

**2019 EPP ANNUAL REPORT DATA TO CAEP:  
EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS AT THE SAN GERMÁN CAMPUS OF THE  
INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO  
ACADEMIC YEAR 2017-2018**

**Educator Preparation Programs**

The Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) at the San Germán Campus of the IAUPR encompass two levels: Initial and Advanced. The TEP is an initial EPP that offers Bachelor degrees in Education or related fields. The Graduate Programs in Education and other related fields are advanced-level EPP. Our advanced-level programs will be submitted in the next accreditation cycle.

We are a TEAC legacy program (accredited by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) until June 2019, but this accreditation status was extended by CAEP until Fall 2019.) In October 5, 2019, the TEP send to CAEP its Self-Study Report (SSR) for re-accreditation. In May 5-8, 2019, we will received the Site-Visit of CAEP. The Educator Preparation Program, hereafter TEP (Teacher Education Program), is an institutional program offered in eight campuses or institutional units, including San Germán Campus.

The *2019 EPP Annual Report* submitted to the Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) is for Teacher Education Program (TEP) at the San Germán Campus. It presents the data required through the Annual Report System (ARS) at

<http://aims.caepnet.org/ARS/Page012017.asp?IID=1269&YID=25&RID=18266>

**Program Options**

The Teacher Education Program (TEP) at the San Germán Campus offers a Bachelor of Arts degree. Its majors are: Preschool Level Education; Early Childhood Education (levels

K-3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>); Secondary Education (Biology, Chemistry, History Mathematics, Social Studies, and Spanish); Physical Education and Recreation (Elementary and Secondary levels, and Adapted); Special Education; Teaching English as a Second Language (Elementary and Secondary levels); Art Education; and Music Education.<sup>1</sup> These options or majors meet the requirements for teacher certification granted by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico (DEPR, 2012).

At the Initial Level, two academic departments administer one EPP (TEP) which offer 18 active program options or specialties (majors). The Department of Education and Physical Education is in charge of the majors: Preschool Level Education; Early Childhood Education (levels K-3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup>); Secondary Education (Biology, Chemistry, History Mathematics, Social Studies, and Spanish); Physical Education and Recreation (Elementary and Secondary levels, and Adapted); Special Education; and Teaching English as a Second Language (Elementary and Secondary levels). The Department of Fine Arts administered the majors: Arts Education (Visual Arts), and Music Education (General-Vocal, and Instrumental).

The program options of TEP of the EPPs at the San Germán Campus are in Table 1.1 *Program Options in the Teacher Education Program (TEP) and EPP Advanced Level Program Options at the San Germán Campus.*

---

<sup>1</sup> IAUPR (2017a), pp. 123-124, 168-194, 278-285.

Table 1.1

*Program Options in the Teacher Education Program (TEP) and EPP Advanced Level  
Program Options at the San Germán Campus<sup>2</sup>*

<b>Option Name</b>	<b>IAUPR Code</b>	<b>CIP Code</b>	<b>Level</b>	<b>Number of Completers (2016-2017)</b>	<b>Number of Students Enrolled (2017-2018)*</b>
<b>Initial Level</b>					
B.A. Secondary Education in Mathematics	128	13.1311	Undergraduate	3	10
B.A. Special Education	136	13.1001	Undergraduate	7	17
B.A. Secondary Education in History	144	13.1328	Undergraduate	1	15
B.A. Secondary Education in Spanish	145	13.1330	Undergraduate	1	17
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Secondary Level	147	13.1401	Undergraduate	1	34
B.A. Secondary Education in Biology	174	13.1322	Undergraduate	1	5
B.A. Secondary Education in Science in the Junior High School <sup>♦</sup>	175	13.1316	Undergraduate	2	0
B.A. Physical Education at the Secondary Level	176	13.1314	Undergraduate	0	11
B.A. Secondary Education in Social Studies	177	13.1318	Undergraduate	1	3
B.A. Physical Education at the Elementary Level	178	13.1314	Undergraduate	3	13
B.A. Secondary Education in Chemistry	187	13.1323	Undergraduate	1	0
B.M. Music Education:	191	13.1312	Undergraduate	2	61

<sup>2</sup> Inter American University of Puerto Rico, IAUPR. (2017a, January). *General Catalog 2015-2017*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Retrieved from <http://documentosinter.azurewebsites.net/#31-catalogos-vigentes>

Option Name	IAUPR Code	CIP Code	Level	Number of Completers (2016-2017)	Number of Students Enrolled (2017-2018)*
Instrumental					
B.M. Music Education: General–Vocal	192	13.1312	Undergraduate	1	79
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Elementary Level	206	13.1401	Undergraduate	0	14
B.A. Adapted Physical Education	207	13.1099	Undergraduate	4	11
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (K-3)	236	13.1202	Undergraduate	1	22
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (4-6)	237	13.1202	Undergraduate	5	7
B.A. Early Childhood: Pre-school Level	243	13.1209	Undergraduate	5	18
B.A. Visual Arts: Art Education	254	13.1302	Undergraduate	6	16
B.A. School Health♦♦	267	13.1299	Undergraduate	5	1
<b>Total of TEP's Students</b>				<b>45</b>	<b>354</b>

Data provided by the Office of Research, Assessment and Planning, IAUPR, and by the Registrar Office of San Germán Campus.

- ♦ - Major change: In April 2016, the closing of the program was approved by the Council of Education of Puerto Rico (Case # 2010-076). A five-year period was established in order to give opportunity to students to complete their BA. No new admissions are permitted.
  - ♦♦ - Major change in July 2015 (Case # 2012-120E): Moratorium approved by the Council of Education in Puerto Rico. A five-year period was established in order to give opportunity to students to complete their BA. No new admissions are permitted.
  - ♦♦♦ - Major change in February 2018: Moratorium request to the Council of Education in Puerto Rico (Certification of Knowledge: 1997-065E, 2005-142, 2016-371, ROA 2018-03). A five-year period was established in order to give opportunity to students to complete their M.A. No new admissions are permitted. The program will closed after this five-year.
  - - Programs of new creation. Beginning date: January 2018.
- \* Preliminary data of YR 2017-18 as of 10/11/2017.

## Annual Reporting Measures

The annual reporting measures included are those required in the Section 4 of 2019 *EPP Annual Report* at <http://aims.caepnet.org/ARS/Page032017.asp?IID=1269&YID=25&RID=18266> :

<b>Annual Reporting Measures (CAEP Component 5.4   A.5.4)</b>	
<b>Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4)</b>	<b>Outcome Measures</b>
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)

### **Impact Measures: Standard 4. Program Impact**

The instruments to evidence the program impact measures are: PD-11 TEP Employer Survey (Survey to School Directors or Employers), local Assessment; PD-13B Alumni (Completers) Satisfaction Survey, local Assessment; IAUPR’s Survey to Employers, proprietary Assessment; IAUPR’s Survey to Alumni, proprietary Assessment, and PCMAS’ Survey, proprietary Assessment. Summary of data are as follows.

#### **Evidence 4.1.1: Impact on P-12 learning and development: Employers Survey, PD-11 (CAEP 4.1)**

The first measure to evidence the impact on P-12 learning and development is instrument PD-11 *TEP Employer Survey* (Survey to School Directors or Employers), local Assessment. Summary of data is in Table 1. The TEP completers have an excellent or very acceptable impact on their students according to employers (School Directors) surveyed. Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.

Table 1

*Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1): TEP Employers Survey*

<b>Academic Term</b>	<b>Mean (Scale &amp; expected point average)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	3.83 (1.00 to 4.00, 2.50 or above)	0.391	Excellent, Homogeneous
May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=10	2.69 (1.00 to 3.00, 1.50 or above)	0.476	Very acceptable, Homogeneous
May 2018 (Spring 2018), n=7	2.89 (1.00 to 3.00, 1.50 or above)	0.239	Very acceptable, Homogeneous

**Evidence 4.1.2: Impact on P-12 learning and development: Completers Satisfaction Survey, PD-13B (CAEP 4.1)**

The second measure to evidence the impact on P-12 learning and development is instrument PD-13B *TEP Completers Satisfaction Survey* (Survey to TEP’s completers or Employees), local Assessment. Summary of data is in Table 2. The TEP completers indicated that they have an excellent or very acceptable impact on their students. Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.

Table 2

*Impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1): TEP’s Completers Survey*

<b>Academic Term</b>	<b>Mean (Scale &amp; expected point average)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	4.99 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.065	Excellent, Homogeneous
May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=70	4.20 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.910	Excellent, Homogeneous
May 2018 (Spring 2018), n=25	4.48 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.649	Very acceptable, Homogeneous

**Evidence 4.2.1: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: Employers Survey, PD-11 (CAEP 4.2)**

The first measure to evidence the indicators of teaching effectiveness of TEP’s completers is instrument PD-11 *TEP Employers Survey* (Survey to School Directors or Employers), local Assessment. Summary of data is in Table 3. The School Directors indicated that TEP’s completers are effective in their teaching. Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.

Table 3

*Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (Component 4.2): TEP Employers Survey*

<b>Academic Term</b>	<b>Mean (Scale &amp; expected point average)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	3.80 of 4.00 (1.00 to 4.00, 2.50 or above)	0.499	Excellent, Homogeneous
May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=10	2.72 (1.00 to 3.00, 1.50 or above)	0.446	Very acceptable, Homogeneous
May 2018 (Spring 2018), n=7	2.90 (1.00 to 3.00, 1.50 or above)	0.180	Very acceptable, Homogeneous

**Evidence 4.2.2: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: Completers Satisfaction Survey, PD-13-B (CAEP 4.2)**

The second measure to evidence the teaching effectiveness of TEP’s completers is instrument PD-13B *TEP Completers Satisfaction Survey* (Survey to TEP’s completers or Employees), local Assessment. Summary of data is in Table 4. The TEP completers indicated that they are effective in their teaching process. Their answers were homogeneous. All scores were above the expected point average.

Table 4

*Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (Component 4.2): TEP’s Completers Survey*

<b>Academic Term</b>	<b>Mean (Scale &amp; expected point average)</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	4.98 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.067	Excellent, Homogeneous
May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=70	4.12 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.955	Good, Homogeneous
May 2018 (Spring 2018), n=25	4.42 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.746	Very acceptable, Homogeneous

**Evidence 4.2.3: Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness: IAUPR’s Survey to Employer, (CAEP 4.2)**

The third measure to evidence the teaching effectiveness of TEP’s completers is the IAUPR’s Survey to Employers, a proprietary Assessment instrument (first administration in November 2016; next administration will be in fall 2018). Summary of data is in Table 5. The School Directors indicated that TEP’s completers are effective in their teaching (98.68% agreed in excellent and good evaluation). All scores were above the expected point average (80% or more of excellent and good answers).

Table 5

*Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness (Component 4.2): IAUPR’s Survey to Employers (2016-2017), n=13*

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Premises</b>	<b>Excellent and Good</b>
<b>General Competences</b>	1. Capacity for teamwork	100%
	2. Know how to handle conflicting situations	100%
	3. Think critically Solve complex problems	100%
	4. Take the initiative	100%
	5. Ability to conduct research	84%
	6. Willingness to learn	85%
	7. Show creativity at work	100%
	8. Exhibit leadership	100%
	9. Maintain good interpersonal relationships	100%



<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Premises</b>	<b>Excellent and Good</b>
	10. Organizational skills	100%
	11. Know how to manage technology	100%
	12. Have an effective communication	100%
	13. Know how to follow instructions	100%
	14. Demonstrate integrity and professional ethics	100%
	<b>Average of General Competences</b>	<b>97.79%</b>
<b>Teacher Education Competencies (Pedagogical Knowledge)</b>	1. Knowledge of the philosophical foundations that are the basis of education.	100%
	2. Knowledge of the processes of construction of learning through the different stages of human development.	100%
	3. Integrate into pedagogical practice the theoretical principles that underlie education.	100%
	4. Plan the learning of the students integrating the teaching strategies with a scientific basis in the instructional design.	100%
	5. Use a variety of teaching strategies to facilitate effective learning.	100%
	6. Apply the assessment to determine the effectiveness of the learning processes.	100%
	7. Apply technological advances as resources to improve pedagogical practice.	100%
	8. Use existing computerized and educational resources in their discipline.	100%
	9. Work collaboratively in professional pedagogical practice.	100%
	10. Demonstrate respect and tolerance to the individual and cultural differences of students in the educational setting.	100%
	11. Assume leadership roles and professional responsibility in the different educational scenarios.	100%
		<b>Average of Teacher Education Competencies (Pedagogical Knowledge)</b>
<b>In general: Teaching effectiveness</b>		<b>98.68%</b>

**Evidence 4.3.1: Satisfaction of Employers: Employers Survey, PD-11 and IAUPR's Survey to Employers (CAEP 4.3)**

The evidences sources for the satisfaction of employers are the instrument PD-11 Employers Survey, local Assessment, and the IAUPR employers' survey, proprietary Assessment. Summary of data is in Table 6. The School Directors were very satisfied with

TEP’s completers. All scores were above the expected point average.

Table 6

*Satisfaction of Employers*

<b>Source of Evidence</b>	<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Mean &amp; Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
As reported by School Directors in TEP Employers Survey, PD-11 (Local Assessment)	December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	3.75 of 4.00 (1.00 to 4.00, 2.50 or above) SD = 0.470	Very satisfied Homogeneous
	May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=10	2.53 of 3.00 (1.00 to 3.00, 1.50 or above) SD = 0.443	Very satisfied Homogeneous
	May 2018 (Spring 2017), n=7	2.70 of 3.00 (1.00 to 3.00, 1.50 or above) SD = 0.271	Very satisfied Homogeneous
As reported in IAUPR’s Employers Survey (Proprietary Assessment)	2016-2017, n=13	98.76% (expected point average: 80% or more)	Very satisfied

**Evidences 4.3.2: Employment Milestones (CAEP 4.3)**

The employment milestones are evidenced through employers (School Directors), and TEP’s completers (Alumni) surveys. Summary of data is in Table 7. All employment milestones measures were above expected point average or performance standard. Data revealed:

- 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%.
- 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%.
- 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%.
- 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%.
- 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%.

- 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%.

- 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%.

- 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%.

Table 8

*Employment Milestones (Initial level only)*

Source of Evidence	Instrument	Data	
As reported by School Directors in TEP Employers Surveys PD-11 (Local Assessment)	December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	Number of Teachers in the School	618
		Teachers from IAUPR, San Germán Campus	305
		Percentage of recruitment	49.4%
	May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=10	Number of Teachers in the School	207
		Teachers from IAUPR, San Germán Campus	64
		Percentage of recruitment	30.9%
	May 2018 (Spring 2017), n=7	Number of Teachers in the School	181
		Teachers from IAUPR, San Germán Campus	106
		Percentage of recruitment	58.6%
As reported by TEP Completers in Satisfaction Survey PD-13B (Local Assessment)	December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=20	24. How much time has passed since you graduated until you got a job?	Not measured
		25: Do you currently practice as a teacher in the major with which you graduated?	
	May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=70	24. How much time has passed since you graduated until you got a job?	77.2% (No more than 12 mo.)

Source of Evidence	Instrument	Data	
	May 2018 (Spring 2017), n=25	25: Do you currently practice as a teacher in the major with which you graduated?	95.7% (Yes)
		24. How much time has passed since you graduated until you got a job?	72.0% (No more than 12 mo.)
		25: Do you currently practice as a teacher in the major with which you graduated?	88.0% (Yes)
As reported in IUUPR's Employers Survey (Proprietary Assessment)	2016-2017, n=13	How many employees does your organization have?	13
		How many graduates of TEP are working in your organization?	13
		Percentage of recruitment	100.0%
As reported in IAUPR's Alumni Survey (Proprietary Assessment)	2011-2012, N=39	Are you currently working?	69.0% (Yes)
		How much time has passed since you graduated until you got a job?	72.0% (No more than 12 mo.)
		How related is your current employment to your area of major?	57.0% (Related or high related to major)
	2015-2016, n=11	Are you currently working?	64.0% (Yes)
		How much time has passed since you graduated until you got a job?	100.0% (No more than 12 mo.)
		How related is your current employment to your area of concentration?	86.0% (Related or highly related)

**Evidence 4.4.1: Satisfaction of Completers: Completers Satisfaction Surveys**  
**(CAEP 4.4)**

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). Summary of data is in Table 9. Completers (Alumni) were very satisfied or satisfied with TEP. All scores were above the expected point average.

Table 9

*Satisfaction of Completers*

<b>Source of Evidence</b>	<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
As reported by Completers in TEP Satisfaction Survey, PD-13B (Local Assessment)	December 2016 (Fall 2016), n=21	4.78 of 5.00 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.658	Very satisfied Homogeneous
	May 2017 (Spring 2017), n=70	4.13 of 5.00 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.796	Satisfied Homogeneous
	May 2018 (Spring 2018), n=25	4.42 (1.00 to 5.00, 3.50 or above)	0.567	Satisfied, Homogeneous
As reported in Alumni Survey (Proprietary Assessment), 2015-2016, n=7	How important was the preparation you received at the TEP for the position you hold?	86.0% (expected point average: 80% or more of very important or important answers)	Not provided	Very important
	Extent to which the academic program contributed to develop the following competencies of the graduate	97.3% (expected point average: 80% or more of excellent and good answers)	Not provided	Excellent and Good
As reported in PCMAS Survey (External Assessment)	2015, n=68	100.0% (expected point average: 80% or more of excellent and good answers)	Not provided	Very adequate, Fair enough, and Adequate (Very satisfied and/or satisfied)
	2016, n=70	100.0% (expected point average: 80% or more of excellent and good answers)	Not provided	Very adequate, Fair enough, and Adequate (Very satisfied and/or satisfied)
	2017, n=65	97.0% (expected point average: 80% or more of excellent	Not provided	Very adequate, Fair enough, and Adequate (Very

Source of Evidence	Instrument	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
		and good answers)		satisfied and/or satisfied)

#### Conclusions/Discussion for Standard 4

**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)

- 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).**
  - General Competences = 97.79% of excellent and good evaluations
  - Teacher Education Competencies (Pedagogical Knowledge) = 100.0% of excellent and good evaluations.
  - 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.**
  - 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).
  - 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.**
  - 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%.
  - 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%.
  - 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%.
  - 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%.
  - 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%.
  - 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%.

- 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%.

- 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.**

- 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

- 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%

- 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.

**Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial level)**

Refer to <http://www.sg.inter.edu/index.php?page=student-right-to-know-act>

Certify correct,



Elba T. Irizarry-Ramírez  
Accreditation Coordinator  
April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2019