



Middle States Commission on Higher Education

3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680. Tel: 267-284-5000. Fax: 215-662-5501

www.msche.org

June 29, 2012

Dr. Ana R. Guadalupe
Chancellor
UPR - Rio Piedras Campus
P. O. Box 23300
San Juan, PR 00931-3300

Dear Dr. Guadalupe:

At its session on June 28, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To accept the monitoring report. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2015-2016.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the Statement of Accreditation Status for your institution. The Statement of Accreditation Status (SAS) provides important basic information about the institution and its affiliation with the Commission, and it is made available to the public in the Directory of Members and Candidates on the Commission's website at www.msche.org. Accreditation applies to the institution as detailed in the SAS; institutional information is derived from data provided by the institution through annual reporting and from Commission actions. If any of the institutional information is incorrect, please contact the Commission as soon as possible.

Please check to ensure that published references to your institution's accredited status (catalog, other publications, web page) include the full name, address, and telephone number of the accrediting agency. Further guidance is provided in the Commission's policy statement *Advertising, Student Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status*. If the action for your institution includes preparation of a progress report, monitoring report or supplemental report, please see our policy statement on *Follow-up Reports and Visits*. Both policies can be obtained from our website.

Please be assured of the continuing interest of the Commission on Higher Education in the well-being of UPR - Rio Piedras Campus. If any further clarification is needed regarding the SAS or other items in this letter, please feel free to contact Dr. Tito Guerrero, Vice President.

Sincerely,

R. Barbara Gitenstein, Ph.D.
Chair

- c: Dr. Miguel Munoz, President, University of Puerto Rico Central Administration
- Prof. Carmen Luz Berrios Rivera, Executive Director, Puerto Rico Council on Higher Education



MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680. Tel: 267-284-5000. Fax: 215-662-5501
 www.msche.org

STATEMENT OF ACCREDITATION STATUS

UPR - RIO PIEDRAS CAMPUS
 P. O. Box 23300
 San Juan, PR 00931-3300
 Phone: (787) 764-0000; Fax: (787) 764-8799
 www.uprrp.edu

Chief Executive Officer: Dr. Ana R. Guadalupe, Chancellor
System: University of Puerto Rico Central Administration
 Dr. Miguel Munoz, President
 G.P.O. Box 4984-G
 San Juan, PR 00936
 Phone: (787) 759-6061; Fax: (787) 759-6917

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

Enrollment (Headcount): 12280 Undergraduate; 3122 Graduate
Control: Public
Affiliation: State and Local
Carnegie Classification: Research - High Research Activity
Degrees Offered: Bachelor's, Postbaccalaureate Certificate, Master's, Post-Master's Certificate, Doctor's - Professional Practice, Doctor's - Research/Scholarship;
Distance Education Programs: Yes (approved for the following program(s): School Library Certificate Program)

Accreditors Approved by U.S. Secretary of Education: American Bar Association, Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar; American Dietetic Association, American Commission on Education in Nutrition and Dietetics; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

Other Accreditors:

 ***** Complete Accreditations *****
<http://opa.uprrp.edu/acreditacionesprofesionales.html>

Instructional Locations

Branch Campuses: None

Additional Locations: Abbott Laboratories, Barceloneta, PR; Pfizer Pharmaceutical Company, Barceloneta, PR; UPR Humacao, Humacao, PR.

Other Instructional Sites: None

ACCREDITATION INFORMATION

Status: Member since 1946

Last Reaffirmed: November 17, 2011

Most Recent Commission Action:

June 28, 2012: To accept the monitoring report. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2015-2016.

Brief History Since Last Comprehensive Evaluation:

- June 22, 2005: To reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report due by November 1, 2006, documenting (1) progress made in the implementation of a comprehensive institutional strategic plan which links long-range planning to decision making and budgeting processes; (2) implementation of a written plan for the assessment of institutional effectiveness; and (3) progress toward the implementation of a new undergraduate curriculum. A small team visit may follow submission of the report. The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2010.
- June 28, 2007: To accept the monitoring report and to thank the institution for receiving the Commission's representatives. To request a progress letter due April 1, 2008, documenting steps taken to strengthen general education, including implementation of the new general studies plan. The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2010.
- January 2, 2008: To acknowledge receipt of the substantive change request and to provisionally include the additional location at the Pfizer Pharmaceutical Company plant located in Barceloneta, Puerto Rico, within the scope of the institution's accreditation pending a site visit within six months. To remind the institution that a progress letter is due April 1, 2008, documenting steps taken to strengthen general education, including implementation of the new general studies plan. The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2010.
- April 30, 2008: To acknowledge receipt of the substantive change request and to include the additional location at UPR Humacao within the scope of the institution's accreditation. To note that a visit to the additional location at the Pfizer Pharmaceutical Company plant located in Barceloneta, Puerto Rico has occurred and that the Commission will act at on the visit at its June 26, 2008 meeting. The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2010.
- June 26, 2008: To accept the progress letter submitted by the institution.
- June 26, 2008: To thank the institution for receiving its representative and to affirm the decision to include the additional location at the Pfizer Pharmaceutical plant located in Barceloneta, Puerto Rico, within the scope of the institution's accreditation. To request a progress letter, due April 1, 2009, documenting the implementation of a documented process to assess the achievement of student learning goals for the M.B.A. program, including evidence that student

learning assessment information is used to improve teaching and learning (Standard 14). The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2010.

- June 25, 2009: To accept the progress letter. The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2010.
- June 24, 2010: To note receipt of the voluntary information report. To place the institution on probation because of a lack of evidence that the institution is in compliance with Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance) and Standard 11 (Educational Offerings). To request a monitoring report due by September 1, 2010, documenting evidence that the institution has achieved and can sustain ongoing compliance with (1) Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance), including but not limited to the development and implementation of clear institutional policies specifying the respective authority of the different governance bodies and their respective roles and responsibilities in shared governance; and (2) Standard 11 (Educational Offerings), including but not limited to a plan for assuring the rigor, continuity, and length of courses affected by the institution's closure. In addition, the report should document evidence of the development and/or implementation of a long-term financial plan, including steps taken to improve the institution's finances and the development of alternative funding sources (Standard 3). An on-site evaluation will follow submission of the report. The purpose of the on-site evaluation is to verify the information provided in the monitoring report and the institution's ongoing and sustainable compliance with the Commission's accreditation standards. To further direct a prompt Commission liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission's expectations for reporting. To note that the institution remains accredited while on probation. To note that the Periodic Review Report due June 1, 2010 was received and will be acted upon by the Commission in November.
- November 18, 2010: To note that the Commission liaison guidance visit took place. To document receipt of the monitoring and to note the visit by the Commission's representatives. To document receipt of the Periodic Review Report and to note that the report provided limited information and analysis on Standard 3. To continue the institution's probation due to a lack of evidence that the institution is in compliance with Standard 3 (Institutional Resources) and Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance). To request a monitoring report due by March 1, 2011, documenting evidence that the institution has achieved and can sustain ongoing compliance with Standards 3 and 4, including, but not limited to (1) five-year financial projections for the UPR System including information from audited financial statements for fiscal year 2010; (2) institutional pro-forma budgets that demonstrate the institution's ability to generate a balanced budget for fiscal years 2012 through 2015, including the personnel, compensation, and other assumptions on which these budgets are based (Standard 3); (3) evidence of implementation of clear institutional policies specifying the respective authority of the different governance bodies and their respective roles and responsibilities in shared governance; (4) evidence that the Board of Trustees assists in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution; (5) evidence of a procedure in place for the periodic objective assessment of the Board of Trustees in meeting stated governing body objectives and responsibilities; (6) evidence that steps have

been taken to assure continuity and stability of institutional leadership, particularly in times of governmental transition; (7) evidence that the UPR Action Plan is implemented, that it is assessed, and the data are used for continuous improvement of the institution's processes; (8) evidence that steps have been taken to improve shared governance, especially in documenting how campus input is solicited and considered in decision making at the System level; and (9) evidence that communication between the Central Administration and the institution and within the institution, is clear, timely, and accurate, and that the sources of such communications are clearly defined and made available to all constituents (Standard 4). An on-site evaluation will follow submission of the March 1, 2011 report. To further request a monitoring report due by April 1, 2012 documenting evidence of (1) steps taken to use assessment results to improve budgeting, programs, services, processes, planning, and resource allocation, including establishment of clear priorities and strategic goals to sustain the quality of education within current financial resources (Standards 2,3, and 7); (2) steps taken to strengthen general education and implementation of a documented assessment process for oral communication, written communication, scientific reasoning, quantitative reasoning, and critical analysis and reasoning (Standard 12); and (3) development and implementation of an organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning in all the graduate programs, including evidence of the use of appropriate direct and indirect methods of assessment (Standard 14). A visit may follow submission of the April 1, 2012 report. To note that the institution remains accredited while on probation.

June 23, 2011:

To accept the monitoring report, to note that a small team visit took place, to note that the institution is in compliance with Standard 3 (Institutional Resources). To continue probation because of insufficient evidence that the institution is currently in compliance with Standard 4 (Governance). To note that the institution remains accredited while on probation. To request a monitoring report due September 1, 2011, documenting evidence of compliance with Standard 4, including, but not limited to (1) steps taken to improve communication and shared governance, especially in documenting how campus input is solicited and considered in decision making by senior campus administration and at the System level; (2) evidence that authority and responsibility are assigned, delegated, and shared in a climate of trust, mutual support and respect; and (3) evidence of an effective process and opportunities for student input regarding decision that affect them, including evidence that student input is considered in decision making. A small team visit will follow submission of the September 1, 2011 report. To further request that the monitoring report due April 1, 2012 on Standards 2,3,7, 12 and 14 also include documentation of further progress in (1) strengthening institutional resources and developing alternative forms of income, including institutional pro-forma budgets that demonstrate the institution's ability to generate a balanced budget for fiscal years 2012 through 2014, including the personnel, compensation, and other assumptions on which these budgets are based; (2) steps taken to ensure timely production of audited financial statements for FY 2011 and subsequent years (Standard 3); (3) further steps taken to improve communication and shared governance, especially in documenting how

campus input is solicited and considered in decision making at the System level; (4) evidence of further implementation of the UPR Action Plan, including evidence that the action plan is being assessed and data is used for improvements; (5) evidence that steps have been taken to assure continuity and stability of institutional leadership, particularly in times of governmental transitions; (6) evidence that communication between the Central Administration and the institution, is clear, timely, accurate, and made available to all constituents; and (7) evidence of further progress in implementing a procedure for the periodic objective assessment of the Board of Trustees (Standard 4). A visit may follow submission of the April 1, 2012 report. The next evaluation visit will be scheduled once accreditation is reaffirmed.

November 17, 2011: To accept the monitoring report, to note the visit by the Commission's representatives, to remove probation, and to reaffirm accreditation. To remind the institution that a monitoring report is due April 1, 2012 on Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), Standard 3 (Institutional Resources), Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment), Standard 12 (General Education), and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning). The monitoring report should document further progress in (1) strengthening institutional resources and developing alternative forms of income, including institutional pro-forma budgets that demonstrate the institution's ability to generate a balanced budget for fiscal years 2012 through 2014, including the personnel, compensation, and other assumptions on which these budgets are based (Standard 3); (2) steps taken to ensure timely production of audited financial statements for FY 2011 and subsequent years (Standard 3); (3) further steps taken to improve communication and shared governance, especially in documenting how campus input is solicited and considered in decision-making at the System level (Standard 4); (4) evidence of further implementation of the UPR Action Plan, including evidence that the action plan is being assessed and data are used for improvements (Standard 7); (5) evidence that steps have been taken to assure continuity and stability of institutional leadership, particularly in times of governmental transitions (Standard 5); (6) evidence that communication between the Central Administration and the institution, is clear, timely, accurate, and made available to all constituents; and (7) evidence of further progress in implementing a procedure for the periodic objective assessment of the Board of Trustees (Standard 4). To further request that the monitoring report document evidence (1) that the institution continues to improve communication, especially with respect to soliciting and considering campus input in decision-making (Standard 2); (2) that the administration makes every effort to expedite the work of the search committees that have been constituted to fill the deanships (Standard 5); and (3) that the institution creates additional opportunities, both formal and informal, to directly receive input from students (Standard 6). A visit may follow submission of the monitoring report. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2015-2016.

Next Self-Study Evaluation: 2015 - 2016

Next Periodic Review Report: 2021

Date Printed: June 29, 2012

DEFINITIONS

Branch Campus - A location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. The location is independent if the location: offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential; has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and has its own budgetary and hiring authority.

Additional Location - A location, other than a branch campus, that is geographically apart from the main campus and at which the institution offers at least 50 percent of an educational program. ANYA ("Approved but Not Yet Active") indicates that the location is included within the scope of accreditation but has not yet begun to offer courses. This designation is removed after the Commission receives notification that courses have begun at this location.

Other Instructional Sites - A location, other than a branch campus or additional location, at which the institution offers one or more courses for credit.

Distance Education Programs - Yes or No indicates whether or not the institution has been approved to offer one or more degree or certificate/diploma programs for which students could meet 50% or more of their requirements by taking distance education courses.

EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION ACTIONS

An institution's accreditation continues unless it is explicitly suspended or removed. In addition to reviewing the institution's accreditation status at least every 5 years, actions are taken for substantive changes (such as a new degree or geographic site, or a change of ownership) or when other events occur that require review for continued compliance. Any type of report or visit required by the Commission is reviewed and voted on by the Commission after it is completed.

In increasing order of seriousness, a report by an institution to the Commission may be accepted, acknowledged, or rejected.

Levels of Actions:

Grant or Re-Affirm Accreditation without follow-up

Defer a decision on initial accreditation: The institution shows promise but the evaluation team has identified issues of concern and recommends that the institution be given a specified time period to address those concerns.

Postpone a decision on (reaffirmation of) accreditation: The Commission has determined that there is insufficient information to substantiate institutional compliance with one or more standards.

Continue accreditation: A delay of up to one year may be granted to ensure a current and accurate representation of the institution or in the event of circumstances beyond the institution's control (natural disaster, U.S. State Department travel warnings, etc.)

Recommendations to be addressed in the next Periodic Review Report: Suggestions for improvement are given, but no follow-up is needed for compliance.

Supplemental Information Report: This is required when a decision is postponed and are intended only to allow the institution to provide further information, not to give the institution time to formulate plans or initiate remedial action.

Progress report: The Commission needs assurance that the institution is carrying out activities that were planned or were being implemented at the time of a report or on-site visit.

Monitoring report: There is a potential for the institution to become non-compliant with MSCHE standards; issues are more complex or more numerous; or issues require a substantive, detailed report. A visit may or may not be required.

Warning: The Commission acts to Warn an institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy when the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission standards and a follow-up report, called a monitoring report, is required to demonstrate that the institution has made appropriate improvements to bring itself into compliance. Warning indicates that the Commission believes that, although the institution is out of compliance, the institution has the capacity to make appropriate improvements within a reasonable period of time and the institution has the capacity to sustain itself in the long term.

Probation: The Commission places an institution on Probation when, in the Commission's judgment, the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission standards and that the non-compliance is sufficiently serious, extensive, or acute that it raises concern about one or more of the following:

1. the adequacy of the education provided by the institution;
2. the institution's capacity to make appropriate improvements in a timely fashion; or
3. the institution's capacity to sustain itself in the long term.

Probation is often, but need not always be, preceded by an action of Warning or Postponement. If the Commission had previously postponed a decision or placed the institution on Warning, the Commission may place the institution on Probation if it determines that the institution has failed to address satisfactorily the Commission's concerns in the prior action of postponement or warning regarding compliance with Commission standards. This action is accompanied by a request for a monitoring report, and a special visit follows. Probation may, but need not always, precede an action of Show Cause.

Suspend accreditation: Accreditation has been Continued for one year and an appropriate evaluation is not possible. This is a procedural action that would result in Removal of Accreditation if accreditation cannot be reaffirmed within the period of suspension.

Show cause why the institution's accreditation should not be removed: The institution is required to present its case for accreditation by means of a substantive report and/or an on-site evaluation. A "Public Disclosure Statement" is issued by the Commission.

Remove accreditation. If the institution appeals this action, its accreditation remains in effect until the appeal is completed.

Other actions are described in the Commission policy, "Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation."