

2019 EPP Annual Report

CAEP ID:	32359	AACTE SID:	
Institution:	Inter American University of Puerto Rico - San Germán		
Unit:	Department of Education and Physical Education		

Section 1. AIMS Profile

After reviewing and/or updating the Educator Preparation Provider's (EPP's) profile in AIMS, check the box to indicate that the information available is accurate.

1.1 In AIMS, the following information is current and accurate...

	Agree	Disagree
1.1.1 Contact person	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.2 EPP characteristics	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1.1.3 Program listings	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2017-2018 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure¹ 45

2.1.2 Number of completers in advanced programs or programs leading to a degree, endorsement, or some other credential that prepares the holder to serve in P-12 schools (Do not include those completers counted above.)²

Total number of program completers 45

¹ For a description of the scope for Initial-Licensure Programs, see Policy 3.01 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

² For a description of the scope for Advanced-Level Programs, see Policy 3.02 in the Accreditation Policy Manual

Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2017-2018 academic year?

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.
- 3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements
- Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status
- 3.7 Change in state program approval

Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4 A.5.4)	
Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)	Outcome Measures
1. Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1)	5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)
2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)	6. Ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial & advanced levels)
3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3 A.4.1)	7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial & advanced levels)
4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4 A.4.2)	8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)

4.1 Provide a link or links that demonstrate data relevant to each of the Annual Reporting Measures are public-friendly and prominently displayed on the educator preparation provider's website.

1

Link: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/index.php?page=caep-informacion>

Description of data accessible via link: [Link to TEP information including annual reports to CAEP](#)

Tag the Annual Reporting Measure(s) represented in the link above to the appropriate preparation level(s) (initial and/or advanced, as offered by the EPP) and corresponding measure number.

Level \ Annual Reporting Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Initial-Licensure Programs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Advanced-Level Programs			<input type="checkbox"/>					

4.2 Summarize data and trends from the data linked above, reflecting on the prompts below.

What has the provider learned from reviewing its Annual Reporting Measures over the past three years?

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

Are benchmarks available for comparison?

Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

For CAEP 4.1 (TEP 4.1): On the impact on P-12 learning and development,

- The TEP completers have an excellent or very acceptable impact on their students according to employers (School Directors) surveyed with local Assessment (PD-11). Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.
 - December 2016: Mean = 3.83, SD = 0.391 (Scale: 1.00 to 4.00, expected point average: 2.50 or above).
 - May 2017: Mean = 2.69, SD = 0.476 (Scale: 1.00 to 3.00, expected point average: 1.50 or above)
 - May 2018: Mean = 2.89, SD = 0.239 (Scale: 1.00 to 3.00, expected point average: 1.50 or above).
- The TEP completers indicated that they have an excellent or very acceptable impact on their students in local Assessment (PD-13B). Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.
 - December 2016: Mean = 4.99, SD = 0.065 (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average = 3.50 or above)
 - May 2017: 4.20, SD = 0.910 (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average: 3.50 or above)
 - May 2018: 4.48, SD = 0.649 (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average = 3.50 or above).

For CAEP 4.2 (TEP 4.2): On the indicators of Teaching Effectiveness,

- The School Directors indicated that TEP's completers are effective in their teaching in local Assessment (PD-11). Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.
 - December 2016: Mean = 3.80, SD = 0.499 (Scale: .00 to 4.00, expected pint average: 2.50 or above)
 - May 2017: Mean = 2.72, SD = 0.446 (Scale: 1.00-3.00, expected point average: 1.50 or above)
 - May 2018; Mean = 2.90, SD = 0.180 (Scale: 1.00-3.00, expected point average: 1.50 or above).
- The TEP completers indicated that they are effective in their teaching process in local Assessment (PD-13B). Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.
 - December 2016: Mean = 4.98, SD = 0.067 (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average = 3.50 or above)
 - May 2017: 4.12, SD = 0.955 (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average: 3.50 or above)

- o May 2018: 4.42, SD = 0.746 (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average = 3.50 or above).
- The School Directors indicated that TEP's completers are effective in their teaching (98.68% agreed in excellent and good evaluation) as measured by IAUPR's survey to employers (proprietary Assessment). All scores were above the expected point average (80% or more of excellent and good answers).
- o General Competences = 97.79% of excellent and good evaluations
- o Teacher Education Competencies (Pedagogical Knowledge) = 100.0% of excellent and good evaluations.
- o In general: Teaching effectiveness = 98.68% of excellent and good evaluations.

For CAEP 4.3 (TEP 4.3): On the satisfaction of employers,

- The evidences sources for the satisfaction of employers are the instrument PD-11 Employers Survey, local Assessment, and the IAUPR employers' survey, proprietary Assessment. The School Directors were very satisfied with TEP's completers. All scores were above the expected point average.
- o As reported by Directors in TEP Employers Survey in PD-11: December 2016: Mean 3.75, SD = 0.470 (Scale: 1.00-4.00, expected point average: 2.50 or above); May 2017: Mean = 2.53, SD = 0.443 (Scale: 1.00-3.00, expected point average: 1.50 or above); and May 2018: Mean = Mean = 2.70, SD = 0.271 (Scale: 1.00-3.00, expected point average: 1.50 or above).
- o As reported in Employers Survey: 2016-2017: Mean = 98.76% (expected point average: 80% or more).

For CAEP 4.3 (TEP 4.3): On employment milestones,

- The employment milestones are evidenced through employers (School Directors), and TEP's completers (Alumni) surveys. All employment milestones measures were above expected point average or performance standard.
- o Percentage of recruitment of TEP's completers (Alumni) according to School Directors in PD-11 (expected point average: minimum 25%): December 2016 = 49.4%; May 2017 = 30.9%; and May 2018 = 58.6%.
- o Percentage of recruitment of TEP's completers (Alumni) according to Completers (Alumni, expected point average: at least, 50% are working): December 2016 = Not measured; May 2017 = 77.2%; and May 2018 = 72.0%.
- o Percentage of recruitment of TEP's completers (Alumni) according to School Directors in IAUPR's survey (expected point average: minimum 25%): 2016-2017 (first administration of survey) = 100.0%.
- o Percentage of recruitment of TEP's completers (Alumni) as reported in IAUPR's Alumni Survey (expected point average: minimum 25%): 2011-2012 (first administration of survey) = 69.0%; and 2015-2016 (last administration of survey available) = 64.0%.
- o Percentage of completers (Alumni) working in their major or subject matter in PD-13B (expected point average: at least, 80% of completers (Alumni) are working in their major): December 2016 = Not measured; May 2017 = 95.7%; and May 2018 = 88.0%.
- o Percentage of completers (Alumni) working in their major or subject matter in IAUPR's Alumni survey (expected point average: at least, 80% of completers (Alumni) are working in their major): 2011-2012 (first administration of survey) = 57.0%; and 2015-2016 (last administration of survey available) = 86.0%.
- o Percentage of completers (Alumni) employed (Alumni) in PD-13B in no more than 12 months (expected point average: at least, 50% of completers (Alumni) were employed in no more than 12 months): December 2016 = Not measured; May 2017 = 77.2%; and May 2018 = 72.0%.
- o Percentage of completers (Alumni) employed (Alumni) in IAUPR's Alumni survey in no more than 12 months (expected point average: at least, 50% of completers (Alumni) were employed in no more than 12 months): 2011-2012 (first administration of survey) = 72.0%; and 2015-2016 (last administration of survey available) = 100.0%.

For CAEP 4.4 (TEP 4.4): On satisfaction of Completers,

- The evidences sources for the satisfaction of employers are the instrument PD-13B Completers Survey, local Assessment, the IAUPR' Alumni survey, proprietary Assessment, and PCMAS' survey to Candidates at completion (proprietary Assessment). Completers (Alumni) were very satisfied or satisfied with TEP. All scores were above the expected point average.
- o As reported by Completers in TEP Satisfaction Survey, PD-13B (Scale: 1.00 to 5.00, expected point average: 3.50 or above): December 2016: Mean = 4.78, SD = 0.658; May 2017"Mean = 4.13, SD = 0.795; and May 2018: Mean = 4.42, SD = 0.567
- o As reported in Alumni Survey (expected point average: 80% or more of very important or important answers): Importance of preparation received at TEP for the position hold: 86.0%; Extent to which the academic program contributed to develop the following competencies of the graduate:97.3%
- o As reported in PCMAS Survey (expected point average: 80% or more of very important or important answers): 2015 = 100.0%; 2016 = 100.0%; 2017 = 97.0% of satisfaction.

Data reported and analyzed is presented annually to Faculty for discussion and recommendations in order to incorporate modifications in content and methodological process on the TEP's courses, if necessary. Evidences confirmed the accomplishment of CAEP Standard 4 and TEP claims.

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

Waived

Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2019 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: ELBA T IRIZARRY RAMIREZ

Position: Associate Professor and Coordinator of Accreditation of the TEP by CAEP

Phone: 7873834939

E-mail: elba_irizarry_ramirez@intersg.edu

I understand that all the information that is provided to CAEP from EPPs seeking initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or having completed the accreditation process is considered the property of CAEP and may be used for training, research and data review. CAEP reserves the right to compile and issue data derived from accreditation documents.

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

An EPP must submit an Annual Report to maintain accreditation or accreditation-eligibility. The report is opened for data entry each year in January. EPPs are given 90 days from the date of system availability to complete the report.

CAEP is required to collect and apply the data from the Annual Report to:

1. Monitor whether the EPP continues to meet the CAEP Standards between site visits.
2. Review and analyze stipulations and any AFIs submitted with evidence that they were addressed.
3. Monitor reports of substantive changes.
4. Collect headcount completer data, including for distance learning programs.
5. Monitor how the EPP publicly reports candidate performance data and other consumer information on its website.

CAEP accreditation staff conduct annual analysis of AFIs and/or stipulations and the decisions of the Accreditation Council to assess consistency.

Failure to submit an Annual Report will result in referral to the Accreditation Council for review. Adverse action may result.

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

The EPP is responsible for the adequacy and accuracy of all information submitted by the EPP for accreditation purposes, including program reviews, self-study reports, formative feedback reports and addendums and site visit report responses, and information made available to prospective candidates and the public. In particular, information displayed by the EPP pertaining to its accreditation and Title II decision, term, consumer information, or candidate performance (e.g., standardized test results, job placement rates, and licensing examination rates) must be accurate and current.

When CAEP becomes aware that an accredited EPP has misrepresented any action taken by CAEP with respect to the EPP and/or its accreditation, or uses accreditation reports or materials in a false or misleading manner, the EPP will be contacted and directed to issue a corrective communication. Failure to correct misleading or inaccurate statements can lead to adverse action.

Acknowledge