organizing principles for a class		23.
INTASC Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	(8) Use of formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate their students and reflect on their performance	24. Planning in accordance with prior reflections using assessments	17% 5/30	24.
		25. Uses diverse assessment techniques		25.
		26. Grades are assigned by the appropriate procedures		26. How can a candidate exceed in assigning grades? Ex. correcting on time, handing out the grades in the appropriate time frame.
		27. The tests are appropriate		27.
		28. Carries out post-test analysis:		28.
INTASC Standard #9: <u>Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</u> . The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her	(10) Pride in their profession and professional development	29. Plans for improvement	7% 2/30	29.
		30. Evidences reflections about the multidimensional codes ,ethics and standards		30.



<p>choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. INTASC Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher <u>seeks appropriate leadership roles</u> and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to <u>advance the profession.</u></p>				
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--



The Statistical analysis for Reliability was conducted in fall 216.

Conclusions: Changes made after the meetings with Faculty and teachers do not significantly diverge from the statistical analysis. The Cronbach Alpha made from the old rubric yielded a 0.93. All the dimensions in the rubric are above 0.35. Items that should be discarded were eliminated. The ones kept were revised. The lowest alphas in dimensions were .51 and .52 and .54. All these sections were rebuilt; the next step will be conducting an analysis with data from the new rubrics, when a significant number of Ns is accumulated. The following table compares the changes with the statistical analysis.

Total Number of items out of 49	Action	Percent	Revised rubric after the Process in comparison with the statistical analysis using the old rubric as a bank of items	Future actions CHECK
32	kept	65%	From these some were kept, revised or consolidated.	
6	revised	12%	From those needing revision 3 were kept	<i>Items that need checking</i> <i>Item dealing with examples and counter examples</i> <i>Item dealing with prejudice and stereotypes in discourse</i> <i>Item having to do with assigning grades</i>
11	discarded	22%	<i>In the revised rubric 11 items were eliminated or completely rebuilt</i>	<i>They are in the sections completely rebuilt</i>



Significant translation from the statistical analysis report

In agreement with the classical measurement literature, the Alfa Cronbach under 0.70 is indicative of a lack of internal consistency (Nunnally, J. C. y Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric theory (Third Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

In harmony with the literature, the correlation of an item with all the added of a dimension, if it is lower 0.35 is poor, under 0.20 is unacceptable. Items with a correlation under 0.20 need to be discarded and a new one put in place.

A correlation between 0.20 and .35 requires an in depth revision (Guildford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.). When an item is discarded after an Alpha Cronbach analysis, it allows the instrument to improve its internal consistency.

Actions for the future;

The EPP needs to document what has been the modification of the rubric impact in Candidates' quality appraisal.

Check the three items that were kept from the old rubric.



Data from the statistical analysis

keep

discard

improve

They were eliminated in the professor's revised version.

Concepts integration : included in other new items

Integración de Conceptos			0.52	Reformular
Ítem 1	0.20	0.61		Eliminar
Ítem 2	0.28	0.50		Eliminar
Ítem 3	0.55	-0.04		Eliminar



The whole section was rebuilt in the revised rubric: Communication Skills

Destrezas de Comunicación			
Ítem 1	0.25	0.51	0.54 Reformular
Ítem 2	0.21	0.53	Eliminar
Ítem 3	0.35	0.47	Revisar
Ítem 4	0.04	0.59	Profundamente
Ítem 5	0.29	0.50	Eliminar
Ítem 6	0.39	0.45	Revisar
Ítem 7	0.41	0.45	Mantener

The whole section was rebuilt in the revised rubric: Creation of learning environments

Diversidad y Ambiente			
Ítem 1	0.31	0.43	0.51 Reformular
Ítem 2	0.20	0.51	Eliminar
Ítem 3	0.33	0.42	Eliminar
Ítem 4	0.34	0.41	Eliminar
Ítem 5	0.35	0.48	Revisar
			0.78 Mantener



Assessment strategies

Estrategias de
Assessment

Ítem 1	0.74	0.71	Mantener
Ítem 2	0.52	0.75	Mantener
Ítem 3	0.60	0.74	Mantener
Ítem 4	0.61	0.73	Mantener
Ítem 5	0.22	0.78	Revisar Profundamente
Ítem 6	0.45	0.77	Mantener
Ítem 7	0.32	0.78	Revisar Revisar
Ítem 8	0.25	0.78	Profundamente
Ítem 9	0.48	0.76	Mantener



Teacher Work Sample (TWS)

Content Validity History

This instrument is structured following the alignment established on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) designed by “The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality”. The Renaissance Partnership established the validity/trustworthiness of the assessment. It was translated to Spanish by UPR Ponce. The instrument was revised by each specialty expert to incorporate the wording and to align it with SPAs and InTASC. The EPP relied on the external validity as evidenced by the literature of the project (Gracia, retrieved 2017). This process of alignment served as a cross content checkup among disciplines and SPAs. It has been said that alignment is a way in which ...expectations and assessments are in agreement and serve in conjunction with one another to guide the system toward students learning what they are expected to know and do” (Webb, 2002 in Elliot, Roach and Webb,2005).

Revision

The new alignment with elementary was recommended by ACEI elementary and InTASC and was implemented in Fall 2015 as recommended. It is important to mention that each supervisor is specific to the discipline of emphasis of the candidate and whenever a candidate is evaluated the content curriculum standard is the one that directs the assessment. In 2016 having two separate documents for elementary and secondary posed difficulties. The two documents were slightly different. The last elementary revision was modeled out of Ponce’s structure. When supervisors met they found that differences made orientations difficult and provoked misunderstandings when candidates of different levels met to work together. Experts revised the document and the Clinical Experience Coordinator produced the last adjusted document. Sections, some items, and mainly the text that explained the project were revised. The new version was piloted in 2016 (fall) and even though the process was informally documented it proved effective. The corroborating process of the alpha Cronbach reliability test showed areas that still need to be revised. Nevertheless, the expert analysis that led to eliminate certain indicators was justified by the Cronbach analysis.

The EPP decided to resend the rubric’s indicators to faculty to: reanalyze the content and circulate the rubric with two new columns with new questions among faculty (panel of experts) with the teachers’ recommendations. These are the balance or proportion of dimensions and the essentialness of indicators to establish if they are conducive to describe the desired behaviors. This is their new plan for an in depth new process of validation after CAEP’s conscientious site visit’s feedback. ***The reliability coefficient of the whole instrument is .895***

The EPP conducted a validating Session with teachers in a bilingual school as further evidence A group of eight teachers in the Aibonito Bilingual high school ascribed to UPR Cayey met for a conversation over the EPP’s assessments. This population had the particularity of being composed of UPR Cayey completers and non UPR completers while being bilingual. They were divided in small groups to examine each rubric with the questions in table 2; New Task. After a description of the instruments each group worked. The aim was to examine the complete descriptors and establish how precise teachers’ behaviors were described. The next step was to share the rubrics until each group has seen them all. At the end a plenary session, implemented as a conversation took place. Two teachers served as cross note takers.



Results of validating session with Teachers 2017

The conversation rendered the following recommendations: in the implementation section the value is not proportional to the importance of the section. The alignment of the should be rethought in order to include leadership and working with parents' standards. It was suggested that parents should be deliberately, explicitly incorporated into planning the project. One of the main recommendations was to be more specific in the descriptors giving examples. Teachers suggested to have a new look at the verbs in the descriptors.

One new question that arises is: **Are the elements balanced across all main assessments across the system?**

TRANSITION Point 4: Teacher Work Sample Scale 1 ,2 &3 Recommendations of the alpha Cronbach analysis performed in spring 2017 by the Assessment Office ascribed to the chancellor. **Yellow stands for eliminate or reconstruct, **light orange** stands for a revision. The reliability coefficient is .895 Alpha Cronbach**

New Task 2017 Please analyze the following table and answer the questions in the last two columns. Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance? (This is sometimes referred to as *content validity* Tally # of times a learning target is referenced in an alignment document and divide by total number of items in the assessment to calculate the proportion of assessment items that are aligned with a particular standard CAEP Evidence guide, 2015). Are they useful or are they really representative?



CAEP Standard 1 INTASC Standards	Competencies by Sections of the Rubric	Attributes in condensed version	Cronbach Alpha of internal consistency	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
Rubric 1 Contextual Factors INTASC Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher <u>uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities</u> to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	The candidate <u>knows, understands, respects and responds to diversity</u> and creates learning environments that promote active learning of the students, social interaction and self-motivation. Alpha Cronbach	1. Knowledge of community, school, and classroom factors.	0.55	5/39 13%	1.
		2. Knowledge of student characteristics.	0.64		2.
		3. Knowledge of different student learning styles.	0.21		3.
		4. Knowledge of student skills and prior knowledge.	0.43 0.18 0.58		4.



	of the Dimension				
	895	5. Knowledge of planning and instructional evaluation implications.			5.
Rubric 2 Learning Goals INTASC STANDARD #4: THE TEACHER UNDERSTANDS THE CENTRAL CONCEPTS, TOOLS OF INQUIRY, AND STRUCTURES OF THE DISCIPLINE(S) HE OR SHE TEACHES AND CREATES LEARNING EXPERIENCES THAT MAKE THE DISCIPLINE ACCESSIBLE AND MEANINGFUL FOR LEARNERS TO ASSURE MASTERY OF THE CONTENT	THE CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATES IN DEPTH KNOWLEDGE OF THE BASIC CONCEPTS, PROCESSES AND SKILLS OF THE SUBJECT AREA THAT S/HE ASPIRES TO TEACH CONTENT. Alpha Cronbach 0.686	6. Importance, challenge and variety		4/39 10%	6.
		7. Clarity	0.31		7.
		8. Suitable for students	0.30		8.
		9. Importance, challenge and variety	0.28		9.
Rubric 3 Assessment Plan INTASC Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	8) SKILLS: THE CANDIDATE UNDERSTANDS AND USES FORMAL AND INFORMAL ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES TO EVALUATE AND ENSURE THE INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDENT AND IS REFLECTED IN HIS/HER TEACHING PERFORMANCE. Alpha Cronbach 0.535	10. Learning goals and alignment		5/39 13%	10.
		11. Criteria and execution standard clarity	0.22		11.
		12. Multiple styles and approaches.	0.31		12. Specify the amount of assessments.
		13. Technical consistency.	0.11		13.
		14. Adaptation to individual needs.	0.42		14.
			0.49		
Rubric 4 Instructional Design INTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. Standard INTASC #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content	(7) SKILLS: THE CANDIDATE KNOWS AND CHOOSES THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTS A VARIETY OF TEACHING STRATEGIES AND TECHNOLOGY THAT SATISFY THE NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS AND PROMOTE LEARNING AND UNDERSTANDING. Alpha Cronbach 0.510	15. Adaptation to individual needs.		7/39 18%	15.
		16. Alignment with goals	-.11		16.
		17. Exact representation of the Language content	.44		17.
		18. Unit and lesson structure	.46		18.
		19. Use of a variety of instructional methods, activities, assignments and resources	.42		19.



areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.		20. Use of information and contextual data to select relevant activities, assignments and resources			20.
		21. Use of technology			21.



CAEP Standard 1 INTASC Standards	Competencies by Sections of the Rubric		Cronbach Alpha of internal consistency	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
Rubric 5 Decision Making in the Teaching Process INTASC Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in <u>ongoing professional learning</u> and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.	(10) DISPOSITIONS: THE CANDIDATE DEVELOPS <u>PRIDE IN HIS/HER PROFESION AND KEEPS UP-TO-DATE WITH THE CHANGES IN HIS/HER SUBJECT AREA AND IN PEDAGOGY</u> Alpha Cronbach 0.557	22. Sound professional practice	<div style="background-color: #cccccc; width: 100px; height: 15px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> 0.40 0.22 0.52	3/39 8%	22. Change the word sound for written.
		23. Modifications based on student learning			23. Divide this attribute in two.
		24. Congruence between modifications and learning goals			



<p>Rubric 6 Student Learning Analysis</p> <p>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in <u>ongoing professional learning</u> and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p> <p>INTASC Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher <u>seeks appropriate leadership roles</u> and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to <u>advance the profession.</u></p>	<p>DISPOSITIONS: THE CANDIDATE DEVELOPS <u>PRIDE IN HIS/HER PROFESION AND KEEPS UP-TO-DATE WITH THE CHANGES IN HIS/HER SUBJECT AREA AND IN PEDAGOGY</u> Alpha Cronbach 0.691</p>	25. Student learning analysis		<p>5/39 13%</p>	25. Specify the ways in which data is going to be represented.
		26. Identify effective instruction and assessment	0.47		
		27. Interpretation OF DATA	0.46		
		28. Implications for future teaching	0.57		
		29. Implications for professional development	0.43		
					27. Interpretation of meaningful should be clarified.



CAEP Standard 1 INTASC Standards		Attributes of the Rubric that respond to INTASC	Cronbach Alpha of internal consistency	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
Rubric 7 Reflection and Self-evaluation INTASC Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice . The teacher engages in <u>ongoing professional learning</u> and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.	DISPOSITIONS: THE CANDIDATE DEVELOPS <u>PRIDE IN HIS/HER PROFESION AND KEEPS UP-TO-DATE WITH THE CHANGES IN HIS/HER SUBJECT AREA AND IN PEDAGOGY</u> Alpha Cronbach 0.891	30. Student learning analysis		5/39 13%	
		31. Identify effective instruction and assessment	0.68		
		32. Alignment of goals, instruction, and assessment	0.60		
		33. Implications for future teaching	0.68		
		34. Implications for professional development	0.50		



references	Alpha Cronbach 0.516	35. References section eliminated in the fall 2016 revision		3/39 8%	
		36. References section eliminated in the fall 2016 revision	0.52		
		37. References section eliminated in the fall 2016 revision	0.19 0.41		
appendixes	Alpha Cronbach 0.169	38. Appendixes section eliminated in the fall 2016 revision		2/39 5%	
		39. Appendixes section eliminated in the fall 2016 revision	0.09 0.09		



Community Service Rubric

History

The Community Service Project was designed by faculty in 2007-2008 and first piloted in spring 2008. It was formulated responding to principles of service that are emblematic of UPR Cayey. The indicators were produced according to the literature about in service learning. NCATE coordinators were in charge of revising (Panel of experts) the content. It was again revised in 2009 by the professor in charge of its implementation.

Revision for content and for reliability

The process of re-validating the Community Service Project started with a master realignment of the generic rubric to all SPAs and to InSTAC. This rubric was originally created by faculty and was revised in 2014. A Panel of Experts, Professors, met to review the rubric indicators and the project. No significant recommendations were received, notwithstanding the fact that the rubrics were realigned (according to Gracia, retrieved 2017, Content-Related Validity: Alignment, that is provided evidence that assessments are aligned with key standards or learning expectations). The statistical analysis was conducted late in fall 2016 using a bank of supervisor's evaluations to corroborate which items coincide or diverge in the statistical analysis with the faculty opinions. The alpha Cronbach analysis was conducted by the Institutional Assessment and Planning Office. The Cronbach Alpha made from the rubric yielded a 0.91. All the dimensions in the rubric are above 0.70. Only one item should be revised: Item number# 4 in the implementation. Through the years the Community Service Project format has been stable.

The EPP decided to resend the rubric's indicators to faculty to: reanalyze the content and circulate among faculty (panel of experts) the rubric with two new columns with new questions. These are the balance or proportion of dimensions and the essentialness of indicators to establish if they are conducive to describe the desired behaviors. This is their new plan for an in depth new process of validation after CAEP's conscientious feedback. One new question that arises is: **Are the elements balanced across all main assessments across the system?**



New Task 2017 Please analyze the following table and answer the questions in the last two columns. Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance? (This is sometimes referred to as *content validity* Tally # of times a learning target is referenced in an alignment document and divide by total number of items in the assessment to calculate the proportion of assessment items that are aligned with a particular standard CAEP Evidence guide, 2015). Are they useful or are they really representative?

Community Service Rubric Adjusted (2016)Alignment

		Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
<p><u>INTASC Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.</u></p> <p>Attributes are complete in this table</p>		<p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p>Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it?</p> <p>Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
A	Attribute Planning of the project		
	1. The problem, situation or the possibility of service found is significant and requires time investment.	8/19	1. Clarify what is significant. Eliminate the word problem and substitute it for issue, situation, and area of emphasis.



	2. Evidence of the research process is wide: collects information and analyzes the dimensions of the situation.	42%	
	3. There is evidence of the conversations and reflections before the planning process.		
	4. The process of reconceptualization of the problem and its solution is deep (evidence shows the consideration of different alternatives, it also explains and evaluates the available resources).		4. The word deep needs to be clarified.
	5. There is evidence of the incorporation of the community as a direct partner of the project.		
	6. The designed Action Plan is workable, based on the theoretical perspectives, in the time allotted for it, the available resources and the expectations of the community.		
	7. His/her discipline is deeply related to other areas (the project is related to the discipline of Education).		
	8. The objectives of the project show the designer's knowledge of (alignment with the abilities, skills and dispositions that a teacher candidate needs to develop).		



<p>Intasc #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Balance</p> <p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p>Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
B	Attribute: Implementation of the project		
	1. Performs the activities in the projected time frame.	<p>6/19</p> <p>32%</p>	
	2. The interventions correspond to the projected plan and any emergent modification is justified and explained.		
	3. Achieves the active and effective participation of the members of the community for which the project is addressed.		
	4. Addresses others in a respectful manner and promotes an appropriate learning process. Needs revision according to the Cronbach reliability analysis		
	5 Registers and documents all the implementation process (identifies the problem or situation, the planning process, the communication with the community, the intentions, processes reflections).		



	6. Attends to scheduled interviews with the advisor during the process.		
<p>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Balance</p> <p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Usefulness Your opinion</p> <p>Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured?</p> <p>If you disagree: How would you write it?</p> <p>Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
C	Attribute Evaluation and dissemination of the project		
	1. Evidences the evaluation process: performs the final evaluations, the self-evaluation, the conclusion and the recommendations for future actions.	5/19	
	2. Evidences the significant impact of the intervention: shows the contribution of the project. (The involvement with the community: this service is beneficial for the community).	26%	



	3.Describes with precision the mutual learning processes: the personal ones and those of the community. (There is reciprocity all the participants are learners as well as teachers).		
	4.Announces the project in the communities involved in it through a presentation, a written communication or a poster at the place and at the University. (The process of announcing the project becomes a public dialogue about it)		4. It should be announced only at the community where the project was implemented.
	5.His/her significant learning processes show the development of a civic conscience within a democratic society.		

Teaching Unit or Teaching Plan

History Content Validity as reported. This process has been left to individual SPA reviewers because the TU needs to address CAEP Standards and the SPAs as well. Expert analysis, sharing with faculty members has been the main feedback along with the SPA recommendations. These have been stronger in secondary than in elementary where ACEI has agreed with the EPP in considering the TU as a strong tool to measure the application of theory top design. The Rubric was revised after meetings held by faculty starting 2014. The revision addressed the following recommendations; the extension of the rubric made it unmanageable sometimes, some of the indicators were not clear enough or were repeated, the sections of the rubric needed to be acutely aligned across the disciplines and to CAEP’s INTASC standards. The rubric was then realigned by professors, various SPA reviewers added or adjusted the wording for each discipline and the rubrics were changed to a single shorter rubric with various brief sections in order to keep and made clear the INTASC alignment. It was transformed to a clearer shorter rubric. Some secondary level SPAS have recommended to adjust the TU to increasingly reflect the content area. The Teaching Unit has been an instrument designed and revised by EPP professors throughout time considering k ways to keep the alignment across disciplines while responding to particular needs. Informal assessment in the form of feedback of completers doing their masters have stated that having designed a Unit at the BA level has supported their curriculum courses at Master’s level. Correlation with the Teacher Work Sample has been found, even though not documented formally, Candidates who design strong units are at ease with the Teacher Work Sample.

The Statistical analysis for Reliability The alpha Cronbach analysis was conducted by the Institutional Assessment and Planning Office in December 2016.

The statistical analysis for the Teaching unit was conducted using the previous version of the rubric. Faculty does not want to depend solely on quantitative data and is using quantitative information as a mean to corroborate analysis and reflection. The project was revised by faculty using mainly recommendations from the Coordinators of Clinical Experiences and the SPA reports or SPA reviewers’ recommendations. **The Cronbach Alpha made from the rubric yielded a 0.859.** Four dimensions of the rubric are above



0.70, one is 0.59 and one is 0.26. In the Cronbach analysis (N=7) 24% of the items should be discarded, (N=5)17% revised and (N=17) 59% kept. Only one dimension should be revised and the one recommended to discard was rebuilt and only three items remain. The last two items received a discard recommendation, from those only was kept. Of the 7 items recommended to discard only three remain in the revised rubric. This is the section of references. Nevertheless internal consistency is still high. See statistical Analysis for the TU (Teaching Unit). Some programs, like secondary English and Science still need to construct addendums to the unit. Items in the first section have to do with the theory and the underlying principles that guide design. The dimension to be rebuild gears around writing objectives. Faculty's opinions were sound.

The EPP decided to resend the rubric's indicators to faculty to: reanalyze the content and circulate among faculty (panel of experts) the rubric with two new columns with new questions with the teachers' recommendations. These are the balance or proportion of dimensions and the essentialness of indicators to establish if they are conducive to describe the desired behaviors. This is their new plan for an in depth new process of validation after CAEP's conscientious feedback. **The EPP conducted a validating Session with teachers in a bilingual school as further evidence**

Results of validating session with Teachers 2017 A group of eight teachers in the Aibonito Bilingual high school ascribed to UPR Cayey met for a conversation over the EPP's assessments. This population had the particularity of being composed of UPR Cayey completers and non UPR completers while being bilingual. They were divided in small groups to examine each rubric with the questions in table 2; New Task. After a description of the instruments each group worked. The aim was to examine the complete descriptors and stabishe how precise teachers' behaviors were described. The next step was to share the rubrics until each group has seen them all. At the end a plenary session, implemented as a conversation took place. Two teachers served as cross note takers. **The conversation rendered the following recommendations: In terms of indicator 6, previous knowledge, there can be a teacher that uses only one previous concept and another using 15. There should be a minimum established.**

One new question that arises is: **Are the elements balanced across all main assessments across the system?**

Teaching Unit Rubric

CAEP 1, 3 & 5

New Task 2017 Please analyze the following table and answer the questions in the las two columns. Are the right attributes being measured in the right balance? (This is sometimes referred to as *content validity* Tally # of times a learning target is referenced in an alignment document and divide by total number of items in the assessment to calculate the proportion of assessment items that are aligned with a particular standard CAEP Evidence guide, 2015). Are they useful or are they really representative?



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assess the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
(6) Skills: The candidate <u>knows, understands, respects and responds to diversity</u> and creates learning environments that promote active learning of the students, social interaction and self-motivation. INTASC Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher <u>uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities</u> to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.			3/25 12%	
Section 1. Description of the Teaching Unit using the frameworks of theory	1.Theory	1. The underlying theory		
	2.Internal Coherence	2.Coherence between theory and methodology:		2. Reformulate the description of the criteria. Explain in details key concepts, like depth, nature, learning theory, coherence.
	3. Adaptations	3. Adaptation to diverse students		
1) THE CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATES IN DEPTH KNOWLEDGE OF THE BASIC CONCEPTS, PROCESSES AND SKILLS OF THE SUBJECT AREA THAT S/HE ASPIRES TO TEACH INTASC Standard #4: Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central				



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
			Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.				
<i>Section 2. Outline of Content</i> : -generating themes, having big ideas, facts, principles, curricular integration, attitudes, values and skills aligned with the Curricular Maps of the Puerto Rican Department of Education	4.Content	4.. Content outline aligns with the exact content of the discipline	.04% 1/25 There are not enough elements. Break it down.	4. Divide into themes, curricular integration. attitudes, values and skills. The affective component should not be evaluated.
. (1) THE CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATES IN DEPTH KNOWLEDGE OF THE BASIC CONCEPTS, PROCESSES AND SKILLS OF THE SUBJECT AREA THAT S/HE ASPIRES TO TEACH INTASC Standard #4 : Content Knowledge. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.				



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
			Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
Section 3: Prior knowledge needed for the development of the unit	5.Prior knowledge	5.Accurately selects the Prior knowledge needed for the development of the unit	2/25 .08%	6. Appropriate is is subjective, should be change to a more measurable criteria. There should be a minimum of arguments and concepts established in the indicator. There can be a teacher that uses only one previous concept and another using 15. There should be a minimum established.
	6.Justified selection of content	6.Justified selection of the previous concepts for the Unit using knowledge of learning theory		
7) Skills: The candidate knows and chooses the essential elements of the instructional Design and implements a variety de teaching strategies and technology that satisfy the needs of the students and promote learning and understanding. INTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. Standard INTASC #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to				



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.			<p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p>Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assess the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
	7.Objectives are aligned with the exact content	7. General and specific encompassing(that include all the outlined content) objectives aligned to the Puerto Rican D.E. Curricular Maps or Standards	<p>3/25</p> <p>12%</p> <p>There are not enough indicators in this section .</p>	7. There should be a minimum of objectives established.
	8.Alignment is hierarchically structured	Alignment is hierarchically structured, horizontally and vertically, from the objectives to their assessments		
	9.Clarity and coherence	9. All the objectives are clearly presented as learning outcomes and coherent with their assessments.		9. Needs explanation. Does not reflect a performance.



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
			<p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p>Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
Section 4: General and specific objectives aligned with the P.R. Curricular Maps or standards				
<p>(7) Skills: The candidate knows and chooses the essential elements of the instructional designs and implements a variety de teaching strategies and technology that satisfy the needs of the students and promote learning and understanding. INTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. Standard INTASC #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. (8) SKILLS: THE CANDIDATE UNDERSTANDS AND USES FORMAL AND INFORMAL ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES TO EVALUATE AND ENSURE THE INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDENT AND IS REFLECTED IN HIS/HER TEACHING PERFORMANCE. INTASC Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>				
Section 5. Curricular Matrix	10.The content is sequentially structured into	10.The detailed content appears to be purposely structured into a horizontal and vertical sequence	16%	



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
			<p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p>Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
	an organized whole		4/25	
	11.The unit is designed from an interdisciplinary perspective .	11.The content effectively and harmoniously integrates and articulates elements from other disciplines such the arts, health and physical education		11. The word harmoniously is affective. A change of the word is suggested.
	12.Varied use of instructional means, activities, technology ,assignments and resources	12.Significant varied use of instructional means, activities, assignments and resources. contributes to the learning process		



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
	13. Multiple assessment approaches	13.The assessment includes diverse approaches and instruments promoting critical thinking and integration of knowledge		13,. Establish a minimum. Organization should be another indicator.
(7) Skills: The candidate knows and chooses the essential elements of the instructional designs and implements a variety de teaching strategies and technology that satisfy the needs of the students and promote learning and understanding. INTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon				



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance	Usefulness Your opinion
<p>knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. Standard INTASC #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. (8) SKILLS: THE CANDIDATE UNDERSTANDS AND USES FORMAL AND INFORMAL ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES TO EVALUATE AND ENSURE THE INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDENT AND IS REFLECTED IN HIS/HER TEACHING PERFORMANCE. INTASC Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>			<p>Are there enough indicators for each dimension?</p> <p>Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?</p>	<p>Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assess the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017</p>
6.Plans	14. Content and Standards Sections 7,7.1 8.and 9 of the plan	14.The instructional design consistently demonstrates coherence	9/25 36%	
	15. Plans are designed from an interdisciplinary perspective.	15.The content consistently integrates elements from other disciplines		



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
	Sections 9 and 10 of the plan			
	16. Writing of instructional objective Section 11 of the plan	16. The plans are consistent in the agreed written format of the objectives.		
	17. Parts of the lesson Section 12 of the Plan	17. The plans are consistent in presenting clearly the three parts of the class.		
	18. Special accommodations or differentiated learning	18. Consistently demonstrates knowing, major concepts, principles, theories, and research		



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assess the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
	Section 13 of the Plan	related to the development of children		
	19. Materials and instructional resources Section 14 of the Plan	19. The materials and resources are diverse and support learning.		
	20.Homework; Section 15 of the plan	20. The plans structure the assignments to reinforce and broaden the contents of the class.		
	21. References, Attachments and appendices	21. Consistently Includes the references and used materials		



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
	Section 16 of the plan			
	22. Reflection Section 17 of the Plan	22.In depth reflections of his/her practices as a teacher		
0) Dispositions: The candidate develops pride IN his/her profession and KEEPS up-to-date with the changes In his/her subject area and N pedagogy INTASC Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning				



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
<p>nd uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. INTASC Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher <u>seeks appropriate leadership roles</u> and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to <u>advance the profession</u>.</p>				
<p>7. A reflection on the design and elaboration processes and their implications as teacher candidates.</p>	<p>23.Reflection during the construction process</p>	<p>23. Describes in depth at least two areas of major difficulty while designing the unit demonstrating an aptitude for seeking out opportunities for professional growth.</p>	<p>3/25 12%</p>	
	<p>24.Implications for future practice</p>	<p>24. Provides ideas for improving or redesigning the unit and justifies the changes in terms of the students learning process.</p>		



Alignment of Teaching Unit Rubric		Indicators In condensed version	Balance Are there enough indicators for each dimension? Is the proportion of indicators adequate? Does the proportion reflect the tasks and performances that evidence the wanted teacher behaviors?	Usefulness Your opinion Is the indicator representative of a behavior? Is the skill or knowledge measured by this item essential, useful, but not essential or not necessary to the performance of the construct? Does the indicator really assesses the construct to be measured? If you disagree: How would you write it? Findings May 16 ,2017
8.References	25.References used are significant	25. References support the Candidate's professional learning.		



Education Department

Evaluation Project of the Educator Preparation Program: Questionnaires

Spring 2017

The questionnaires used as assessments for standard 4 underwent the following validity measures as described in the following narrative not included in the addendum but reported by the University-School liaison Team. In the first instance a research was planned (2015-2016) and due to the Department of Education and the requirements of the Circular Letter Núm. 13-2014-2015, which regulates investigative processes in school it was changed to a Project of Evaluation. Efforts were initiated by four Supervisors of the Clinical Experience: Dra. Blanca Borges, Dr. Hernando Steidel, Dr. William Ríos and Dr. Ricardo Molina with CAEP coordinators and related personnel. As a result of this effort three questionnaires were created and were checked by the Faculty and by assessment specialists in the Cayey School District, which are our partners. This led to a revised version of the questionnaires. They recommended a more feasible project in order to have available information for Standard 4. In alliance with the Department of Education Dr. Daisy Santiago and Dr. Navedo, Superintendents of Schools, checked the three original questionnaires and offered recommendations. These were incorporated at once. In addition, the questionnaires were checked by a committee of experts, composed by directors of schools, teachers and students. Recommendations were registered as rubricated notes over the questionnaires. The Completers' questionnaire, the employers' questionnaire and the students' questionnaire were administered. The first two in the previous and revised versions. Actually, there have been three revisions by experts in the lapse of time between NCATE and the beginning of CAEP. The There has been only one version for the students' questionnaire.

Further actions

The Cooperating teacher's evaluation and the Supervisors Evaluation by the Teacher candidates in the clinical experience need to undergo validating processes. The Diversity tracking system also need a plan for its validity even though recommendations have been register across the years but no formal action has been taken. The Report card Survey is an instrument developed before NCATE accreditation, all its revision processes have to be retrieved. The questionnaires will need a new formal more structured process.

References

Agostinho, S. (2004 retrieved 2019). Naturalistic inquiry in e-learning research. International Journal of Qualitative



methods, 4(1), Article 2. Retrieved [insert date] from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/4_1/pdf/agostinho.pdf

Allen, Sandra and Knight, John (2009) "A Method for Collaboratively Developing and Validating a Rubric," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 3: No. 2, Article 10. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2009.030210>

Burns, W. C (1996 retrieved 2017)_Defining Content Validity. *Content Validity, Face Validity, and Quantitative Face Validity*

<http://burns.com/wcbcontval.htm>

Crutchfield, M. (2016 retrieved 2017). October 27,2016 Consultant presentation <http://oacteok.org/OACTE%20Slides/Keynote/Oklahoma.pdf>

Elliott, S.N., Roach. A. T. & Webb, N.L. (2005 retrieved 2019) Alignment of an Alternate Assessment with State Academic Standards: Evidence for the Content Validity of the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment, University of Wisconsin–Madison, *THE JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION VOL. 38/NO. 4/2005/PP. 218–231*
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ693854.pdf>

Kelly, M.D(retrieved 2017). *Validity Analysis of the Reliability and Validity of a Mentor's*

Assessment for Principal Internships Glenn L. Koonce. Regent University

Virginia Tech . <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1105546.pdf>

_____ (retrieved 2017). Strategies for calibrating performance assessments.

<https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Administrative/Provost/PeuH>



UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO AT CAYEY
CAYEY, PUERTO RICO

DEPARTMENT OF PEDAGOGY

Ghanizadeh, A. & Jahedizadeh, S. (2017 retrieved 2019). Validating the Persian Version of Reflective Thinking Questionnaire and Probing Iranian University Students' Reflective Thinking and Academic Achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(3), 209-226.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.10314a>

Gracia, S.(retrieved 2017) Demystifying Assessment Validity and Reliability. Feinstein School of Education and Human Development. Rhode Island College. <https://www.towson.edu/coe/about/documents/caep/standard5demystifying.pdf>

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(4), 597-606.
Retrieved from <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol8/iss4/6>