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Introduction

The University of Puerto Rico

The University of Puerto Rico (the University), founded in 1903, is a state supported university system created by Law No. 1 of January 20, 1966, “Law of the University of Puerto Rico” (Act No. 1), as amended, with the mission to serve the people of Puerto Rico, pursue the ideals of a democratic society, and contribute to the development and enjoyment of the fundamental, ethical and esthetic values of Puerto Rican culture. To advance its mission, the University strives to provide high quality education and foster the growth of knowledge in the Arts, Sciences and Technology.

The University is a public corporation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and is governed by a thirteen-member Governing Board, of which nine members were appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico for a six-year term and confirmed by the Senate of Puerto Rico. The remaining members of the Governing Board serve for one year and consist of two tenured professors and two full-time students elected by their peers, one of which must be a graduate student. The Secretary of the Department of Education of the Commonwealth is an ex-officio member of the Governing Board.

The University is the largest institution of higher education in Puerto Rico. Commonwealth appropriations are the principal source of the University revenues, but additional revenues are derived from tuitions, federal grants, patient services, auxiliary enterprises, interest income, and other sources. The University is in good accreditation standing with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the regional accreditation entity of the eleven units that comprise the University of Puerto Rico system.

The University of Puerto Rico system oversees eleven campuses distributed throughout the Island: Río Piedras, Mayagüez, Medical Sciences, Cayey, Humacao, Ponce, Bayamón, Aguadilla, Arecibo, Carolina and Utuado. The Central Administration office is located in the San Juan area, in the Botanical Garden, which is also an integral part of the Institution.
The Río Piedras Campus

The University of Puerto Rico’s Río Piedras Campus (UPR-RP) is part of the University of Puerto Rico system—a multi-campus, state-supported institution of higher education licensed by the Puerto Rico Council on Higher Education. Founded in 1903, The UPR-RP is the oldest and most complex of the eleven units within the University system.

As a public research-oriented comprehensive doctoral institution, its academic offerings range from the bachelor to the doctoral degree, through 70 undergraduate and 39 graduate degree programs, including professional fields. Research activities are developed in a variety of centers and institutes, including the widely recognized Institute for Tropical Ecosystem Studies, which belongs to a global research network and conducts long-term environmental research on Caribbean Islands and similar tropical areas. Graduate offerings have grown to include fifteen doctorate degrees (twelve PhDs and three Doctorate degrees in Education). There are also forty-eight master degrees and international programs in Law, at both the LLM and JD levels. Over fifty academic programs are accredited by twelve different professional accrediting agencies. Moreover, our services, such as our library and counseling programs, also hold accreditation and/or certification by various organizations, including the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) of the American Library Association (ALA), and the International Association of Counseling Services (IACS), respectively. The UPR-RP Museum of History, Anthropology, and Arts has been accredited by the American Alliance of Museums (AAM). In fact, four additional professional accreditations were granted during the period covered by this report.
The student body of the UPR-RP’s Campus consists of almost 15,000 students, 20% of whom are graduate students, and represents the best academic profile in Puerto Rico with an increasing population of international students. The UPR-RP Campus grants an average of over 3,000 degrees a year, and from 2005 through 2011, the number of doctoral degrees conferred has increased. The campus has a diverse group of faculty members, whose academic degrees have been awarded by world-class universities. Our professors are distinguished with national prizes such as the 2010 "Andrew Gemant Award” awarded by the American Institute of Physics, and the “Dr. Etta Z. Falconer Award” for Mentoring and Commitment; and also with renowned international prizes such as the 2013 Premio Internacional Rómulo Gallegos in Hispanic Literature. The UPR-RP campus also houses artistic, documentary, cultural, environmental, and symbolic resources for teaching, research, creation, and enjoyment by the public.

Design of Self-Study

A self-study process is a wonderful opportunity to gather data that the University community can use to discuss and identify its strengths and needs. It can then be used to develop and project future needs and directions for the institution. This is to say that it can include important information for future planning documents. Moreover, it can help all constituents analyze data that can evidence different ways in which we meet our mission, including how well our students learn, the strengths and needs of our faculty, and the effectiveness of our curricular offerings and administrative organizational structure.

With these goals in mind, the Río Piedras Campus has begun to organize a self-study process as part of its decennial cycle of institutional accreditation. Although this initiative is part of the accreditation requirements of the Middle States Association, we are also well aware of the excellent opportunity this process provides for an enthusiastic improvement of the institution.
Model Selected

Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC)

The process to complete a decennial evaluation of the Rio Piedras campus began this semester when the Chancellor appointed the members of the self-study steering committee, as follows:

Committee Members:

1) Dr. Celeste E. Freytes González, Coordinator, College of Education
2) Dr. Aracelis Rodríguez Delgado, College of Humanities
3) Dr. María García Padilla, College of Education
4) Dr. Juan C. Alicea Rivera-Acting Associate Dean, College of Business Administration
5) Dr. Don Walicek Lindley, College of General Studies
6) Mr. Juan C. Silén, Student Representative, General Student Council

Also, two special advisers were designated to work with the steering committee. They have a wealth of expertise in higher education and from working with various campus and system level projects, and they actively participate in the self-study steering committee meetings. They are:

Dr. Pedro Subirats, Professor, College of Education

Mr. Luis M. Villaronga, Distinguished Professor, School of Law

Added to the list is the Dean of Academic Affairs of the Río Piedras Campus, Dr. Tania García, Professor, College of Social Sciences.

All the resources for the Self-Study Committee are located in this office. The Dean meets regularly with the Committee Coordinator and facilitates every resource needed for this project, and continuous communication is sustained with the Chancellor of the Río Piedras Campus.
We decided to maintain a smaller self-study committee that could meet regularly on account of the timeframe. Frequent meetings are important to establish and identify relevant and pressing issues related to the design of the self-study. In many of these meetings we achieved a 100% attendance, and a genuine esprit de corps was developed along with a better understanding of the self-study process.

The Coordinator, a professor from the School of Education who has previous experience in working with accreditation processes at the Río Piedras Campus, chairs this committee. She has also held different administrative positions at the campus level and within UPR’s system, which equips her with special knowledge of the institution from various perspectives. The other members of the committee are professors, administrators and students from different schools and colleges, such as the College of Business Administration, the College of Education, the College of Humanities, the College of General Studies, and the School of Law. The members have experience in working with campus initiatives and some have held different administrative positions at the campus level. The committee also includes a student who represents the General Student Council and a member from the clerical workers’ union (HEEND). At this time we are waiting for the worker’s union to substitute the person originally appointed. Each member of the committee is well known on campus and is enthusiastic about the opportunity to participate in this effort.

One of the first tasks of this group was to discuss their responsibilities as suggested in the Self Study Handbook of MSA. During the initial meetings, each of the self-study models presented by MSA was carefully reviewed and analyzed. The selection of the final model took into account the importance of integrating and analyzing the standards. The SSSC considered it important to encourage the discussion of differences and common areas of the standards.

Once all of the models proposed by MSA were reviewed, the SSSC selected the Comprehensive Model, with the Reordering of Standards. The Dean of Academic Affairs and the Chancellor discussed the information and approved the model, which was judged to be the best option for the Campus at this time for the following reasons:
First of all, ten years ago, during the last self-study process, the Río Piedras Campus selected the Comprehensive Report Model and viewed the institution from the perspective of each individual standard. However, on this present occasion, new and relevant information suggesting a more integrative perspective could be beneficial to this process.

Second, at the final stages, all the reports and information are frequently sent to an editor who, among other tasks, has the responsibility of integrating the content at this time. The option of grouping the standards gives each working group the opportunity of integrating the concepts and discussing the relationships between the standards they are working with, as well as with other standards.

Finally, when different standards are clustered, the members selected for each group are more diverse. The expertise and background of each member will enrich and facilitate the discussion of overarching themes in each working group. (See Figure 1. Design of the Self-Study of the Río Piedras Campus: Organization of the Working Groups.)
Figure 1 Design of the Self Study of the Río Piedras Campus: Organization of the working groups
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The standards were reordered according to the following working groups:

1. **Planning, Resources and Budget**
   - Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
   - Standard 3: Institutional Resources
   - Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

2. **Administrative Structure**
   - Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
   - Standard 5: Administration

3. **Academic Programs**
   - Standard 6: Integrity
   - Standard 10: Faculty
   - Standard 11: Educational Offerings

4. **Assessment of Student Learning**
   - Standard 12: General Education
   - Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

5. **Student Support and Faculty**
   - Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention
   - Standard 9: Student Support Services
   - Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
**Standard 1: Mission and goals.** The Mission and Goals standard was viewed as intrinsic to all of the Standards above. As such, it traverses all the standards and is integrated into each of the topics that the five working groups will be analyzing. Thus, compliance with the Mission and Goals standard can be best understood as expressed through the thematically organized clusters of standards. For this reason, it is represented in the upper section of the model and is common to all areas.
Working Groups

Each working group includes representation from professors, administrators and students from each of the colleges and schools. The Students Council provided student recommendations for each of the working groups and for the SSSC. (See Appendix A. Members Work Group.)

The working groups also include professors that have been at the institution for at least 10 to 15 years. These professors will participate in this campus–wide initiative for the first time. This criterion was very important since it provides a great opportunity for them to familiarize themselves with and learn about the content required to complete a self-study. In many ways, this will provide a sense of continuity towards the next MSCHE report.

Each working group includes a professor who can also participate as the editor in charge of the final report. This component is extremely important in order to minimize the amount of time dedicated to writing the report and produce a more precise document.

Finally, each group has a coordinator who will also meet with the self-study steering committee and the chair of the SSSC to request information or share concerns or questions.

Task for the Working Groups

The Self-Study Steering Committee discussed the task for the working groups and recommended that as representatives of the institution, they should participate in the process of identifying relevant questions for the institution to consider. One of the most important concerns is to ensure that the working groups are given a task that is relevant and useful for the institution. As such, they will be receiving documents and data to analyze, which will help prioritize the questions that should be developed.
All members of each working group were invited to meet with the Coordinator of the self-study steering committee prior to beginning work as a group. At this meeting, they received specific orientation concerning the design of the self-study that was selected and relevant content they should consider in this process. As part of that orientation process, all members were asked to review the standards and received a copy of the following MSCHE publications:

- Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education
- Designs for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study
- Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report, Second Edition

The SSSC coordinated a first meeting with all members of the working groups in April. The following information was presented and discussed:

I. **Review of the objectives of the self-study** and the importance of using the MSCHE publications to initiate discussion of the campus strengths and needs.

The commission's expectation for planning and assessment, with special emphases on the two fundamental questions, as suggested by MSCHE.

- Are we, as an institutional community, achieving what we want to achieve?
- What should we do to improve our effectiveness in achieving our fundamental aims?
II. General Discussion: How the groups will develop the questions, taking into account the following MSCHE recommendations:

A. Identify the key requirements of the standard that must be addressed in the self-study.

B. Once these key requirements have been identified, indicate the relationship of each one with our institution, taking into account our mission statement.

C. Establish the relationship between the institutional mission and plan and subsequently, to these key requirements. The groups are expected to recognize the current assessment activities that the Campus has in place and analyze how this assessment data or information can be used to improve the institution.

D. Consider other factors relevant to this initial discussion.

III. Process to formulate the Campus questions

A. Criteria. As proposed by the MSCHE Self-Study handbook, the following criteria were shared with the working groups for their consideration in the process of constructing the questions:

1) Can the questions stimulate thinking and analyses of how the key requirements are related to improvement of the Campus?

2) Is there a clear relationship between the standards, key requirements, specific institutional mission and objective, and issues that can strengthen the self-study?

3) Do the questions require evaluation and judgment?

4) Are the questions relevant issues that can be answered within the timetable of the self-study questions?

5) Is there a clear relationship that can be established between the standards and different dimensions of the institution at this time?
B. **Content.** Once the standards are considered, each working group should also take into account elements, issues, and data relevant to the topic they are working with. Some examples of these elements and issues are as follows:

1) Budget and financial challenges of all institutions of higher education.
2) The status of the planning document Vision University 2016 that ends in 2016, and the need for a new strategic plan for the Campus.
3) The need to initiate the process for a new system strategic plan—Ten for the Decade—that also ends during the year 2016.
4) Some committees will require specific information about the data used to evaluate the effectiveness of Vision University 2016, which includes two operational plans.
5) Certification approved by the Board of Governors related to future periodic adjustments for tuition rates.
6) Transition process for the selection of a new chancellor.
7) Impact of the recently appointed Board of Governors; recent law that establishes this change.
8) The appointment of a new Chancellor and all acting deans.
9) The data and documents that are part of the licensing requirements, an initiative that we are currently working with.
10) Information related to institution and student learning assessment.
11) Other issues.

Additionally, we have identified many documents, reports and data that the working group may use as reference or to gather data. These documents are organized according to the different groups and standards. (See Appendix B. Data, information, and documents for the working groups).
IV. Meetings

At the initial meeting between the SSSC and all the working groups, specific information about the task they have to complete was presented. All of the working group members have received information about the self-study design and the importance of reviewing the standards. They have also received a copy of the Characteristics of Excellence to guide the review of the information and the standards that they have been assigned. Other information presented includes some of the data available at the institution, the timetable, and the report format. The committees met during the second part of the meeting as a group to identify their meeting schedule, at which time they also selected a coordinator.

Next, the SSSC Coordinator will meet individually with each of the committees to answer questions, ensure that they are addressing the required information, and identify any resource, data, or report that they might need.

As a follow-up activity, the SSSC will conduct individual meetings with each of the working groups every other week to exchange information about their impressions of the contents they are discussing.

The SSSC Coordinator will meet with the working group coordinators to answer questions, ensure that they are addressing the required information, and identify any resources, data or reports that they might need.

These frequent meetings between the self-study steering committee and the working groups will establish continuous communication and help identify and work with any problem that might affect the completion of the report. It can also help to ensure that all groups are clear about the content and issues they should be addressing.
Self-study Research Questions

The process to prepare the self-study research questions included the active participation of both the self-study steering committee and the working groups. The steering committee carefully reviewed each of the standards and criteria proposed by the Commission to prepare research questions.

The steering committee then met with all the working groups to share and discuss this information. In this meeting, the SSSC suggested that the groups consider developing different types of questions, such as compliance, assessment, and improvement questions. They also noted that the objective was not to generate a large number of questions, but to ensure that the questions would encourage thinking and improve the academic agenda of the institution. They also emphasized the importance of the standards.

After this general meeting the working groups met individually to examine and review the questions, and to develop or identify those that could be used as part of their working agenda.

These questions provided a good starting point for concurrence on some of the most important issues for the Río Piedras Campus.

It was evident that the content of some standards overlap. For example, Standards 11 and 12 both have sections related to student learning assessment. In this case, Group 4, which is in charge of Student Assessment, will be responsible for this content. On the other hand, Group 3, Academic Programs, will include the information of Standard 12, which is related to academia.

The following section includes the questions proposed by each of the committees.
GROUP 1. PLANNING, RESOURCES AND BUDGET
(Standards: 2, 3 & 7)

Committee Members:

1) **Planner Annette De León Lozada**, Coordinator, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting
2) Dr. Carmen M. Concepción Rodríguez, Acting Director, Graduate School of Planning
3) Dr. Noel Motta Cruz, Academic Affairs Coordinator and Academic Advisor, Chemistry Department, College of Natural Sciences
4) Ms. Zulyn Rodríguez Reyes, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting
5) Ms. Rosa Marta Alers Ramos, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting
6) Dr. Waldemiro Vélez Cardona, College of General Studies
7) Ms. Andrea R. Iguina Pérez, General Student Council
8) Mr. Carlos M. Cruz Torres, Acting Director, Office of Finance

**Introduction**

Working Group 1 revised the preliminary MSA questions designed by the Self-Study Steering Committee. The questions were evaluated in terms of their contribution to stimulate and provide a more accurate understanding of our institution’s strengths and areas for improvement. As part of our tasks, we modified and elaborated a series of compliance, assessment and improvement questions for each standard. The three standards were worked as an integrated topic to avoid redundancy as the questions were generated. Some main research questions are divided into one or more subquestions that will guide our research and analysis.
STANDARD 2. PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Questions

1. How well is the Río Piedras Campus achieving its goals as stated in the Strategic Plan Vision University 2016? What results have been achieved in the light of the campus’ mission and vision? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-1] (C/A/I)
   a. How has the planning process been linked with daily academic needs regarding teaching, research and provision of services?
   b. What decisions have been taken in the implementation of the Strategic Plan Vision University 2016, due to the current fiscal situation?

2. What is the relationship between the determination of strategic priorities, the planning process, and the budget allocation in compliance with the institution’s mission and goals? (C/A)
   a. How does the Institution ensure the proper allocation of its resources in order to meet faculty and departmental needs according to the academic priorities? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-2]

3. What best practice models and benchmarks are used for the ongoing improvement of our plans (strategic/operational), considering the strengths of our institution? (A)

4. How well articulated are the planning and academic processes such as academic development, faculty recruitment, student outcome learning assessment, technology, and physical installations? (A)

5. What are the recommendations in the face of current challenges for the effectiveness of the Campus planning process and the design of a new Strategic Plan that should initiate by 2016? (I)
STANDARD 3. INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

The human, financial, technical, physical, and other resources necessary to achieve and institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

1. How have the institutional resources of the Río Piedras Campus facilitated the achievement of our mission and goals? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-1] (C/A)

2. What evidence exists that specific initiatives or actions have been developed to ensure that the institutional resources are used in an efficient way? (C)

3. How has the institution faced or dealt with the impacts of employee retirement and fiscal restraints? In lieu of resources reductions, which strategies has the institution implemented to maintain its level of service? (C/A/I)
   a. How has the budget been reorganized to deal with fund reductions and continue fulfilling the campus’ mission and goals?
   b. How can the institution achieve its goals and objectives when challenged with the reality of reduced human, technical, and financial resources?
   c. What strategies have been implemented to acquire funds and reduce costs?

4. How adequate is the deployment of human and financial resources, as well as infrastructure and facilities for the achievement of our institutional and student learning outcomes assessment? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-7 & S-14] (A)

5. What decisions should be made to improve or modify the institutional resources to ensure that they are efficient and achievable within the current financial structure of the institution? (I)
   a. Due to challenges imposed by diverse reasons, what management model that has been applied in one or more institutions similar to ours can be used to improve the efficient and effective use of our institutional resources?

6. What changes can be made to expedite the allocation and use of funds? (I)

7. How does the Institution’s professional development program improve its administrative staff performance? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-2 & S-5] (I)
STANDARD 7. INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

1. To what extent is the campus institutional assessment a continuous, participative, and integrated process? (C/A)
   
   a. To what extent has institutional assessment been adopted as part of the Campus culture?

2. How do campus administration and management processes promote transparency, active participation, and accountability? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-6] (C/A)

3. To what extent does the institutional data collection and reporting on our Campus facilitate the assessment of institutional effectiveness? (A/C)

4. How are institutional assessment findings used to accomplish students’ success, improve programs and services, and assist in planning and budgeting? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-9 & S-14] (A/C)

   a. In what ways have the results of institutional assessment been used to improve the planning process and institutional renewal? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-2]

5. What are the three major challenges that the Campus faces regarding its institutional assessment processes? (I)

   a. If the institutional assessment process is not having the desired impact or does not translate its results into continuous improvement, how can this process be restructured to achieve more adaptive actions?

6. How should the Campus strategic plan foster research activities, student satisfaction, administrative practices, and faculty development? [Relationship to Other Standards: S-9 & S-10] (I)
GROUP 2. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE  
(Standards: 4 & 5)

Committee members:

1) **Dr. Aurora Lauzardo Ugarte**, Coordinator, Acting Dean, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
2) Dr. Richard Blanco-Peck, Graduate School of Public Administration
3) Mr. Jesús M. Flores, General Student Council
4) Mr. Walter Alomar Jiménez, Esq., School of Law
5) Dr. Juanita Rodríguez Marrero, College of Business Administration
6) Dr. Luz Miriam Tirado Torres, English Department, College of General Studies
7) Dr. Jimmy Torres Rodríguez, Acting Director, School of Communication

**Introduction**

The Administrative Structure Committee reviewed the questions for Standard 4. Leadership and Governance and Standard 5. Administration. We will begin writing the report using these questions. We met and are already identifying the sources to answer the questions. It is possible that in the process of answering them we make some adjustments.
STANDARD 4. LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

1. To what extent do the structures and procedures followed in day-to-day governance maintain consistency or correctly reflect the provisions of written governing documents? (A/C)

2. To what extent are the particular roles and responsibilities of each group within arenas of shared governance understood and accepted by those involved, and/or by the different governing bodies of the institution, including the Governing Board? (A)

3. How effectively do the institution’s leadership and processes of governance facilitate the fulfillment of its mission and the accomplishment of its goals? (C)

4. Do the institution’s organization, administration, and governance facilitate teaching, enable and encourage research, and expedite service? And how do they foster institutional improvement within a framework of academic freedom? (C/ Relationship to Other Standards)

5. What might improve institutional governance in such a way as to enhance the institution’s capability of fulfilling its mission and reaching its objectives? (I)

6. In what ways and for what reasons have the institution’s governance systems changed since the last accreditation process? What has been the impact of these changes? (A)

7. To what extent are the institution’s policies, rules, and regulations, including written policies outlining governance responsibilities of administration and faculty, adequately disseminated, readily available, and effectively discussed with the campus community? (A)

8. How consistently does the institution ensure appropriate opportunities for student, faculty, and staff input regarding decisions that affect them? Do the institution’s governance structures, procedures, and practices effectively ensure the reasonable and serious consideration of student input in decision-making? (C)
STANDARD 5. ADMINISTRATION

The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution’s organization and governance.

1. To what extent do the institution’s administrative structure, services, and operations facilitate learning and research/scholarship? (C)

2. Do the academic background, skills, and professional training of academic leaders enable the institution to attain its mission and goals? (C)

3. In what ways and for what reasons have staffing patterns and reporting lines been changed since the last accreditation process? Have the changes proven to be appropriate and/or effective to advance the institution’s fulfillment of its mission and provision of the needed support services? (Relevant Institutional Issues)

4. To what extent does the institution undertake regular reviews of the effectiveness of administrative structures and processes? Are the bases on which the institution makes changes to its administrative structures and procedures effective for reaching its goals? (C)

5. Would it be fair to state that the institution’s systems provide decision-makers with adequate information and decision-making systems to support the work of the administrative leaders?

6. How does the institution gather and make the information needed to make decisions that will impact the fulfillment of its mission readily accessible for all stakeholders? (A)
Committee Members:

1) **Mr. Javier Isado Vigil**, Coordinator, Architect, School of Architecture
2) Dr. Clarisa Cruz Lugo, College of General Studies
3) Ms. Erika Morales, Student Representative, General Student Council
4) Dr. Migdalisel Colón Berlingeri, College of Natural Sciences
5) Dr. Noemí Cintrón Carrasquillo, College of Natural Sciences
6) Dr. Eunice Pérez Medina, Center for Academic Excellence
7) Prof. Marisol Gutiérrez, Library System
8) Dr. Ketty Rodríguez, Library System

**Introduction**

The Committee began writing the research questions at the meeting held on April 30, 2014 (the product of our efforts that day includes the tables in this document). We agreed to continue working on the project and share it with the group via email.

During the process of generating the research questions, we followed one of the key questions that MSCHE proposes for the self-study project: As an institutional community, are we achieving our University’s mission? After identifying the key requirements of Standards 6, 10, and 11, we identified their corresponding Campus Goals. The institutional processes that seek to comply with the various areas of the Campus’ mission that focus on the faculty, standards of integrity, and academic programs will be evaluated.
Various members of the group wrote questions that were used to create a work document that was sent via email and revised by members of the committee. Several of the questions were taken from MSCHE’s Self-Study documents and were later modified. Many of the questions are compliance questions. Our reasoning was that as we answered them, they would direct us to the assessment and then the improvement questions. We also attempted to establish a hierarchy of questions. The compliance, assessment, and improvement questions are the research questions from which more specific questions are derived that will help us identify quality indicators within the evaluation process. In order to formulate the investigation questions, we took into account the goals of the mission of the UPR, so that they all directly or indirectly relate to Standard 1. The following is our work document.

STANDARD 6. INTEGRITY

In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

1. How do the institutional policies that establish or define provide support for the production and dissemination of knowledge? (C)

2. How does the institution demonstrate that it adheres to ethical standards in its policies, programs, and activities? In what way do these policies and practices support academic and intellectual freedom? (C)

   a. How are the students and employees informed about policies, procedures, and regulations that are important for student life and how effective do these appear to be? How do they foster a climate that engages academic and intellectual freedom?

3. How effective are the institution’s efforts to evaluate its ethical practice, including academic and intellectual freedom? (A)

4. What must the institution do to strengthen their ethical practices? (I)

5. What are the institution’s own stated policies and ethical standards? How does it demonstrate that its academic, administrative and research processes are based on ethical standards? (C)
6. How effectively has the institution educated people concerning these ethical standards? How effective have the institutions efforts been to evaluate its ethical practices and institutional activities? (A)

7. What must be done to strengthen the academic activities that will help achieve the highest standards of integrity? (I)

8. In what way do the contents of the catalog present the institution’s commitment to its curriculum? (C)
Related questions:

1. How are the students and employees informed about policies, procedures and regulations that are important for student life and how effective do these appear to be? How do they foster a climate that engages academic and intellectual freedom?
2. How does the institution support creative production and the acquisition of knowledge? (For example: TARE, mini-sabbaticals, sabbaticals, etc.) How effective are these efforts?
3. What assurance does the institution give that it knows the policies related to academic and intellectual freedom?
4. How does the UPR-RP ensure that intellectual and academic freedom are protected and that do not infringe upon the need to maintain rigor and academic excellence?
5. How does the institution support the dissemination of knowledge? (For example: pecuniary support for the institution’s journals, various publications, conventions, professional meetings, etc.) *(Related to Standard 10)*
6. How do they foster a climate that both protects and engages academic and intellectual freedom?
7. What protocols deal with cases in which there has been a lack of integrity in academic, administrative, and research tasks?
   - How conflicts are promptly and adequately resolved?
   - Who determines whether the conflict resolution practices are adequate?
   - In the case of conflict of interest, how can it be avoided or resolved?
   - How is intellectual property defined, and how does the Campus protect intellectual property rights? How is this information communicated to the University community? How does the Campus? How does the Campus know whether its community believes the intellectual property is being managed fairly?
   - How can the Campus ensure its integrity when dealing with advertisements, recruitment, and admissions?
8. Based on reported cases of academic or research misconduct, how effective are the institutional policies on ethics and integrity?

STANDARD 10. FACULTY

The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

1. How does the institution determine whether the personnel it hires are suitable for furthering the Campus’ mission? (C)
2. How can the recruitment process be strengthened and implemented effectively? (I)
3. How does data on academic programs impact the effectiveness of the recruitment plans of the academic units? (A)
4. How does faculty contribute to the development, improvement and assessment of the academic programs? (C)
5. How effectively does each institutional unit promote the participation of faculty in curriculum development and personnel committees? How well do programs address the academic and service responsibilities of the faculty? (A)
6. How does the Campus promote the international presence of faculty as well as collaboration with academic and professional resources that will contribute to develop the University’s international academic perspective? (C)
7. To what extent does the UPR-RP promote collaboration to develop an international academic perspective? (A)
8. What activities or initiatives can help develop a stronger international academic profile? (I)
9. How does the Campus provide institutional support to strengthen academic and teaching and research?
10. How effectively does our institution promote and support research?

Questions related to other standards:

Standard 1 y 10

- Does each unit on campus have a recruitment plan? Is this recruitment plan based on the strategic plan of each department? Does it respond directly to the institution’s mission?
Standard 10 y 11

- How is the curriculum designed and revised to ensure an excellent offering that includes cooperation and support between colleges, the Academic Senate, and the Dean of Academic Affairs?

STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

1. Are the educational programs congruent with the mission? (C)
2. What evidence demonstrates that the institution’s educational offerings have the academic content and rigor required for the degree level(s)? Does the graduate and professional curricula provide for the development of research and independent thinking on the advanced level? (C)
3. How does periodical evaluation strengthen the co- and extra-curricular programs and experiences? How are the results used to allow students to manage their own academic progress? (C)
4. Does each department-program evaluate the curricular sequence, ongoing offerings, and proposals for new offerings? What major decision has been made in the past three years to improve offerings? (A)
5. To what extent are the learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional library staff adequate to support the institution’s educational programs? (A)
6. How are the learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional staff evaluated to ensure they are current and continuously updated? (A)
7. How can the excellence and pertinence of the academic programs be strengthened? (I)
   a. How do the graduate program curricula make provision for the development of research and independent thought?
   b. How do the graduate programs develop knowledge of and experience with research methods?
c. How are students (both graduate and undergraduate) shown to be capable of thinking independently?

d. What ensures that graduate program applicants know how to evaluate their abilities?

e. How is the valuation of student learning and graduate programs carried out relative to the objectives and goals of the graduate program? How these results are used to improve student learning and program effectiveness?

8. How does the Campus attend to the diversity of students with special needs, including technological assistance? (C)

   a. How adequate are the Campus’ information resources?
   b. How does the library personnel participate in supporting and promoting information competencies that are relevant to the curriculum?
   c. How does the UPR-RP ensure that classroom, hybrid, and online courses maintain the same level of rigor, content, and quality?
   d. How are the course credit equivalencies from other local, national, or international institutions established?

9. How effectively do the academic tasks contribute to the country’s needs, interdisciplinary work, and the growth of the disciplines? And to sustainable development? (A)

10. How can the Campus effectively develop its service and collaboration links with its graduates and with various sectors of the community? (C)

11. How effectively has it managed to strengthened these links? (A)

12. How do recent changes to the Student Manual ensure academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission? How has the institution responded to concerns about grade inflation?

13. What decisions, policies and procedures are effective in establishing and communicating criteria for recognition of degrees, such as transfer credit?
STANDARD 12. GENERAL EDUCATION

The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

1. How do general education requirement courses promote values, ethics and diverse perspective?
2. How effectively are general education requirements and academic program requirements linked and integrated?
3. What recommendations should the institution consider to improve the general education component?
GROUP 4. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING
(Standards: 12, 14 and Standard 11 components related to Assessment)

Committee members:

1) Dr. Julio Rodríguez Torres, Coordinator, College of Education
2) Prof. Nadia Cordero Antuñano, Associate Dean, College of Natural Sciences
3) Dr. Wanda Velázquez Rosado, College of Business Administration
4) Dr. Vanessa Irizarry Muñoz, College of General Studies
5) Dr. María Ojeda O’Neill, College of Education
6) Mr. John Ramírez Leiton, Office of Assessment and Student Learning
7) Dr. Carmen Haydee Rivera Vega, Associated Dean, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
8) Ms. Karla Sanabria Véaz, Student Representative, General Student Council
9) Ms. Chamary Fuentes, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Introduction

After the steering committee established the working groups and facilitated the initial meeting between the members of the various committees, the Committee of Assessment of Student Learning outlined a work plan with the primary objective of writing the research questions aimed to examine the aspects related to student learning at the Río Piedras Campus.

The steering committee suggested dividing the Standards of Accreditation among the working groups. The Committee of Assessment of Student Learning was assigned Standard 14 in its entirety, along with the elements related to the Assessment of Student Learning from Standards 11 and 12.
With this assignment in mind, the Assessment of Student Learning working group held its first meeting on Tuesday, April 22, during which the members reviewed Standards 11, 12, and 14, and determined the fundamental areas in which the research questions would be conducted. They also reviewed the Campus’ Mission in order to take it into account when carrying out the assignment. The final product of this meeting was the identification of the fundamental elements of the Standards and the key components of the Institutional Mission.

In the following meetings, held on Monday, April 28, and Monday, May 5, 2014, respectively, the members developed the research questions, which were focused on three areas: compliance, assessment, and improvement. The resulting research questions were reviewed in light of the work completed in the first meeting to ensure that they comprehended the areas related to student learning. The final version of the questions was turned in to the steering committee on Friday, May 9, 2014, by means of the Committee Coordinator. The questions were divided according to the Standards and the categories of compliance, assessment, and improvement.

STANDARD 11. EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Compliance

1. How are the following points for the educational offerings in the academic programs evidenced?

   • Time and information to learn and practice the knowledge, skills, and abilities imparted by the academic program.
   • Clarity in the proposal of the objectives and strategies to evaluate the students’ progress. Are they outlined in the syllabus? In the program’s assessment plan?
   • Opportunities for the student to become actively involved in the learning—in what type of activities?
   • Opportunities for collaborative learning and working as a group in a learning task.
• Knowledge of the program’s learning objectives, of the courses, and of the institution. How are they expected to achieve these objectives to demonstrate what they have learned?

• Local or extramural structures or technology that support the programs’ curricula. What are they? And how effective are they?

• Incorporate investigation competency skills in the syllabus and the curriculum. Are the expectations of how the student should demonstrate he has acquired these skills described?

Assessment

2. What is the state and result of the Campus’ Assessment Plan for Student Learning in terms of:

   • Assessment cycles performed
   • Number of programs involved
   • Number of fields evaluated (and frequency)
   • Use of multiple measures in multiple instances
   • Number of professors involved in the assessment
   • Evidence of improvement of the process in general
   • Evidence of improvement of learning in the program

3. How effective are the curriculum committees in terms of ensuring that the curricula and the graduate and undergraduate courses reflect content that is appropriate, coherent, and displays the necessary academic rigor for the corresponding level?

Improvement

4. How are the evaluation results used to modify and improve the academic offerings and the curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences?

5. How does the institution provide the necessary support and economic resources for the evaluation process, in order to improve the academic offerings of the Campus’ programs?
STANDARD 12. GENERAL EDUCATION

The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

a. What evidence exists that the curricula are designed for students?

b. What evidence exists that the graduates meet the institution’s expected level of competency?

Related questions

1. To what extent does general education incorporate the study of values, ethics, and diversity consistent with the institution’s mission?

2. What resources (including learning, facilities, services, and competent personnel) exist to facilitate the learning and evaluation of the information competencies within the academic programs?

   a. Is collaboration evident among the professional library personnel, the administrators, and the faculty that promotes and supports the information competencies throughout the curriculum?

3. What should be done to ensure that upon graduation, the student fulfills the necessary criteria for general education expressed in the Graduate Profile and what measures are taken to strengthen areas that are weak?

STANDARD 14. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

1. How concordant are the learning objectives, the evaluation instruments, and the expected achievements that were established, with the graduate profile expectations for the evaluated fields? (C)
2. To what extent did the student learning assessment process use or include (incorporate) the following: (C)
   a. Multiple measures (various educational activities)
   b. Multiple instances (times it was measured)
   c. Valuation for the criteria for establishing pertinent transforming actions
   d. Valid evaluation instruments
   e. Incorporates or implements and values the proposed transforming actions in the next assessment cycle
   f. Incorporates direct or indirect measures in the valuation its program’s student learning (E.g., surveys for former students, exit interviews)

3. What impact has the student learning assessment had on the graduation and retention appraisals? (C)

4. How does the academic management of the School, College or Campus show it collaborates, supports, or promotes the student learning assessment process (policies, circular letters, structures, administrative and economic support, professional development, increase in the number of professors involved in the student learning assessment process)? (C)

5. How does the Campus’ student learning assessment project demonstrate that it provides valid, reliable information? (A)

6. To what extent have the proposed transforming actions impacted the students’ learning in the programs? (A)

7. How appropriate and effective have the activities developed by the OEAE been in the processes of student learning evaluations, such as (1) writing and identifying the learning objectives related to a given field (2) writing the valuation instruments (3) data analysis support (4) other? (A)

8. What are the appropriate structures and incentives that will effectively sustain a university-wide commitment to a culture of assessment linked to planning and improvement? (I)

9. How can we improve the systems for the access to and dissemination of information of the learning assessment? (I)
Group 5. STUDENT SUPPORT
(Standards: 8, 9 & 13)

Committee members:

1) **Dr. Mirerza González Vélez**, Coordinator, Director, English Department, College of Humanities
2) Dr. José Rodríguez Vicenti, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
3) Dr. Mayra Chárriez Cordero-Acting Dean, Office of the Dean of Students
4) Dr. Ángel Villafañe Santiago, Associate Dean, Office of the Dean of Students
5) Dr. Sunny Cabrera Salcedo, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and Orientation, College of Humanities
6) Dr. Marissa Medina Piña, Counseling Department for Student Development
7) Mrs. Cruz B. Valentín Arbelo, Director, Admissions Office
8) Mrs. María de los Ángeles Castro Mercado, Admissions Office
9) Mr. Marcos Verdejo Calderón, Student Representative, General Student Council

**Introduction**

The members of the committee met twice to discuss the fundamental elements of Standards 8, 9 and 13 as identified by MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence. The members decided to organize two working groups to write questions on issues of compliance, assessment and improvement per standard. A member of the committee prepared questions related to Standard 13.

In a third meeting, the committee identified and suggested four questions out of the ones developed by the working groups. One of the questions integrated issues related to the UPR-RP’s mission statement. A shared concern expressed during working sessions is the absence in the UPR-RP’s mission statement of direct references to student support services.

Suggested questions to the steering committee are presented below.
STANDARD 8. STUDENT ADMISSION RETENTION

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students’ educational goals.

1. How do student recruitment processes comply with the envisioned alumni profile? (C)
2. How is institutional effectiveness linked to recruitment efforts? (A)
3. To what extent is the general admission index (i.e. IGS) the best criteria for student admissions? (I)
4. How accurate is data collected from available information on student admissions, retention, and time to degree? (I)

Related to Standard 1

1. How do student admission and recruitment processes align with the UPR-RP’s institutional mission and goals?

STANDARD 9. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution’s goals for students

1. How do the student support services comply with the UPR-RP’s mission? (C)
2. What assessment processes are used to measure the effectiveness of the UPR-RP’s student support services? (A)
3. To what extent do governance issues impact the UPR-RP’s student support services? (I)

Related to Standard 1

1. How does the UPR-RP’s institutional mission promote the development of an academic and administrative culture based on student support services?
STANDARD 13. RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The institution’s programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

1. How well is the UPR-RP sharing with students the institutional and academic policies that regulate the awarding of credit for experimental learning experiences? (C)
2. How effectively have related educational activities developed in the last 10 years, particularly online learning? (A)
3. To what extent are the UPR-RP’s academic policies and institutional processes allowing remedial or pre-college level courses that do not provide academic degree credit? (I)

Related to Standard 1

1. How have related educational activities promoted the achievement of the UPR-RP’s educational goals?

Related questions

The following questions include all those proposed by committee members during the working sessions for Standards 8, 9 & 13. As other committees generate questions related to their standards, they may overlap with the Student Support Services questions.

Related questions for Standard 8

1. To what extent are the UPR-RP’s admissions and retention policies shared with prospective students?
2. To what extent is institutional effectiveness linked to recruitment efforts? (This question may be submitted for Standard 1)
3. How can the institution enhance the recruitment of students who fit the envisioned alumni profile?
4. How do student admission and recruitment processes align with the UPR-RP’s institutional mission? (This question may be submitted for Standard 1)
5. To what extent is available information on students’ admission, retention, and attrition used to assess institutional effectiveness? (This question can be submitted to the committee responsible for Standard 7)

6. How are the UPR-RP’s educational objectives guiding recruitment efforts? (This question can be submitted to the committee responsible for Standard 11)

7. How accurate is the data collected from available information on admissions, retention, and time to degree?

Related questions for Standard 9

1. What support services does the UPR-RP have that are related to the institutional mission? (Indicators: description of services, circular material, etc.)

2. How does the University offer student support services while taking the institutional mission into consideration?

3. How do the services that each area offers contribute to the institution’s effort to improve academic excellence?

4. Are the student support services integrated in order to facilitate their effectiveness?

5. Do the Campus’ complaint procedures offer sufficient protection for students and their families, faculty, and others involved?

6. To what extent do the student support services contribute to attaining the students’ academic, social, and personal goals in accordance with the institutional mission (retention, student graduation rate, and time to degree)?

7. Are these support services being offered by qualified personnel, whose credentials and experience enable them to provide high-quality student services?

8. What evaluation processes are being used to measure the effectiveness of the student support services?

9. How do the programs and services provide students with opportunities to get involved in curricular activities?

10. How does the institution inform the faculty, personnel, and the students’ relatives of its policies and procedures that regulate the students’ confidential information?
11. According to the institutional mission, which student support services should be improved, expanded, eliminated, added, or implemented in the various programs and departments? (E.g.: registration system, room and board, financial aid, retention processes, special needs services, international and exchange student services, cultural offerings, etc.)

12. What designs or plans of actions will be used to improve or implement support service programs that follow the institutional mission?

13. Are our institutional policies effectively addressing student needs?

14. How effectively has the UPR-RP addressed problems expressed by students regarding student support services?

15. Have the offices that provide student support services on our campus implemented assessment instruments to measure self-efficiency and self-effectiveness?

16. To what extent is the UPR-RP sensitive to its students’ needs?

17. Is the efficiency and effectiveness of our student support services promoted by the governance?

The members of the committee also suggest using the five questions proposed for Standard 9 by the steering committee. Page six of the document title “MSA Questions for the Working Groups” contains these questions, which are:

1. How will the implementation of a new student system benefit the students?
2. How will the educational material from the Office of the Dean of Students help to promote admission requirements and student services?
3. To what extent do professional services meet the students’ most urgent needs and enable them to achieve their academic goals?
4. How can the institutional valuation processes generate effective strategies for improving student services?
5. How does the student learning valuation help student retention?
Pool selection of questions that integrates standard 1 to standards, 8, 9 &13:

1. Is student support considered in our mission?
2. How can components of student support be incorporated into the UPR-RP’s mission?
3. Should our mission clearly state the necessity to promote an academic and administrative culture based on student support services and related educational activities?
Report format

A common report format will ensure that the SSSC can complete a first draft of the report in the specified time projected. Considering similar activities that have been conducted on campus, we are well aware of the time that it takes to prepare a general report. It is for this reason that an editor or translator will be identified during the following weeks for each of the working groups and the SSSC. The translators or editors will actively participate in conversations about the common format and will be knowledgeable about the priorities and content expressed by committee members. We understand that this will ensure that the information is more clearly integrated and precise. (See Appendix C. Working Group Report Format)

Timetable

The Timetable will be reviewed with the new Chancellor, who should be designated by the month of June. At this time, the new Chancellor may decide to continue with the established schedule, which designates March 2016, as the month for the MSCHE evaluation committee visit. (See Appendix D for the timetable.)

We are well aware that the ample and active participation of the entire academic community is important. Yet, considering the complexity of the campus and the fact that the appointment of a new chancellor is pending, we decided to include the participation of all the Schools and Colleges during the second semester of 2014-2015.
The visual representation in Figure 2 presents the complete process of the self-study design of the Río Piedras Campus. The first section of the figure includes the organization of the working groups, which we have previously discussed. Each group is expected to hand in a report of their findings during September or October. The reports will be used to develop a first draft of the self-study report. Public hearings will then be held for the University community to share their observations of the draft. Once their concerns or observations are considered, a report will be developed and distributed to each of the Colleges and Schools, giving them the opportunity to discuss the report and share their concerns. This will probably be the longest timeframe dedicated to the self-study, which is why more time will be assigned for this conversation. It could well take up to one semester.

The process that will be used to discuss the report will be determined by the dean of each unit (See Appendix D. Deans of Colleges and Directors of Schools).

Once all of the reports are received from the units, a final draft of the report will be prepared for the commission. We have also incorporated some time to hold a second and final public hearing session.
Figure 2 Design of the Self Study of the Rio Piedras Campus: A view of the complete process
As we explained previously, the working groups will analyze and consider relevant information and data, as well as the standards and content required by MSCHE and prepare an agenda for the Campus community. Once the report of each individual working group is received, the SSSC will prepare a document that brings together all the information presented by these committees. This document will be used for public hearings and the recommendations received from this process will be incorporated into a second document. A second document will be prepared with specific tasks and questions and will be distributed to each of the units. This phase is expected to take three to four months.

The documents sent to the units will have a specific format that allows the information to easily be compared and that facilitates the preparation of the final document to be sent to MSCHE. This document should be shared with the academic community, whose observations and recommendations will be subsequently incorporated.

The SSSC has also discussed different ways to engage other special groups in this process. As the different activities continue, a system will be developed to engage the following three additional groups:

- External community
- Academic Senate
- Campus alumni

During the following weeks, we will discuss the different ways to incorporate these three groups in this process.

**Recommendations to MSCHE peer evaluating committee**

We recommend the following criteria for selection of the president and members of the evaluation committee:
In other similar situations, we have had positive experiences working with evaluation committee members that come from other institutions in the U.S. that are similar to the Río Piedras Campus. We recommend that the president and evaluation committee member be selected from U.S. institutions of higher education that meet these criteria.

We also recommend that a certain number of the members be familiar with the Hispanic culture and be able to speak Spanish.
Appendix A
Members of the working groups

Self-Study Steering Committee

Committee Members:

1) **Dr. Celeste E. Freytes González**, Coordinator, College of Education
2) Dr. Aracelis Rodríguez Delgado, College of Humanities
3) Dr. María García Padilla, College of Education
4) Dr. Juan C. Alicea Rivera, Acting Associate Dean, College of Business Administration
5) Dr. Don Walicek Lindley, College of General Studies
6) Mr. Juan C. Silén, Student Representative, General Student Council

Group 1. Planning, Resources and Budget

Committee Members:

1) **Planner Annette De León Lozada**, Coordinator, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting
2) Dr. Carmen M. Concepción Rodríguez, Acting Director, Graduate School of Planning
3) Dr. Noel Motta Cruz, Academic Affairs Coordinator and Academic Advisor, Chemistry Department, College of Natural Sciences
4) Ms. Zulyn Rodríguez Reyes, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting
5) Ms. Rosa Marta Alers Ramos, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting
6) Dr. Waldemiro Vélez Cardona, College of General Studies
7) Ms. Andrea R. Iguina Pérez, Student Representative, General Student Council
8) Mr. Carlos M. Cruz Torres, Acting Director, Office of Finance
Group 2. Administrative Structure

Committee Members:

1) **Dr. Aurora Lauzardo Ugarte**, Coordinator, Acting Dean, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
2) Dr. Richard Blanco-Peck, Graduate School of Public Administration
3) Mr. Jesús M. Flores, Student Representative, General Student Council
4) Mr. Walter Alomar Jiménez, Esq., School of Law
5) Dr. Juanita Rodríguez Marrero, College of Business Administration
6) Dr. Luz Miriam Tirado Torres, English Department, College of General Studies
7) Dr. Jimmy Torres Rodríguez, Acting Director, School of Communication

Group 3. Academic Programs

Committee Members:

1) **Mr. Javier Isado Vigil**, Coordinator, Architect, School of Architecture
2) Dr. Clarisa Cruz Lugo, College of General Studies
3) Ms. Erika Morales, Student Representative, General Student Council
4) Dr. Migdalisel Colón Berlingeri, College of Natural Sciences
5) Dr. Noemí Cintrón Carrasquillo, College of Natural Sciences
6) Dr. Eunice Pérez Medina, Center for Academic Excellence
7) Prof. Marisol Gutiérrez, Library System
8) Dr. Ketty Rodríguez Casillas, Library System
Group 4. Assessment of Student Learning

Committee Members:

1) **Dr. Julio Rodríguez Torres**, Coordinator, College of Education
2) Prof. Nadia Cordero Antuñano, Associate Dean, College of Natural Sciences
3) Dr. Wanda Velázquez Rosado, College of Business Administration
4) Dr. Vanessa Irizarry Muñoz, College of General Studies
5) Dr. María Ojeda O’Neill, College of Education
6) Mr. John Ramírez Leiton, Office of Assessment and Student Learning
7) Dr. Carmen Haydeé Rivera Vega, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
8) Ms. Karla Sanabria Véaz, Student Representative, General Student Council
9) Ms. Chamary Fuentes, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Group 5. Student Support and Faculty

Committee Members:

1) **Dr. Mirerza González Vélez**, Coordinator, Director, English Department, College of Humanities
2) Dr. José Rodríguez Vicenti, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
3) Dr. Mayra Chárriez Cordero-Acting Dean, Office of the Dean of Students
4) Dr. Ángel Villafañe Santiago, Associate Dean, Office of the Dean of Students
5) Dr. Sunny Cabrera Salcedo, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and Orientation, College of Humanities
6) Dr. Marissa Medina Piña, Counseling Department for Student Development
7) Mrs. Cruz B. Valentín Arbelo, Director, Admissions Office
8) Mrs. María de los Ángeles Castro Mercado, Admissions Office
9) Mr. Marcos Verdejo Calderón, Student Representative, General Student Council
## Appendix B

### Data, information and documents for the working groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORKING GROUPS</th>
<th>Reference Number</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>DATA/INFORMATION</th>
<th>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Organization of the Campus Self-Study Committee</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative Structure of the Rio Piedras Campus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic managers by type of Deanship and academic preparation</td>
<td>SS2005 year(s) not specified</td>
<td>Academic deanship and non-academic deanship (Bachelor, Master, JD, Doctorate, Degree not available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic managers by Deanship and rank</td>
<td>SS2005 year(s) not specified</td>
<td>Rank: Level I, Level II, Level III, Level IV and rank not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic managers by Years of Service - 2003</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Number of years: 0-9, 10-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Percentage of incoming students with high school GPA &gt; 3.00 and &gt; 3.50, and with CEEB math and verbal aptitudes &gt;500</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>GPA 3.00 or more, Verbal aptitude 500 or higher, Math aptitude 500 or higher, GPA 3.5 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>International students and Exchange Program students, 1995–2003</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Degree of satisfaction with quality of teaching and support services, graduating class of 2003–04</td>
<td>Senior Exit 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 y 2011</td>
<td>Senior Exit Items: Teaching (Professors’ advising, Library services, Basic courses, Courses in major, Teaching outside major, Teaching in major, Quality of Teaching) &amp; Support Services (Access to courses and sections, Support in seeking employment, Physical facilities, Technical support, Classrooms and laboratories, Counseling by College, Counseling by Deanship of Students, College extracurricular activities, Campus extracurricular activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Distribution of full-time teaching faculty with doctorate, by type of appointment (1st semester of indicated year)</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Regular vs Contract Full time faculty with doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Graduate Assistantships – Academic Years 2005-06 to 2013-14</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Number of assistantships by type (Professional, Research, Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Total participation in workshops and seminars given by the CEA</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Attendance per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Average degree of satisfaction with academic offerings, by department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Average level of satisfaction with administrative services, by department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Comparison of undergraduate students’ drops with C’s, D’s, and F’s, 1993–2002</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2016</td>
<td>Percentage by academic year (F, includes F*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>UPR-RPC Operating Budget – Revised to the 30th of June of each year</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>University of Puerto Rico General Fund Sources</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Initial Budgets approved for the Campus (as of July 1 of each year)</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2016</td>
<td>UPR, RPC and % Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>External funds received by the Rio Piedras campus</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2017</td>
<td>Sources: State, Federal &amp; Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Complaints referred to and resolved by the Student Ombudsman</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>By category: Student-faculty relations (grades, negative attitude, no reasonable accommodation; not discussing exams; removal of Incompletes); 2: Difficulties with administrative handling of academic issues (course equivalencies; course requirements; registration); 3: Administrative and support services to students; 4: Security; 5: Discipline; 6: Legal advice; 7: Student-professor contractual relation; 8: Sexual harassment; 9: Other (domestic violence, sexual, racial, or sexual-orientation discrimination).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Administrative hearings for review of fines</td>
<td>SS2005 year(s) not specified 2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>By complainant: Student, Faculty, Administrative personnel (upheld, overturned &amp; Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Profile of incoming students, Río Piedras Campus</td>
<td>Estudio Nuevo Ingreso 2005-06; 2010-2011 Datos estadísticos o administrar Nuevo Ingreso 2015-2016</td>
<td>By Gender, Public school, GPA &gt;= 3.5, GPA &gt;= 3.0, First generation college, Live with parent(s), Works, Wants to go on for graduate work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Number of service and undergraduate programs impacted by the Program-Assessment Project</td>
<td>SS2005 - year 2004 STATUS at 2014-2015</td>
<td>By Degree-granting, Non-degree-granting, Academia &amp; Service; Data y Colleges and Schools (Evaluación de programas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students from high school admitted and enrolled</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Admitted (A), Enrolled (E) &amp; E/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Profile of applicants admitted and enrolled</td>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>Number of students, General Admissions Index (GAI), HS GPA, Verbal Aptitude, Math Aptitude, English Achievement, Math Achievement &amp; Spanish Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Services offered by the Office of the Dean of Students, 1999–00 and 2003–04</td>
<td>SS2005 two years: 1999-2000 &amp; 2003-2004 2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>By type of service: Orientation and counseling, Group counseling, Peer orientation, Medical Services (includes: nursing services, emergency care consultation, services after working hours, and physician consultations), Job Placement, Job Search, Assistance Through the Office for Individuals with Disabilities, Quality of Life Office &amp; Student Residences. Includes five-year average and % Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Distribution of full-time teaching faculty by type of appointment and academic preparation (first semester of each indicated year)</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10 T</td>
<td>Annual Amount of Graduate Assistantships by Type – First Semester Academic Year 2003–04 (1st semester of indicated year)</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Annual Amount by Assistantships: Teaching, Research, Professional [Annual Amount computed by multiplying the monthly pay by 10 (average length of assistantships)] Data Source: SAGA-HRS Extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10 T</td>
<td>External funds: Intramural Practice, generated by faculty members, 1999–present</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Number of projects and income per project by unit (colleges, schools and other units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10 T</td>
<td>Leaves requested and granted to teaching and research faculty, and budget</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Number of leaves/budget: Sabbaticals/Extraordinary with pay (requested, granted) &amp; budget assigned / Study leave with financial aid (requested, granted &amp; budget assigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10 T</td>
<td>Student-teacher ratio in U.S. universities</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>12 institutions including UPR-RPC that are research intensive, 18,000 or more students, urban, CSRDE members (Benchmarking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11 T</td>
<td>Library System resources in support of academic programs, as of June, 2004</td>
<td>As of June 2014</td>
<td>By resource: Books in general circulation, not counting repeated titles, Reference works, not counting repeated titles, Videos, not counting repeated titles, Journals with abstracts online or on CDs, Subscriptions to print journals, academic and professional, Subscriptions to electronic journals, academic and professional, Other resources: microforms, Other resources: audiovisual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11 T</td>
<td>Total Enrollment by Gender and Academic level – First Semester 1994-95 to 2003-04</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>By gender (Male, Female and Female percentage) and academic level [Campus, Undergraduate, Post Bach, Post Master certificate, Doctorate, Masters, First Professional-JD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11 T</td>
<td>Degrees Confirmed by Academic level – First Semester 1994-95 to 2003-04</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>By level [Campus total, Undergraduate, Graduate (Certificates, Masters, First Professional-JD, Doctorates] and percentages of each level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13 T</td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
<td>2012-2013 to 2014-2015</td>
<td>Hybrid and online courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Degree of satisfaction with academic aspects (average of outcomes)</td>
<td>SS2005 year(s) not specified</td>
<td>2002 DECEP Study (Rojas Jiménez, 2002) -- Items: Professor’s ability to facilitate learning, Up-to-date content, Applicability of the course content to student’ work or daily life, Professor’s availability to clarify issues, Quality of educational materials, Professor’s attendance and punctuality, Professor’s effectiveness in the use of class time [Legend: Scale: Very high = 5, Good = 4, Fair = 3, Little = 2, None = 1] DSP= Department of Special Programs, CMD=Center for Management Development, FAW=Fine Arts Workshop, MMI=Multilingual and Multicultural Institute, MPC=Multidisciplinary Program and Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Average level of satisfaction with administrative services</td>
<td>SS2005 year(s) not specified</td>
<td>2002 DECEP Study (Rojas Jiménez, 2002) -- Items: Number of students per section, Service received by non-teaching staff, Speed of enrollment process, Physical facilities, Provision of information to the public [Legend: Scale: Very high = 5, Good = 4, Fair = 3, Little = 2, None = 1] DSP= Department of Special Programs, CMD=Center for Management Development, FAW=Fine Arts Workshop, MMI=Multilingual and Multicultural Institute, MPC=Multidisciplinary Program and Certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Second-year retention: Río Piedras Campus vs. U.S. institutions</td>
<td>2005-2006 to 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Graduation rates per cohort, 1993 through 2000</td>
<td>Cohorts 2001 to 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Graduation rates for cohorts 1993 through 1997</td>
<td>Cohorts 2003 to 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Assessment of graduating students and graduates with respect to attainment of learning-domains expected of them as per Campus’s mission statement</td>
<td>Senior Exit 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 y 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Pass rate (%) for professional licensing examinations</td>
<td>2010-2011 to 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Río Piedras Campus Mission and VU2016, operational plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Planning in the UPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2, 4, 6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Assessment Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2, 14</td>
<td>A Student Learning Assessment Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A Budget Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A External Funds by College/Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A University of Puerto Rico Rio Piedras Campus Information Technology Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A University of Puerto Rico Leadership and Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A University of Puerto Rico System Organization Chart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs of the Rio Piedras Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A Enrollment of New Students Tables and Figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STudy 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Organization Charts of Rio Piedras Deanships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>International Students and Rio Piedras Campus Participants in Exchange Programs, 2005 to 2013 Participant in Exchange Programs - Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Financial Aid Funds Assigned From 2010 to 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Faculty Tables and Figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Graduate Assistantships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Student Tables and Figures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPR-RP Academic Programs and their Professional Accreditation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UPR-RP Library System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING GROUPS</td>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>DATA/INFORMATION</td>
<td>PERIOD TO BE REPORTED SELF-STUDY 2015</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12 A</td>
<td>Improvement in the General Education Component, College of General Studies: Summary, since 1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13 A</td>
<td>Non-credit Offerings at the Rio Piedras Campus 2005-2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13 A</td>
<td>Most Outstanding Community Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Working Group Report Format

All working groups must submit a report using the format recommended below.

The reports should be submitted in English. If need be, we will provide professional assistance to translate sections or documents of the report. If this should be the case, it is important to request assistance in a timely matter.

The editorial style and format to use will be the following: MSWord, Times New Roman, font 12.

The self-study steering committee will develop an integrated self-study report draft to share with the academic community in public hearings.

Both the self-study steering committee and the coordinator will meet individually with each of the Working Groups and are available to receive any recommendations you might have related to this format.

It is important to include in the appendix all the information used to analyze the data:

- Institutional documents.
- Formats that were developed to analyze information.
- Formats or questions that were used to interview people.
- People that were interviewed and brief description of the information discussed.
- Meetings with other Working Groups.
- Surveys or questionnaires that were commissioned or developed to gather data.

**Executive summary**

A brief description of the major findings and recommendations.

- In a one-page summary, indicate the most important findings and recommendations of your report.
Introduction

Purpose

- Indicate the main purpose of the Working Group.

Scope of work

- Briefly elaborate on the specific task of the Working Group.
- Indicate the names of participant, and how the tasks were organized, the meetings held and other information.

Describe how the Standards were integrated

- In a few paragraphs indicate how the questions were reviewed and integrated and the specific attention given to the Standards.

Process

Documents and data that were considered during the analyses of the information.

- Elaborate on the documents and data considered during the analyses of the information, including formats, possible interviews, surveys, and/or questionnaires.

Findings

Relationship of the task with the Río Piedras Campus’ Mission.

- In a few paragraphs, establish the relationship between the content considered by your committee and its relationship to the mission statement of the Río Piedras Campus.
General findings

- For each of the questions studied, indicate the most important findings related to the Standards and how they are relevant to the improvement of the Río Piedras Campus. It is important to present information in an analytical format. Descriptive data may be included in a brief introductory section.

Conclusions

Analyses of unique strengths and challenges of our institution, according to the findings.

- In this section include a few paragraphs of your conclusions for each of the findings.

Recommendations

The five most important improvement recommendations.

- Present and briefly describe each of the five most important recommendations you have for improvement of the Río Piedras Campus

Specific considerations for the planning process at the UPR and the RP campus

Recommendations to be considered by the Río Piedras Campus in its new planning document.

- In a few paragraphs, indicate future action or objectives that the Río Piedras Campus should consider a priority for its next planning process.

Recommendations to be considered by the University of Puerto Rico System in its new planning document.

- In a few paragraphs, indicate future action or objectives that the University of Puerto Rico should consider a priority for its next planning process.
General recommendations to the process.

- Share any reflections or recommendations that you might have to improve this process at the Río Piedras Campus

Appendices

- Include all the documents and references used to develop the report. It is also important to have this information available in electronic format.
### Appendix D Timetable

#### SSSC Timetable 2014-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester II 2013-2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| February        | . Designated Self Study Steering Committee (SSSC)  
                   . Designate Working Groups  
                   . Prepare Self-Study Design  
                   . Organize and identify data and institutional documents                                                                                                                                                  |
| March-April     | . Approve Self-Study Design  
                   . Meeting between SSSC and Working Groups  
                   . Individual meeting between SSSC Coordinator and Working Groups to discuss questions  
                   . Individual meeting between SSSC and Working Groups  
                       . Discuss questions  
                   . Notify the University Community  
                   . Presentation to the Academic Senate                                                                                                                                                                     |
| April-June      | . SSSC weekly meetings  
                   . Meetings of Working Groups  
                   . Meetings: SSSC with Working Groups  
                   . Identify and prepare data and format for the report  
                   . Update the Vice-president of Academic Affairs (VPAA) on the Self-Study Process and coordinate the information required from Central Administration on Standards: 2, 3, 4 and 5  
                   . Establish process to work with specialized committees (Academic Senate, Alumni, External Community)                                                                                               |
| **Semester I, 2014-2015** |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| September-October | . Working Groups hand in reports  
                   . SSSC Review the Working Group Reports                                                                                                                                                                    |
| October-December | . SSSC prepare first draft of report  
                   . SSSC holds public hearings  
                   . Community recommendations are incorporated  
                   . Prepare task for Colleges and Schools                                                                                                                                                                   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester II, 2014-2015</strong></td>
<td>January-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribute tasks for Colleges and Schools to review report and share recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleges and Schools work with report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleges and Schools hand in reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSCHE selects Evaluation Team Chair and institution approves selection; identifies dates for first visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May-July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSSC incorporates their recommendations of Colleges and Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSSC prepares MSCHE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester I, 2015-2016</strong></td>
<td>August-October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Hearing with campus-wide participation to react to the MSCHE report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate recommendations to the MSCHE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare final report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSCHE selects evaluation team members; RPC approves evaluation team composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send MSCHE report to the President of the Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair of the Evaluation Committee visits RPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send Self-study report to the President of the UPR and the Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare final MSCHE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share final report with University community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>October</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send final Self-Study Report to MSCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize the Evaluation Team’s visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue communication with the President of the Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester II, 15-16</strong></td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send Self-study report to the Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Team Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation Team Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester I, 2016 -2017</strong></td>
<td>Summer or Fall after Academic Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Evaluation Team reports to MSCHE’s Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Deans of Colleges and Directors of Schools

1) Dr. Carlos Colón de Armas, Acting Dean, College of Business Administration
2) Dr. Rafael Arce Quintero, Acting Dean, College of Natural Sciences
3) Dr. Blanca Ortíz Torres, Dean, College of Social Sciences
4) Dr. Marta Medina Santos, Acting Dean, College of General Studies
5) Dr. María de los Ángeles Castro Arroyo, Acting Dean, College of Humanities
6) Dr. Juanita Rodríguez Colón, Dean, College of Education
7) Architect Francisco J. Rodríguez Suárez, Dean, School of Architecture
8) Esq. Vivian I. Neptune Rivera, Dean, School of Law
9) Dr. Carlos A. Suárez Balseiro, Acting Director, Graduate School of Information Sciences and Technologies
10) Dr. Carmen M. Concepción Rodríguez, Acting Director, Graduate School of Planning
11) Dr. Jimmy Torres Rodríguez, Acting Director, School of Communication