

***ANNUAL REPORT: 2013-2014
OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (TEP)****

Submitted to the Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP) by:


Prof. Agnes Mojica, Chancellor
Dr. Nyvia I. Alvarado, Dean of Studies

Primary Authors:

Dr. Miriam Padilla, Director Department of Education and Physical Education
Dr. Elba T. Irizarry, Coordinator of TEP's Accreditation

Supporting Authors:

Faculty and Staff
Teacher Education Program



April 17, 2015

* Accredited by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) until June, 2019.

Table of Content

List of Tables.....	iii
List of Figures.....	iv
List of Appendixes.....	v
Introduction.....	1
1. General information about the Teacher Education Program (TEP).....	3
1.1 Curriculum framework.....	3
1.2 Majors and requirements.....	7
1.3 General requirements.....	9
1.4 Alignment.....	12
1.5 Enrollment.....	19
1.6 Number of completers.....	20
1.7 Graduation rates.....	21
1.8 Retention rates.....	27
2. Accomplishment of Accreditation Standards 1 and 4 of CAEP and TEP’s Claims.....	33
2.1 TEP’s Claims and CAEP Accreditation Standards.....	35
2.2 Accreditation Standards of CAEP, TEP’s Claims and Methods of Assessment.....	35
2.3 Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge.....	54
2.4 Standard 4: Program Impact.....	94
3. Consumer information.....	108
References.....	111
Contact persons.....	121

List of Tables

Table 1	<i>Majors, Components and Total Credits of the TEP in the San Germán Campus (DEPR, 2015^d, pp. 120-123, 166-185, 216-219 & 258-262).....</i>	8
Table 2	<i>Graduation Grade Point Indexes (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 165).....</i>	12
Table 3	<i>TEP’s core courses alignment to the TEP’s Claims (2015), the DEPR standards (DEPR, 2006), and Standards of CAEP (2013).....</i>	13
Table 4	<i>TEP Enrollment (Academic Years 2011-12 to 2014-15).....</i>	19
Table 5	<i>Number of Completers of the Teacher Education Program (TEP), San Germán Campus (2011-2012 to 2013-2014).....</i>	19
Table 6	<i>Graduation Rates, TEP in San Germán Campus.....</i>	21
Table 7	<i>Retention Rates, TEP in San Germán Campus.....</i>	28
Table 8	<i>Alignment of Accreditation Standards of CAEP (2013) with TEP’s Claims (2015).....</i>	35
Table 9	<i>Accreditation Standards 1 and 2 of CAEP (2013), TEP’s Claims (2015) and Methods of Assessment.....</i>	36
Table 10	<i>PCMAS Passing Scores of TEP’s Teacher Candidates: Subject matter knowledge.....</i>	53
Table 11	<i>Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data Report of PCMAS for TEP’s Teacher Candidates of San Germán Campus: Specialization (Subject matter Knowledge).....</i>	55
Table 12	<i>Data for TEP’s Teachers Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge.....</i>	55
Table 13	<i>Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge.....</i>	56
Table 14	<i>Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge.....</i>	57
Table 15	<i>Assessments’ Summary for Claim 1.....</i>	58
Table 16	<i>Professional Competencies for Elementary and Secondary Level Performances of Teacher Candidates of the TEP that Passed PCMAS vs. the Statewide Population: Pedagogical Knowledge.....</i>	59
Table 17	<i>Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data Report of PCMAS for TEP’s Teacher Candidates of San Germán Campus: Professional Competencies</i>	

	<i>(Pedagogical Knowledge).....</i>	61
Table 18	<i>Data for TEP’s Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge (Professional Competencies).....</i>	61
Table 19	<i>Final Grades distribution in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED Courses.....</i>	62
Table 20	<i>Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC Core Courses (Academic Year 2013-2014).....</i>	63
Table 21	<i>Departmental Final Exams in EDUC Core Courses.....</i>	64
Table 22	<i>Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge.....</i>	65
Table 23	<i>Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge.....</i>	66
Table 24	<i>Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge.....</i>	67
Table 25	<i>Final Average Allotted of TEP’s Teacher Candidates by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers.....</i>	69
Table 26	<i>Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED Clinical Courses...</i>	70
Table 27	<i>Assessments’ Summary for Claim 2.....</i>	71
Table 28	<i>Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Disposition).....</i>	74
Table 29	<i>Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Disposition).....</i>	76
Table 30	<i>Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity (Caring and Effective Teaching Skills or Professional Disposition).....</i>	77
Table 31	<i>Assessments’ Summary for Claim 3.....</i>	78
Table 32	<i>Final grades distribution in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED Courses: Learning How to Learn.....</i>	79
Table 33	<i>Departmental Final Exams of EDUC 4012.....</i>	80
Table 34	<i>Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn.....</i>	81
Table 35	<i>Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn.....</i>	82

Table 36	<i>Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn.....</i>	82
Table 37	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.1.....</i>	83
Table 38	<i>Final Grades Distribution in EDUC and HPER Courses: Diversity.....</i>	85
Table 39	<i>Final Grades of TEP's Teacher Candidates in EDUC Core Courses (Academic Year 2013-2014): Diversity.....</i>	86
Table 40	<i>Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Diversity.....</i>	87
Table 41	<i>Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Diversity.....</i>	87
Table 42	<i>Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Diversity.....</i>	88
Table 43	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.2.....</i>	89
Table 44	<i>Final grades distribution in EDUC and HPER courses: Technology.....</i>	90
Table 45	<i>Final grades of TEP's Teacher Candidates in EDUC Core Courses (Academic Year 2013-2014): Technology.....</i>	91
Table 46	<i>Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Technology.....</i>	92
Table 47	<i>Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Technology.....</i>	92
Table 48	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.3.....</i>	93
Table 49	<i>Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Subject matter Knowledge.....</i>	95
Table 50	<i>Survey to School Directors: Subject matter Knowledge.....</i>	95
Table 51	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 1.....</i>	96
Table 52	<i>Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Pedagogical Knowledge.....</i>	97
Table 53	<i>Survey to School Directors: Pedagogical Knowledge.....</i>	98
Table 54	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 2.....</i>	98
Table 55	<i>Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions).....</i>	99
Table 56	<i>Survey to School Directors: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions).....</i>	100

Table 57	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 3</i>	101
Table 58	<i>Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Learning How to Learn</i>	102
Table 59	<i>Survey to School Directors: Learning How to Learn</i>	103
Table 60	<i>Continuation of Graduate Studies at IAUPR</i>	103
Table 61	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.1</i>	104
Table 62	<i>Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Diversity</i>	105
Table 63	<i>Survey to School Directors: Diversity</i>	106
Table 64	<i>Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.2</i>	106
Table 65	<i>Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Technology</i>	107

List of Figures

Figure I	TEP's Organizational Chart.....	2
-----------------	---------------------------------	----------

**ANNUAL REPORT OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM (TEP)
AT THE SAN GERMAN CAMPUS
OF THE INTER AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO
(For Academic Year 2013-2014, posted on April, 2015)**

Introduction

The TEP is an institutional program offered in eight campuses or institutional units of the Inter American University of Puerto Rico. Its conceptual framework is included in the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d). This program includes general education requirements, in addition to the major and core courses' components. The TEP is exactly the same for all campuses that are authorized to offer it.

The San Germán Campus offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in Preschool Level Education; Early Childhood Education (levels K-3rd and 4th-6th), Secondary Education (Biology, Chemistry, History Mathematics, Social Studies, Spanish and English); School Health; 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. These options or majors meet the requirements for teacher certification granted by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico (DEPR, 2012).

The TEP's organizational chart is presented in Figure I. It is one program that is administered by two academic departments. The Department of Education and Physical Education is in charge of the options or majors: Early Childhood: Pre-school, K-3rd and 4th-6th; Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL): Elementary and Secondary; Special Education; School Health; Physical Education: Elementary, Secondary, Adapted; and Secondary Education: Biology, Chemistry, History, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Spanish. The Department of Fine Arts administered the options or majors: Arts Education (Visual Arts), and Music Education (General-Vocal, and Instrumental).




Figure 1. TEP's Organizational Chart

1. General information about the Teacher Education Program (TEP)

1.1 Curriculum framework

In July 2014, the TEP was revised and established its Theoretical and Methodological frame. It is presented as follows (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 160-163):

The Teacher Education Program (TEP) of Inter American University of Puerto Rico (IAUPR) constitutes an answer to the needs and aspirations of a society in constant change and to the requirements of the Certification of Teachers Regulations of the Puerto Rico Department of Education. For this, it takes as its basis the Vision, the Mission and the Goals of IAUPR, the University's conception of an educated person, the Professional Standards of Teachers adopted by the Puerto Rico Department of Education, and the "Standards of Accreditation" of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Theoretical and Methodological Frame of the TEP

The Teacher Education Program has a psycho philosophical foundation of a behaviorist, constructivist and humanist character. This approach can be considered as an eclectic conceptual model, which allows the Program to integrate, in an organized way, principles of the three theoretical frames in its curricular designs and in its pedagogical practice leading to the formation of the future teacher. This frame of theoretical and methodological reference will serve as a guide of the TEP for decision making and actions related to its development and its curricular revision and assessment processes, in harmony with the highest standards of quality and educational excellence.

It could be indicated, that although the TEP is based on an eclectic conceptual paradigm, it gives more emphasis to the constructivist and humanist theoretical perspectives. Under the constructivist perspective the aspiring teacher is considered as an active and totally reflective person in his professional formation process. On the other hand, the humanist approach orients the educational process of the future teacher towards his integral development as a being human, in such a way, that he contributes his competencies of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to improve the quality of life of his students and society.

It is important to mention that during the last half of the last century, and during the part of the current century that has past, education in Puerto Rico has been framed, generally, in two learning theories: the behavioral theory and the cognitive theory. In the last decades the idea of a constructivist approach in learning and in the curriculum has acquired particular interest among educators. The psychological frame of constructivism is delimited by cognitive theories of learning, and within the curriculum of the TEP, it is founded on a humanist basis of education. From the perspective of the philosophy and psychology of education, constructivism presents a coherent explanation of how a person learns by means of an active process of construction of knowledge through significant experiences, whereas the humanist vision in the curriculum promotes the professional and social commitment of the future teacher to attend to the educational needs and interests of the diverse student populations, with sensitivity.

This implies that all teacher education programs must provide a wide variety of educational experiences for the academic formation of the aspiring teachers, directed toward the maximum development of a pedagogical culture. These practical and formative educational experiences will permit the future teacher to establish a connection between the theoretical knowledge and the pedagogical practice, in a pertinent context of human formation.

In order to give direction to its vision, mission and declaration of goals statements, the TEP uses the professional standards of teachers established by the Puerto Rico Department of Education and by the CAEP. These standards have as their main purpose to delineate the professional characteristics that the teacher must have to achieve that the students develop, in an integral way, their capacities and potentialities to the maximum in all dimensions as human beings, within a context of a culture of peace and acceptance of diversity. In addition, these standards establish the indicators of the qualities that the teachers must have to facilitate their students' learning of knowledge, skills and attitudes. It is important to indicate that the standards also serve the teacher as parameters for him to reflect on his continuous professional development and how this must be in harmony with the learning needs of his students.

In synthesis, the task of educational formation is a complex one and is a great social responsibility. In order to assume this responsibility, the TEP has designed a curriculum focused on how to prepare the teachers that society needs and demands, as an effective means to improve its quality of life.

Vision of the TEP

The Program aspires to develop a series of integrated educational experiences, focused on the professional formation of a teacher of excellence. That is to say, that the teacher will contribute to the educational scenario with his professional competencies of knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to promote changes and answers adapted to the educational environment. Primarily, the Program aims to prepare a teacher, who is knowledgeable of the problems of education in Puerto Rico and in other countries, in such a way that he will be able to collaborate in the process of constructive changes that will improve his quality of life and that of others.

Mission of the TEP

The Program is directed to the formation of teachers within a curriculum that provides an accumulation of articulated experiences which, at the same time, provides space for the construction of the pedagogical knowledge and content that will develop the future teacher. These experiences will be characterized by continuous reflection, practice in real scenarios, research, collaboration, relevance of the contents, pedagogical modeling and the search and use of means that will provide solutions to the typical problems of the teaching-learning processes in different contexts. In this curriculum the components of the general education, core and major courses will be integrated.

Goals of the TEP

In harmony with the vision and the mission for the TEP, the following goals, in coherence with the profile of competencies of graduates of the Program, are established.

1. Develop educational professionals focused on the mastery of the knowledge of the discipline within the context of a scientific, pedagogical and humanist culture.
2. Promote research, the management of information and the use of technology as means to generate the production and construction of knowledge that will result in the improvement of pedagogical practice within the education system.
3. Develop education professionals, who are sensitive to the needs and interests of the diverse social groups that exist in the population, within a context of human transformation.
4. Promote the solution of problem related to the educational environment within the frame of ethical, legal and social responsibility that regulates the profession.
5. Develop educational leaders committed to their professional development as a means to promote a better pedagogical practice and, therefore, a better quality of life within the context of a culture of peace.

General Objectives of the TEP

The Program aims to achieve the following general objectives:

1. Apply, in an integrated manner, theoretical and methodological knowledge to the pedagogical practice in the educational scenario.
2. Use research, the sources of information and technological advances on which to base the development of educational innovations.
3. Show an attitude of acceptance and sensitivity to the educational needs and interests presented by the diverse student populations.
4. Apply the ethical, legal and social dimensions in the processes of problem solving and decision making related to the practice of the profession in the different educational scenarios.
5. Show commitment to the continuous improvement of the required professional competencies in the field of education.

Profile of the Competencies of Graduates of the TEP

This Program is designed to develop the general competencies, tied to the core courses that will permit students to:

Knowledge

To know and understand:

1. The philosophical, psychological and sociological foundations that serve as a base for education and give direction to the pedagogical practice.

2. The processes of construction of cognitive, affective and psychomotor learning through the different stages of human development.
3. The importance of the creation of a harmonious physical and social environment that is adjusted to the diversity of the social groups and to the individual needs and interests of the students.
4. The laws, regulations and procedures of the educational system, as well as the ethical, legal and social implications of their professional performance.
5. The implications and importance of the integration of parents and other sectors of society in the educational task of the school community.

Skills

1. Integrate into the pedagogical practice the theoretical principles that serve as the basis for education.
2. Plan student learning by integrating educational strategies with a scientific base into instructional design.
3. Use a variety of teaching strategies to facilitate the effective learning of the complexity of the concepts, skills and attitudes of the subject matter they teach.
4. Apply the complementary processes of evaluation, assessment and measurement to determine the effectiveness of the teaching-learning processes and make decisions, which facilitate the improvement of all students' learning.
5. Apply research and the technological advances as resources to expand knowledge and to innovate and improve the pedagogical practice.
6. Use the existing computerized and educational resources to integrate technology in their teaching area or discipline.
7. Use a variety of educational and technological resources to facilitate learning in diverse student populations.
8. Use communication skills in an effective way to develop in the students the understanding of how they learn.

Attitudes

1. Show respect and tolerance to individual and cultural differences of students in the educational scenario.
2. Show a positive and binding attitude between professional development and the academic needs of the students.
3. Show a critical and creative attitude towards the management of information available in different sources related to the teaching discipline and to the field of education.
4. Assume leadership roles and professional responsibility in the different educational scenarios and communitarian contexts to promote learning and the integral development of students.

In the other hand, the IAUPR curriculum is composed of three interrelated components: general education, majors (specialization) and electives, which address the holistic development

of the student in terms of a liberal arts education (IAUPR, 2015^d). The TEP's curriculum consists of the following components:

1. General Education – The General Education Program emphasizes the development of a personal and social conscience, the refinement of communication skills, quantitative and philosophical thought; the use of technology as a means of access to information; the cultivation of ethical and esthetical sensitivity; the knowledge of principles of faith and Christian practice. This Program, which offers a comprehensive education of human knowledge, is structured on the following categories: Basic Skills; Philosophic and Esthetic Thought; Christian Thought; Historic and Social Context; Scientific and Technological Context; and Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Fifty four (54) credits are required in General Education for the TEP.
2. Core courses – This component includes the education courses that offer professional knowledge to the teacher candidate. Its areas are: Fundamental Knowledge, Methodology, and Field and Clinical Experiences. Two new courses were added titled EDUC 4551 *Integration of Basic Knowledge and Communication Skills* and EDUC 4552 *Integration of Professional Skills*. The approval of these courses is a requirement for obtaining authorization to take the Teacher Certification Standardized Tests known as *Pruebas para la Certificación de Maestros de Puerto Rico* (PCMAS, their Spanish acronym). It is also included the course HIST 3010 *Historical Process of the United States of America* which is required by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico for the teacher certification (DEPR, 2006).
3. Major courses – The major includes the courses oriented toward the specific subject-matter and pedagogical knowledge for the teacher candidate.
4. Specialization courses – The specialization requirement is present in the Physical Education Major, where the teacher candidate selects a specialized area (Adapted, Elementary Physical Education or Secondary Physical Education).
5. Electives courses – Electives refer to free courses that the teacher candidate can take according to his/her interests and needs.

1.2 Majors

The majors, components and total of credits of the TEP in the San Germán Campus are presented in Table 1. The difference in the number of credits is due to the process of curricular revision that the TEP underwent in the last years. The changes had taken into account the changes in the requirements of de DEPR for the teacher certification or license, and the areas that need to be strengthened according to the results of the Teacher Certification Standardized Tests (PCMAS).

Table 1

Majors, Components and Total Credits of the TEP in the San Germán Campus (DEPR, 2015^d, pp. 120-123, 166-185, 216-219 & 258-262)

Majors of TEP	Code	Components						Total Credits
		Gen. Education	Core	Major	Prescriptive Distributives	Specialization	Electives	
B.A. Early Childhood: Preschool Level (PK)	243	54	41	28	---	---	3	126
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (K-3)	236	54	41	29	---	---	3	127
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (4-6)	237	54	41	30	---	---	3	128
B.A. Secondary Education in Biology	174	51	41	48	---	---	3	143
B.A. Secondary Education in Chemistry	187	51	44	49	---	---	3	147
B.A. Secondary Education in History	144	48	38	39	---	---	6	131
B.A. Secondary Education in Mathematics	128	51	41	35	---	---	3	130
B.A. Secondary Education in Social Studies	177	51	38	36	---	---	3	128
B.A. Secondary Education in Spanish	145	51	41	37	---	---	3	132
B.A. Special Education	136	54	37	27	---	---	3	121
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Elementary Level	206	51	39	28	---	---	3	121
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Secondary Level	147	51	39	34	---	---	3	127
B.A. Adapted Physical Education	207	51	32	36	---	15	3	137
B.A. Physical Education at the Elementary Level	178	51	32	36	---	12	3	134
B.A. Physical Education at the Secondary Level	176	51	32	36	---	12	3	134
B.A. School Health	267	51	41	29	---	---	3	124
B.A. Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	51	39	48	---	---	3	141

Majors of TEP	Code	Components						Total Credits
		Gen. Education	Core	Major	Prescriptive Distributives	Specialization	Electives	
B.M. Music Education: General-Vocal**	192	48	31	65	6	---	3	153
B.M. Music Education: Instrumental**	191	48	31	65	6	---	3	153

* - Majors of the Academic Department of Fine Arts.

♦ - Change in the components of the BM (DEPR, 2015^d).

The general and specific requirements for TEP majors can be obtained in *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015d) at <http://documentos.inter.edu/docs/index.php?article=168>.

1.3 General requirements

1.3.1 Admission requirements for the Teacher Education Program

According to the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 163-164), all students admitted to the University that seek admission to the Teacher Education Program will be classified under the PRE-TEP until they are officially admitted to the TEP major of their interest. When requesting admission and readmission to the Teacher Education Program, students must meet the following requirements:

1. Have a minimum general point average of 2.50 at the university level.
2. Have earned a minimum of 18 university credits, among these are:
 - a. EDUC 1080 (Field Experience in the Educational Scenario I), or its equivalent, with a minimum grade of B.
 - b. EDUC 2021 (History and Philosophy of Education) or EDUC 2022 (Society and Education) or EDUC 2031 (Developmental Psychology), with a minimum grade of B.
 - c. GESP 1101 (Literature and Communication: Narrative and Essay) and 1102 (Literature and Communication: Poetry and Theater), with a minimum grade of B. 164
 - d. GEEN 1101 and 1102 (English as a Second Language I and II) or GEEN 1201 and 1202 (Development of English through Reading I and II) or GEEN 2311 (Reading and Writing) and 2312 (Literature and Writing) with a minimum grade of B. Students wishing to enter the Teaching of English as a Second Language at the Elementary Level program or the Teaching of English as a Second Language at the Secondary Level program must have passed the courses GEEN 2311 Reading and Writing and GEEN 2312 Literature and Writing.
3. Submit, in the corresponding academic department, the Application for Admission to the Teacher Education Program.

4. Students will have three (3) semesters or four (4) trimesters to complete the admission requirements. If they do not complete these requirements in the required time, they must choose another field of studies.

Additional Notes:

1. Students presenting official evidence of having worked under a teacher or assistant teacher contract during a semester or more will be exempt from taking the course EDUC 1080 – Field Experience in the Educational Scenario I.
2. Students in distance learning courses that require visits to schools must make the corresponding arrangements prior to registering in the courses.
3. The distance learning students of the teacher education program, who are candidates to take the courses of Clinical Experiences in Educational Scenario I and II, will take them in those schools designated by the University as Practice Centers. If there is no practice center available at their place of residence, the student must take them in the designated centers in Puerto Rico.

1.3.2 Retention requirements for the Teacher Education Program

According to the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 164), the retention requirements for the TEP are:

1. To remain in the Teacher Education Program, students must finish the academic year with a minimum general grade index as indicated below:
 - a. 47 credits or less: 2.50
 - b. 48-71 credits: 2.75
 - c. 72-95 credits: 2.90
 - d. 96 or more credits: 3.00.
2. Student must comply with the institutional norm of credits attempted and approved.
3. Students that do not meet the required grade point index to remain in the Program will be placed on probation for a period no greater than two academic semesters or three trimesters.
4. Students that do not reach the required grade point index during the probationary period will be dropped from the Teacher Education Program.
5. Students dropped from the Program may request admission to or change their major to another field of studies.

1.3.3 Admission requirements for the courses Clinical Experiences in the Educational Scenario II (EDUC 4013) or Practice Teaching (Applies to students admitted or readmitted to the Teacher Education Program starting in August of 2009)

According to the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 164), the admission requirements for Clinical Experiences courses are:

1. Have passed the Core Course Requirements of the Program, except EDUC 4551 and 4552.
2. Have passed the Major Requirements.
3. Have a minimum grade point average of 3.00.
4. Have a minimum grade point average of 3.00 in the Core Course Requirements, in the Major Requirements and in the Specialization Requirements.
5. Submit the Application for Admission and have the approval of the Practice Teaching Coordinator or Supervisor.

Students in online programs that are candidates for practice teaching must adhere to the requirements established in this Catalog and the regulations of the Department of Education of Puerto Rico. Nonresidents of Puerto Rico must inquire on the procedures established in their place of residence and complete the proper proceedings. The location of the clinical experience courses will be subject to the approval of the Institution as well as of the pertinent school authorities.

Public as well as private schools serve as daytime laboratories for the students to acquire experience in the area of teaching and learning.

1.3.4 Graduation requirements of the Teacher Education Program

According to the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 165), in order to fulfill the requirements for graduation for the Bachelor of Arts Degree in the Teacher Education Programs, every student that is a candidate for graduation from any of the majors of the Teacher Education Programs, who have been admitted or readmitted since August of 2009, must:

1. Have obtained a minimum general grade point average of 3.00.
2. Have obtained a minimum grade point average of 3.00 in the core course requirements.
3. Have obtained a minimum grade point average of 3.00 in the major and specialization.

4. Have earned a minimum grade of B in the course of Clinical Experiences II Practice Teaching course). Graduation Grade Point Indexes for Students Admitted or Re-admitted to the Teacher Education Program before August of 2009.

The graduation Grade Point Indexes (GPI) for students admitted or re-admitted to the Teacher Education Program before August of 2009 are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Graduation Grade Point Indexes for TEP's Students (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 165)

Academic year of Graduation	General index in Core, Major and Specialization
2009-2011	2.50
2011-2013	2.80
2013-2014 and beyond	3.00

1.3.5 Teacher Certification of Puerto Rico

According to the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015d, p. 165), students interested in obtaining the teacher certification to teach in Puerto Rico, must fulfill the current requirements of the Department of Education of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Likewise, students who wish to obtain a teaching certification of another territory, state of the United States of North America or another place of origin, must meet the requirements established in the corresponding jurisdiction. Minor, Alternate Method and Recertification Student interested in completing a Minor in Education, or in being certified by the Alternate Method or in being recertified must have a minimum general average of 3.00.

1.3.6 Minor, Alternate Method and Recertification

According to the *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d, p. 165), student interested in completing a Minor in Education, or in being certified by the Alternate Method or in being recertified must have a minimum general average of 3.00.

1.4 Alignment

The Education, Art Education and Music Education core courses of the TEP are aligned with the TEP's claims (2015), the Professional Standards of Teachers in Puerto Rico (DEPR, 2008), and the Standards of CAEP (2013) and InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards (2011). Specific courses descriptions can be obtained in *General Catalog 2013-2015* (IAUPR, 2015^d) at <http://documentos.inter.edu/docs/index.php?article=168>. The Table 3 presents this alignment.

Table 3

TEP's core courses alignment to the TEP's Claims (2015), the DEPR standards (DEPR, 2006), and Standards of CAEP (2013) and InTASC (2011)

TEP's Core Courses	TEP's Claims (2015)[♦]	Professional Standards of Teachers (DEPR, 2008)[Ⓞ]	Standards of CAEP (2013) and of InTASC *
Fundamentals of Education			
EDUC 2021 HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION	1	2	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 5, 9
EDUC 2022 SOCIETY AND EDUCATION	1, 4.2	2, 4	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 2, 3, 5, 9
EDUC 2031 DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY	1, 4.2	2	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5
EDUC 2032 LEARNING PSYCHOLOGY	1, 4.2	2, 4, 5	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5
EDUC 2870 THE EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT POPULATION	1, 4.2	4, 5	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5
Methodology			
EDUC 2060 USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION	2, 4.1, 4.3	5, 7, 10	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 3, 5, 8
EDUC 3013 TEACHING STRATEGIES	2, 4.1, 4.3	3	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3187 ENGLISH CURRICULUM, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL (K-6)	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3188 ENGLISH CURRICULUM, TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3470 TECHNOLOGICAL ASSISTANCE, CURRICULUM AND MATERIALS FOR TEACHING STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8

TEP's Core Courses	TEP's Claims (2015)[♦]	Professional Standards of Teachers (DEPR, 2008)[Ⓞ]	Standards of CAEP (2013) and of InTASC *
EDUC 3564 METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING SOCIAL SCIENCES	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3565 METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING HISTORY	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3566 METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING CHEMISTRY	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3570 TEACHING STRATEGIES, METHODS AND TECHNIQUES FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3863 INSTRUCTIONAL THEORY, METHODOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN THE TEACHING OF BIOLOGY	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3869 INSTRUCTIONAL THEORY, METHODOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN THE TEACHING OF MATHEMATICS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3875 EDUCATIONAL THEORY, METHODOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN THE TEACHING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL 7-12	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3878 METHODOLOGY AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN THE TEACHING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AT THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3885 EDUCATIONAL THEORIES AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES FOR THE TEACHING OF ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 3886	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1

TEP's Core Courses	TEP's Claims (2015)♦	Professional Standards of Teachers (DEPR, 2008)º	Standards of CAEP (2013) and of InTASC *
EDUCATIONAL THEORY, METHODOLOGY, AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES IN TEACHING SCHOOL HEALTH (K-12)			InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 4011 EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 5, 6, 9
EDUC 4012 CLASSROOM RESEARCH	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10
EDUC 4035 METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING THE MATERNAL LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
EDUC 4050 CURRICULUM DESIGN	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
ARED 1900 FUNDAMENTALS OF ART EDUCATION	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
ARED 3750 EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY IN ART TEACHING	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8
ARED 3850 METHODS OF TEACHING ART IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
ARED 3851 METHODS IN ART EDUCATION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
ARED 4015 EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH IN ART TEACHING	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
MUED 4400 ELEMENTARY METHODS: THE TEACHING OF MUSIC or MUED 4401 ELEMENTARY METHODS: THE TEACHING OF MUSIC	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
MUED 4410 SECONDARY METHODS: THE TEACHING OF MUSIC or MUED 4411 SECONDARY METHODS: THE TEACHING OF MUSIC	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
MUED 4436 TECHNOLOGY IN MUSIC	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1

TEP's Core Courses	TEP's Claims (2015) [♦]	Professional Standards of Teachers (DEPR, 2008) [Ⓞ]	Standards of CAEP (2013) and of InTASC *
EDUCATION			InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 5, 8
HPER 2210 FUNDAMENTALS OF THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION DISCIPLINE AND PROFESSION, FUNCTION OF THE TEACHER IN THE DISCIPLINE AND IN SOCIETY	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
HPER 3220 THEORY AND DESIGN OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR THE ELEMENTARY LEVEL K-6	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
HPER 3230 THEORY AND DESIGN OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS LEVEL 7-12	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
HPER 4110 EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION K-6	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
HPER 4120 EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION 7-12	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
HPER 4130 EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF ADAPTED PHYSICAL EDUCATION	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
HPER 4140 ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION AND RESEARCH OF TEACHING AND LEARNING IN SCHOOL HEALTH EDUCATION	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
HPER 4370 THE TEACHING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS	2, 4.3	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
Field and Clinical Experiences			
EDUC 1080 FIELD EXPERIENCES IN THE EDUCATIONAL SCENARIO I	1.2, 1.3	4, 5	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3
EDUC 2890 FIELD EXPERIENCES IN THE EDUCATIONAL SCENARIOS II	1.2, 1.3	4, 5	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3

TEP's Core Courses	TEP's Claims (2015)♦	Professional Standards of Teachers (DEPR, 2008)Ⓞ	Standards of CAEP (2013) and of InTASC *
EDUC 3015 CLINICAL EXPERIENCES IN THE EDUCATIONAL SCENARIO I	1.2, 1.3, 4.2	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
EDUC 4013 CLINICAL EXPERIENCES IN THE EDUCATIONAL SCENARIO II	1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
ARED 1080 FIELD EXPERIENCES IN ART EDUCATION I	1.2, 1.3	4, 5	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3
ARED 2080 FIELD EXPERIENCES IN ART EDUCATION II	1.2, 1.3	4, 5	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3
ARED 3080 CLINICAL EXPERIENCES IN ART EDUCATION I	1.2, 1.3, 4.2	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
ARED 4913 CLINICAL EXPERIENCES ART EDUCATION II	1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
MUED 1091 FIELD EXPERIENCES IN MUSIC EDUCATION I	1.2, 1.3	4, 5	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3
MUED 2080 FIELD EXPERIENCES IN MUSIC EDUCATION II	1.2, 1.3	4, 5	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3
MUED 3080 CLINICAL EXPERIENCES IN MUSIC EDUCATION	1.2, 1.3, 4.2	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
MUED 4915 STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC: GENERAL-VOCAL or MUED 4919 STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC: GENERAL-VOCAL	1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
MUED 4916 STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC: INSTRUMENTAL or MUED 4920 STUDENT TEACHING IN MUSIC: INSTRUMENTAL	1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11	CAEP: 1, 2 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
Integration Courses			

TEP's Core Courses	TEP's Claims (2015) [❖]	Professional Standards of Teachers (DEPR, 2008) [⊕]	Standards of CAEP (2013) and of InTASC *
EDUC 4551 INTEGRATION OF BASIC KNOWLEDGE AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS	4.1	8	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
EDUC 4552 INTEGRATION OF PROFESSIONAL SKILLS	1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10	CAEP: 1 InTASC: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

❖ - TEP's Claims (march, 2015):

1. *Subject Matter Knowledge*: Teacher candidates and the completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate knowledge in their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% ("B", above average attainment) or more.
2. *Pedagogical Knowledge*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and the required skills to apply them to the teaching of their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.
3. *Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate commitment and positive attitudes toward their students and to teaching and professional development by achieving a performance of 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.
- 4.1 *Cross-cutting Theme Learning How to Learn*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned how to access information on their own (research), that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the attitudes and skills that will support life-long learning in their field by achieving a performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.
- 4.2 *Cross-cutting Theme Diversity*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of diversity (race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives) by achieving a performance of above average attainment, or satisfactory or more.
- 4.3 *Cross-cutting Theme Technology*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP are able to use classroom technology by achieving performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.

⊕ - Professional Standards of Teachers of Puerto Rico (DEPR, 2008):

- Standard 1: Subject matter Knowledge
- Standard 2: Pedagogical Knowledge
- Standard 3: Instructional Strategies
- Standard 4: Learning Environments
- Standard 5: Diversity and Special Needs
- Standard 6: Evaluation and Assessment
- Standard 7: Integration of Technology
- Standard 8: Communication and Language
- Standard 9: Family and Community
- Standard 10: Information Management
- Standard 11: Professional Development

★ - Standards of CAEP (2013):

- Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge
- Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice

- Standard 3: Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity
- Standard 4: Program Impact
- Standard 5: Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement
- InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards (2011):
 - Standard 1: Learner Development
 - Standard 2: Learning Differences
 - Standard 3: Learning Environment
 - Standard 4: Content Knowledge
 - Standard 5: Application of Knowledge
 - Standard 6: Assessment
 - Standard 7: Planning for Instruction
 - Standard 8: Instructional Strategies
 - Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice
 - Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration

1.5 Enrollment

The enrollment of active students (admitted and enrolled, not duplicated) for each major in academic years 2010-2011 (base-line data) to 2013-2014 is presented in Table 4 (April, 2015^c). The number of enrolled students in the TEP has oscillated between 411 (2011-2012) to 09 (2012-2013), but in the last three academic years the numbers have decreased.

Table 4

TEP Enrollment (Academic Years 2011-12 to 2014-15)[□]

Majors of TEP	Code	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Mathematics	128	15	16	11	12
BA in Special Education	136	15	23	28	24
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of History	144	9	19	20	13
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	14	17	20	22
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of English as Second Language	147	12	26	31	34
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	4	6	10	7
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High [♦]	175	3	1	1	1
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	22	31	21	20
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	1	9	7	6
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Elementary Level	178	18	32	22	26
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	1	1	2	0
BM in Music Education: Instrumental [*]	191	78	74	70	60
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal [*]	192	102	99	102	93
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching English as Second Language	206	10	11	10	10
BA in Adapted Physical Education	207	8	17	12	12
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level K-3	236	27	44	40	37

Majors of TEP	Code	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	11	14	7	9
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	24	33	30	21
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	27	26	25	20
BA in Education: School Health	267	10	10	6	7
TEP Active Students (Admitted and Enrolled, not duplicated)		411	509	475	434

☑ - Data was revised and corrected by the Office of Planning, Academic Information and of Research, IAUPR, (2015^c)

◆ - Major change in 2014: Eliminated after moratorium accepted by the Council of Education in Puerto Rico

* - Majors of the Academic Department of Fine Arts

1.6 Completers

The number of completers for each major in academic years 2010-11 (base-line data) to 2013-2014 is presented in Table 5 (April, 2015^d). The number of completers in the TEP has decreased.

Table 5

Number of Completers of the Teacher Education Program (TEP), San Germán Campus (2011-2012 to 2013-2014) [☑]

Majors of TEP	Code	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
B.A. Early Childhood: Pre-school Level	243	6	3	5
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (K-3)	236	8	4	5
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (4-6)	237	3	3	0
B.A. Secondary Education in Biology	174	4	0	1
B.A. Secondary Education in Chemistry	187	0	0	1
B.A. Secondary Education in History	144	1	0	2
B.A. Secondary Education in Mathematics	128	6	6	0
B.A. Secondary Education in Science in the Junior High School◆	175	0	0	1
B.A. Secondary Education in Social Studies	177	0	2	0
B.A. Secondary Education in Spanish	145	7	0	1
B.A. Adapted Physical Education	207	1	1	1
B.A. Physical Education at the Elementary Level	178	6	3	4
B.A. Physical Education at the Secondary Level	176	6	5	5
B.A. School Health	267	3	5	1
B.A. Special Education	136	6	1	3
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Elementary Level	206	3	0	1
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Secondary Level	147	1	3	1

Majors of TEP	Code	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
B.A. Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	5	3	4
B.M. Music Education: General–Vocal*	192	8	9	12
B.M. Music Education: Instrumental*	191	5	7	6
Total of Students		79	55	54

☑ - Data was revised and corrected by the Office of Planning, Academic Information and of Research, IAUPR, (2015^a)

* - Majors of the Academic Department of Fine Arts

♦ - Major change in 2014: Eliminated after moratorium accepted by the Council of Education in Puerto Rico.

1.7 Graduation rates

The Institutional Office for Student Retention (IAUPR, 201^b) prepared a report for the graduation rates of TEP at the San Germán Campus. The analysis of the rates applied the same methodology and standards used for the *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System* (IPEDS). The graduation rates were calculated for students enrolled in TEP majors who graduated in 6 or less years, and for student who changed of major but remained in the TEP. Data are presented in Table 6. The graduation rates were: 20% for Cohort 2006, 19% for Cohort 2007, and 19% for Cohort 2008 (Mean=19%).

Table 6

Graduation Rates of TEP, San Germán Campus

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
Cohort: 2006							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Mathematics	128	5	3	60%	0	0%	60%
BA in Special Education	136	9	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of History	144	8	2	25%	2	25%	50%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	4	1	25%	1	25%	50%
BA in Sec.	147	8	0	0%	0	0%	0%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
Educ: Teach of English as Second Language							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	6	1	17%	0	0%	17%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High [♦]	175	2	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	15	1	7%	0	0%	7%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	N/A					
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Elementary Level	178	9	2	22%	0	0%	22%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	N/A					
BM in Music Education: Instrumental [*]	191	22	2	9%	1	5%	14%
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal [*]	192	13	2	15%	0	0%	15%
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching English as	206	6	1	17%	1	17%	34%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
Second Language							
BA in Adapted Physical Education	207	5	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level K-3	236	19	5	26%	1	5%	31%
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	4	0	0%	2	50%	50%
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	4	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	5	1	20%	0	0%	20%
BA in Education: School Health	267	3	1	33%	0	0%	33%
Total Cohort 2006		147	22	15%	8	5%	20%
Cohort: 2007							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Mathematics	128	8	1	13%	0	0%	13%
BA in Special Education	136	6	2	33%	0	0%	33%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of History	144	7	1	14%	1	14%	28%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of English as Second Language	147	5	0	0%	0	0%	0%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	4	0	0%	1	25%	25%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High♦	175	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	11	1	9%	1	9%	18%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	N/A					
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Elementary Level	178	8	1	13%	0	0%	13%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	1	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BM in Music Education: Instrumental*	191	20	2	10%	0	0%	10%
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal*	192	24	6	25%	0	0%	25%
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching English as Second Language	206	3	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Adapted	207	3	0	0%	0	0%	0%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
Physical Education							
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level K-3	236	19	5	26%	0	0%	26%
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	3	1	33%	0	0%	33%
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	4	2	50%	0	0%	50%
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	6	1	17%	0	0%	17%
BA in Education: School Health	267	N/A					
Total Cohort 2007		132	23	17%	3	2%	19%
Cohort: 2008							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Mathematics	128	5	1	20%	0	0%	20%
BA in Special Education	136	6	0	0%	1	17%	17%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of History	144	5	0	0%	1	20%	20%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	5	2	40%	0	0%	40%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of English as Second Language	147	3	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	3	0	0%	0	0%	0%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High [♦]	175	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	15	1	7%	0	0%	7%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	N/A					
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Elementary Level	178	6	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	2	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BM in Music Education: Instrumental*	191	19	2	11%	1	5%	16%
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal*	192	19	2	11%	0	0%	11%
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching English as Second Language	206	2	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Adapted Physical Education	207	5	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Teach Elementary	236	9	2	22%	1	11%	33%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Graduation in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in 6 years or less	Graduation in other major in 6 years or less	Graduation Rate in other major in 6 years or less	Total Graduation Rate for Majors of TEP in 6 years or less
Primary Level K-3							
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	1	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	4	2	50%	0	0%	50%
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254		4	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Education: School Health	267	1	0	0%	0	0%	0%
Total Cohort 2008		110	16	15%	4	4%	19%
Mean							19%

◆ - Major change in 2014: Eliminated after moratorium accepted by the Council of Education in Puerto Rico

* - Majors of the Academic Department of Fine Arts

N/A = No enrollement

1.8 Retention rates

The Institutional Office for Student Retention (IAUPR, 201^h) prepared a report for the retention rates of TEP at the San Germán Campus. The analysis of the rates was applied the same methodology and standards used for the *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System* (IPEDS). The retention rates were calculated for students enrolled in TEP majors who remained in the Campus after the first year of studies, and for student who changed of major but remained in the TEP and in the Campus after the first year of studies. Data are presented in Table 7. The retention rates were: 50% for Cohort 2011, 67% for Cohort 2012, and 56% for Cohort 2013 (Mean=58%).

Table

Retention Rates of TEP, San Germán Campus

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Retention	Retention Rate	Retention in other major	Retention Rate	Total Retention Rate for Majors of TEP
Cohort: 2011							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Mathematics	128	4	0	75%	0	0%	75%
BA in Special Education	136	1	1	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of History	144	3	1	33%	0	0%	33%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	2	2	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of English as Second Language	147	2	2	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High♦	175	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	5	2	40%	0	0%	40%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	N/A					
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of	178	7	2	29%	0	0%	29%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Retention	Retention Rate	Retention in other major	Retention Rate	Total Retention Rate for Majors of TEP
Physical Education at Elementary Level							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	N/A					
BM in Music Education: Instrumental*	191	11	7	64%	0	0%	64%
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal*	192	14	7	50%	0	0%	50%
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching English as Second Language	206	1	1	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Adapted Physical Education	207	3	1	33%	1	33%	66%
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level K-3	236	8	5	63%	0	0%	63%
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	2	1	50%	0	0%	50%
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	5	1	20%	0	0%	20%
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	1	0	0%	0	0%	0%
BA in Education: School Health	267	N/A					
Total Cohort 2011		69	34	49%	1	1%	50%
Cohort: 2012							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach	128	1	1	100%	0	0%	100%

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Retention	Retention Rate	Retention in other major	Retention Rate	Total Retention Rate for Majors of TEP
of Mathematics							
BA in Special Education	136	3	3	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of History	144	1	1	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	1	1	100%	0	0%	100%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of English as Second Language	147	5	3	60%	0	0%	60%
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High♦	175	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	4	1	25	0	0	25
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	2	2	100	0	0	100
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Elementary Level	178	2	1	50	0	0	50
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	N/A					

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Retention	Retention Rate	Retention in other major	Retention Rate	Total Retention Rate for Majors of TEP
BM in Music Education: Instrumental*	191	9	6	67	0	0	67
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal*	192	12	8	67	0	0	67
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching English as Second Language	206	2	2	100	0	0	100
BA in Adapted Physical Education	207	2	1	50	0	0	50
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level K-3	236	5	2	40	0	0	40
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	N/A					
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	5	2	40	1	20	60
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	3	2	67	0	0	67
BA in Education: School Health	267	N/A					
Total Cohort 2012		54	35	65%	1	2%	67%
Cohort: 2013							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Mathematics	128	2	2	100	0	0	100
BA in Special Education	136	4	3	75	0	0	75
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of	144	1	1	100	0	0	100

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Retention	Retention Rate	Retention in other major	Retention Rate	Total Retention Rate for Majors of TEP
History							
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Spanish	145	4	2	50	0	0	50
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of English as Second Language	147	10	6	60	1	10	70
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Biology	174	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teach Science Junior High♦	175	N/A					
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Secondary Level	176	3	1	33	0	0	33
25BA in Sec. Educ: Teach of Social Studies	177	N/A					
BA in Elementary Educ: Teaching of Physical Education at Elementary Level	178	1	0	0	0	0	0
BA in Sec. Educ: Teaching Of Chemistry	187	1	0	0	1	100	100
BM in Music Education: Instrumental*	191	14	7	50	1	7	57
BM in Music Education: General-Vocal*	192	10	6	60	0	0	60
BA in	206	N/A					

Majors of TEP	Code	N	Retention	Retention Rate	Retention in other major	Retention Rate	Total Retention Rate for Majors of TEP
Elementary Educ: Teaching English as Second Language							
BA in Adapted Physical Education	207	4	1	25	0	0	25
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level K-3	236	7	6	86	0	0	86
BA in Teach Elementary Primary Level 4-6	237	N/A					
BA in Early Childhood: Pre-School Level	243	3	0	0	1	33	33
BA in Visual Arts: Art Education*	254	2	0	0	0	0	0
BA in Education: School Health	267	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total Cohort 2013		67	35	52%	3	4%	56%
Mean							58%

◆ - Major change in 2014: Eliminated after moratorium accepted by the Council of Education in Puerto Rico

★ - Majors of the Academic Department of Fine Arts

N/A = No enrollement

2. Accomplishment of Accreditation Standards 1 and 4 of CAEP (2013) and TEP's Claims (2015)

2.1 TEP's Claims (2015) and CAEP Accreditation Standards (2013)

The TEP's Claims (revised in March 2015) are the followings:

- Claim 1. *Subject matter knowledge*: Teacher candidates and the completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate knowledge in their subject matter by

- achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (“B”, above average attainment) or more.
- Claim 2. *Pedagogical knowledge*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and the required skills to apply them to the teaching of their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.
 - Claim 3. *Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate commitment and positive attitudes toward their students and to teaching and professional development by achieving a performance of 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.
 - Claim 4.1 *Cross-cutting theme Learning How to Learn*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned how to access information on their own (research), that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the attitudes and skills that will support life-long learning in their field by achieving a performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.
 - Claim 4.2 *Cross-cutting theme Diversity*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of diversity (race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives) by achieving a performance of above average attainment, or satisfactory or more.
 - Claim 4.3 *Cross-cutting theme Technology*: Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP are able to use classroom technology by achieving performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.

The Standards of CAEP (2013) are the followings:

- Standard 1. *Content and Pedagogical Knowledge*: The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.
- Standard 2. *Clinical Partnerships and Practice*: The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students’ learning and development.
- Standard 3: *Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity*: The provider demonstrates that the quality of candidates is a continuing and purposeful part of its responsibility from recruitment, at admission, through the progression of courses and clinical experiences, and to decisions that completers are prepared to teach effectively and are recommended for certification. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator

preparation in all phases of the program. This process is ultimately determined by a program’s meeting of Standard 4.

- Standard 4: *Program Impact*: The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.
- Standard 5: *Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement*: The provider maintains a quality assurance system comprised of valid data from multiple measures, including evidence of candidates’ and completers’ positive impact on P-12 student learning and development. The provider supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based, and that evaluates the effectiveness of its completers. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements and capacity, and test innovations to improve completers’ impact on P-12 student learning and development.

Table 8 presents the alignment between accreditation standards of CAEP and the TEP’s claims and the Inquiry Brief pathway.

Table 8

Alignment of Accreditation Standards of CAEP (2013) with TEP’s Claims (2015)

CAEP’s Accreditation Standards	TEP’s Inquiry Brief Pathway
Standard 1 – Content and Pedagogical Knowledge	Claims 1, 2, 3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
Standard 2 – Clinical Partnerships and Practice	Appendix 1: Internal audit report
Standard 3 – Candidate Quality, Recruitment, and Selectivity	Appendix: Internal audit of the quality assurance system
Standard 4 – Program Impact	Claims 1, 2, 3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3
Standard 5 – Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement	Section 2: Claims and rationale Section 3: Methods of assessment Appendix 1: Internal audit report Appendix 2: Inventory of evidence Appendix 3: Locally developed assessment instruments

2.2 Accreditation Standards 1 and 4 of CAEP, TEP’s Claims and Methods of Assessment

The alignment between the Accreditation Standards 1 and 4 of CAEP with TEP’s claims and the methods of Assessment are presented in Table 9. Data for these Standards and Claims are included in annual report 2013-2014 (posted in April, 2015).

Table 7

Accreditation Standards 1 & 2 of CAEP (2013), TEP's Claims (2015) and Methods of Assessment

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items
Standard 1: CONTENT AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE <i>The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all students toward attainment of college- and career-readiness standards.</i>	Claim 1. Subject matter Knowledge			
	1. Teacher Certification Standardized Tests (PCMAS)	Standardized test by the College Board for the certification of teachers in the Department of Education of Puerto Rico. The PCMAS are offered each year in March.	Cut-scores established by the DEPR as the state licensing agency to teachers. These cut-scores are of obligatory achievement in order to approve each part of the standardized test. Scale for Major competencies (subject-matter content): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish = 93.0 of 160 • English = 98.0 of 160 • Mathematics = 88.0 of 160 • Science = 94.0 of 160 • Social Studies = 96.0 of 160 	Major competencies (subject-matter content): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish • English • Mathematics • Science • Social Studies
	2. Teacher Certification Standardized Tests (PCMAS) of Completers	Completers' performance in the Standardized test by the College Board for the certification of teachers in the Department of Education of Puerto Rico.	Cut-scores established by the DEPR as the state licensing agency to teachers. These cut-scores are of obligatory achievement in order to approve each part of the standardized test. Scale for Major competencies (subject-matter content): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish = 93.0 of 160 • English = 98.0 of 160 • Mathematics = 88.0 of 160 • Science = 94.0 of 160 • Social Studies = 96.0 of 160 	Major competencies (subject-matter content): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spanish • English • Mathematics • Science • Social Studies
	3. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: A.3 & A.5
4. Portfolio Rubric: Subject	Teacher candidates self-check with check by	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their	Item: I.1	

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items
	matter Knowledge	University Supervisors in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	competencies as teachers. Scale: All evidence satisfies the criterion (4); most of the evidence satisfies the criterion (3); some evidence does not satisfy the criterion (2); no evidence presented satisfies the criterion (1); no evidence found (0)	
Claims: 2. Pedagogical Knowledge				
	5. Teacher Certification Standardized Tests (PCMAS): Professional Competence (Pedagogical Knowledge)	Standardized test by the College Board for the certification of teachers in the Department of Education of Puerto Rico. The PCMAS are offered each year in March.	Cut-scores established by the DEPR as the state licensing agency to teachers. These cut-scores are of obligatory achievement in order to approve each part of the standardized test. Scale for Pedagogical competencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary = 89.0 of 160 Secondary = 87.0 of 160 	Pedagogical competencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational philosophy Human development Psychology of Education Sociology of Education Methodology, strategies and teaching techniques Learning evaluation Education research
	6. Aggregate Assessment Level Pass-Rate for Professional Competence (Pedagogical Knowledge) in PCMAS	Standardized test by the College Board for the certification of teachers in the Department of Education of Puerto Rico. The PCMAS are offered each year in March.	The proportion of program teacher candidates who passed all the tests they took in each knowledge area, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area.	Pedagogical competencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational philosophy Human development Psychology of Education Sociology of Education Methodology, strategies and teaching techniques Learning evaluation Education research
	7. Teacher Certification Standardized Tests (PCMAS) of Teacher Candidates: Professional Competence (Pedagogical Knowledge)	Performance of teacher candidates in the Standardized test by the College Board for the certification of teachers in the Department of Education of Puerto Rico.	Cut-scores established by the DEPR as the state licensing agency to teachers. These cut-scores are of obligatory achievement in order to approve each part of the standardized test. Scale for Pedagogical competencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary = 89.0 of 160 Secondary = 87.0 of 160 	Pedagogical competencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational philosophy Human development Psychology of Education Sociology of Education Methodology, strategies and teaching techniques Learning evaluation Education research
	8. Final grades	Table of Final Grades	Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of	Courses:

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
	distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED courses	using the document of Registrar Office <i>SWDGDIS</i>	<p>TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses.</p> <p>Grading system:</p> <p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^o). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	<p>Fundamentals of Education: EDUC 2021, 2022,2031, 2032, 2870</p> <p>Methodology: EDUC 2060, 3013, 3185, 3186, 3187, 3188, 3470, 3564, 3565, 3566, 3570, 3863, 3869, 3875, 3878, 3885, 3886, 4011, 4035, 4050; HPER 2210, 3220, 3230, 4110, 4120, 4130, 4140, 4370; ARED 1900, 3750, 3850, 3851, 4015; MUED 4400/4401, 4410/4411, 4436</p> <p>Integration courses: EDUC 4551, 4551</p>
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	9. Final grades of TEP's teacher candidates in EDUC core courses	Table of Final Grades in EDUC core courses using the documents of SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR	<p>Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses.</p> <p>Grading system:</p> <p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p>	<p>Courses:</p> <p>Fundamentals in Education: EDUC 2021, 2022, 2031, 2032, 2870</p> <p>Methodology: EDUC 3013, 4011, 4050</p> <p>Integration: EDUC 4551, 4552</p> <p>Field & Clinical Experiences: EDUC 1080, 2890, 3015</p>												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
			<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^c). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	10. Departmental exams in EDUC core courses	Table of departmental exams' punctuations, and descriptive and inference statistics	<p>Each departmental exam measures the pedagogical knowledge of TEP's students in EDUC core courses. They are aligned to PCMAS's content. All exams have adequate to high reliability (Küder-Richardson 21 Coefficient, KR₂₁)</p> <p>Grading system:</p> <p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pages 68-69.)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	Core courses: EDUC 2021, 2022, 2031, 2032, 2870, 3013, 3015, 4011, 4050
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	11. Survey to students of	Questionnaires with Likert type scale	The students express their perception of the performance of their teacher candidate in the	Items: • PK: 1, 3, 4, 5												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items						
	teacher candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge		final clinical course. Scales: PK, K-3 rd and 4 th -12 th = Yes (2); Sometimes (1); No (0)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-3: 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 • 4th-12th: 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 						
	12. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: A.4, A.6, A.13						
	13. Portfolio Rubric: Pedagogical Knowledge	Teacher candidates self-check with check by University Supervisors in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scale: All evidence satisfies the criterion (4); most of the evidence satisfies the criterion (3); some evidence does not satisfy the criterion (2); no evidence presented satisfies the criterion (1); no evidence found (0)	Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I.2, I.3 • II.a.1, II.a.2, II.a.3, • II.b.1 • II.c.1, II.c.2, II.c.4 						
	14. Final evaluation of teacher candidates in Clinical Experience Course courses	Scale filled by university supervisors and by cooperating teachers which includes their global evaluation in the final clinical course	Final overall evaluation of teacher candidates' work in the final clinical course. Grading system: A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour. B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour. C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour. D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour. F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour. Scale: <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Scores</td> <td>Grades</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> </table>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	Final Average allotted by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers in EDUC 4013 and ARED 4013
Scores	Grades									
100-90%	A									
89-80%	B									

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pages 68-69.)</p>	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F							
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	15. Final grades distribution in Clinical Experiences courses	Table of Final Grades in Clinical Experiences courses using the document of Registrar Office <i>SWDGDIS</i>	<p>Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, ARED and MUED clinical courses.</p> <p>Grading system:</p> <p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	Clinical courses: EDUC 4013, ARED 4013, MUED 4915/4919, MUED 4916/4920
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
Claim 3. Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)																
	16. Survey to students of teacher candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills	Questionnaires with Likert type scale	<p>The students express their perception of the performance of their teacher candidate in the final clinical course.</p> <p>Scales:</p> <p>PK, K-3rd and 4th-12th = Yes (2); Sometimes (1); No (0)</p>	<p>Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PK: 2, 6, 7 • K-3: 1, 3, 10 • 4th-12th: 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 13 												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items
	(Professionals Dispositions)			
	17. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professionals Dispositions)	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • A.8, A.11, A.12 • B.15, B.16, B.19
	18. Rubric – Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity (Professional Disposition)	Evaluation by university supervisors and cooperating teachers in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	University supervisors and cooperating teachers evaluate each Teacher Candidate in this aspect. Scale: PK = Yes (2); Sometimes (1); No (0)	Items: 1-3, 5, 9, 12-14
Claim 4.1 Cross-Cutting Theme: Learning How to Learn				
	19. Final grades distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED courses	Table of Final Grades using the document of Registrar Office <i>SWDGDIS</i>	Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses. Grading system: A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour. B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour. C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour. D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour. F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour. Scale:	Methodology courses: EDUC 4012; ARED 4015; HPER 4110, 4120, 4130, 4140

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	20. Final grades of TEP's teacher candidates in EDUC core courses	Table of Final Grades in EDUC core courses using the documents of SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR	<p>Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses.</p> <p>Grading system:</p> <p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	Core course: EDUC 4012
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	21. Departmental exams in EDUC core courses	Table of departmental exams' punctuations, and descriptive and inference statistics	<p>Each departmental exam measures the pedagogical knowledge of TEP's students in EDUC core courses. They are aligned to PCMAS's content. All exams have adequate to high reliability (Küder-Richardson 21</p>	Core course: EDUC 4012												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
			Coefficient, KR_{21}) Grading system: A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour. B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour. C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour. D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour. F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour. Scale: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> (Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015 ^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i> . San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pages 68-69.)	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	22. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Learning how to learn	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A.7, A.9, A.10 • B.22, B.23, B.24 												
	23. Portfolio Rubric: Learning how to learn	Teacher candidates self-check with check by University Supervisors in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scale: All evidence satisfies the criterion (4); most of the evidence satisfies the criterion (3); some evidence does not satisfy the criterion (2); no evidence presented satisfies the criterion (1); no evidence found (0)	Items: II.a.4, II.c.3												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
	24. Rubric – Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity (Professional Disposition)	Evaluation by university supervisors and cooperating teachers in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	University supervisors and cooperating teachers evaluate each Teacher Candidate in this aspect. Scale: PK = Yes (2); Sometimes (1); No (0)	Items: 10-11, 15												
Claim 4.2 Cross-Cutting Theme: Diversity																
	25. Final grades distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED courses	Table of Final Grades using the document of Registrar Office <i>SWDGDIS</i>	Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses. Grading system: A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour. B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour. C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour. D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour. F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour. Scale: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> (Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015 ^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i> . San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	Core courses: EDUC 2022,2031, 2032, 2870; HPER 4370
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	26. Final grades of TEP's teacher candidates in EDUC core	Table of Final Grades in EDUC core courses using the documents of SWDCAEPSTD,	Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses. Grading system:	Core courses: EDUC 2022, 2031, 2032, 2870												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
	courses	SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR	<p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	27. Departmental exams in EDUC core courses	Table of departmental exams' punctuations, and descriptive and inference statistics	<p>Each departmental exam measures the pedagogical knowledge of TEP's students in EDUC core courses. They are aligned to PCMAS's content. All exams have adequate to high reliability (Küder-Richardson 21 Coefficient, KR₂₁)</p> <p>Grading system:</p> <p>A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour.</p> <p>D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour.</p> <p>Scale:</p>	Core courses: EDUC 2022, 2031, 2032, 2870												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
			<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pages 68-69.)</p>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	28. Survey to students of teacher candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professionals Dispositions)	Questionnaires with Likert type scale	The students express their perception of the performance of their teacher candidate in the final clinical course. Scales: PK, K-3 rd and 4 th -12 th = Yes (2); Sometimes (1); No (0)	Items: • 4 th -12 th : 6, 16												
	29. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Diversity	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • A.14 • B.17, B.18												
	30. Rubric – Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity (Professional Disposition)	Evaluation by university supervisors and cooperating teachers in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	University supervisors and cooperating teachers evaluate each Teacher Candidate in this aspect. Scale: PK = Yes (2); Sometimes (1); No (0)	Items: 6-7												
Claim 4.3 Cross-Cutting Theme: Technology																
	31. Final grades distribution in EDUC, ARED	Table of Final Grades using the document of Registrar Office	Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses.	Courses: EDUC 2060, 2870, 3470, 3863, 3869, 3875, 3878, 3885, 3886; ARED 3750; MUED 4436												

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items												
	and MUED courses	<i>SWDGDIS</i>	Grading system: A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour. B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour. C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour. D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour. F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour. Scale: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> (Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015 ^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i> . San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															
89-80%	B															
79-70%	C															
69-60%	D															
59-0%	F															
	32. Final grades of TEP's teacher candidates in EDUC core courses and Technology course GEIC 1010	Table of Final Grades in EDUC core courses using the documents of SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR	Final grades reflect the overall evaluation of TEP's students in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses. Grading system: A- Superior academic achievement; 4 honor points per credit hour. B- Above average academic achievement; 3 honor points per credit hour. C- Average academic achievement; 2 honor points per credit hour. D- Deficiency in academic achievement; 1 honor point per credit hour. F- Failure in academic achievement; no honor point per credit hour. Scale: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Scores</th> <th>Grades</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>100-90%</td> <td>A</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Scores	Grades	100-90%	A	Courses: EDUC 2060, GEIC 1010								
Scores	Grades															
100-90%	A															

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items								
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>89-80%</td> <td>B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>79-70%</td> <td>C</td> </tr> <tr> <td>69-60%</td> <td>D</td> </tr> <tr> <td>59-0%</td> <td>F</td> </tr> </table> <p>(Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^d). <i>General Catalog 2013-2015</i>. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author. Pp. 68-69)</p>	89-80%	B	79-70%	C	69-60%	D	59-0%	F	
89-80%	B											
79-70%	C											
69-60%	D											
59-0%	F											
	33. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Technology	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	<p>Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers.</p> <p>Scales: Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)</p>	Items: B.20, B.21								
	34. Portfolio Rubric: Technology	Teacher candidates self-check with check by University Supervisors in the final clinical course with Likert type scale	<p>Each teacher candidate expresses their appreciation of the TEP's impact in their competencies as teachers.</p> <p>Scale: All evidence satisfies the criterion (4); most of the evidence satisfies the criterion (3); some evidence does not satisfy the criterion (2); no evidence presented satisfies the criterion (1); no evidence found (0)</p>	Item: II.b.2, II.c.5								
Standard 4: PROGRAM IMPACT <i>The provider demonstrates the impact of its completers on P-12 student learning and development, classroom instruction, and schools, and the satisfaction of its completers with</i>			Claim 1. Subject matter Knowledge									
				35. Survey to TEP's graduates or completers: Subject matter Knowledge	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	<p>TEP's graduates express their appreciation of the program impact in their competencies as teachers.</p> <p>Scales: Item 10 = Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1) Item 11 = Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0) Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)</p>	<p>Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 • A-1, A-3 					
36. Survey to School Directors	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	<p>The school directors express their evaluation of the performance of TEP's graduates or completers</p> <p>Scale:</p>	Item: 7									

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items
<i>the relevance and effectiveness of their preparation.</i>			Excellent (4), Satisfactory (3), Regular (1), and Poor (1)	
	Claim 2. Pedagogical Knowledge			
	37. Survey to TEP's graduates or completers: Pedagogical Knowledge	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	TEP's graduates express their appreciation of the program impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Item 10 = Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1) Item 11 = Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0) Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • A-2, A-4, A-10, A-11 • B-8
	38. Survey to School Directors: Pedagogical Knowledge	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	The school directors express their evaluation of the performance of TEP's graduates or completers Scale: Excellent (4), Satisfactory (3), Regular (1), and Poor (1)	Items: 3, 5
	Claim 3. Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)			
	39. Survey to TEP's graduates or completers: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	TEP's graduates express their appreciation of the program impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Item 10 = Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1) Item 11 = Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0) Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • A-12 • B-1
	40. Survey to School Directors	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	The school directors express their evaluation of the performance of TEP's graduates or completers Scale: Excellent (4), Satisfactory (3), Regular (1), and Poor (1)	Items: 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
	Claim 4.1 Cross-Cutting Theme: Learning How to Learn			

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items
	41. Survey to TEP's graduates or completers: Learning how to learn	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	TEP's graduates express their appreciation of the program impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Item 10 = Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1) Item 11 = Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0) Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • 11a, 11b, 11c, • A-5, A-7, A-8 • B-9, B-10
	42. Survey to School Directors: Learning how to learn	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	The school directors express their evaluation of the performance of TEP's graduates or completers Scale: Excellent (4), Satisfactory (3), Regular (1), and Poor (1)	Item: 9
	43. Continuation of Graduate Studies in IAUPR by TEP's Teachers Candidates or Completers	Table for data and analysis by Faculty member of teacher candidates by date of graduation and major in simple random sampling (10% of all graduation students in Registrar document by term <i>SWDGRAD</i>)	For each student in sample (cohort): Graduate studies at IAUPR = Yes or no, and Campus	For each student in sample (cohort): Graduate studies at IAUPR = Yes or no, and Campus
Claim 4.2 Cross-Cutting Theme: Diversity				
	44. Survey to TEP's graduates or completers: Diversity	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	TEP's graduates express their appreciation of the program impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Item 10 = Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1) Item 11 = Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0) Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • A-6, A-9 • B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5

CAEP's Standards	Methods of Assessment	Description	Cut-Scores	Areas or Items
	45. Survey to School Directors: Diversity	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	The school directors express their evaluation of the performance of TEP's graduates or completers Scale: Excellent (4), Satisfactory (3), Regular (1), and Poor (1)	Items: 4, 8
Claim 4.3 Cross-Cutting Theme: Technology				
	46. Survey to TEP's graduates or completers: Technology	Questionnaire with Likert type scale	TEP's graduates express their appreciation of the program impact in their competencies as teachers. Scales: Item 10 = Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1) Item 11 = Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0) Items A and B = Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)	Items: • 11d • B-6, B-7

The progress report for academic year 2013-2014 presents the findings for the accomplishment of Accreditation Standard 1 and 2 of CAEP (2013). The TEP’s claims (2015) are presented under each accreditation standard.

2.3 Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge

Teacher candidates and the completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate knowledge in their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (“B”, above average attainment) or more.

Evidence 1.1 Major (Specialization) Exams in PCMAS

The subject matter knowledge is evaluated by the Teacher Certification Tests (PCMAS) in the Major exams (College Board^{b,c}, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014). The passing scores for Major or Specialization knowledge are reported by College Board and are presented in Table 10. All majors evidenced bigger means than the passing scores, and their means were bigger than the statewide means. In the other hand, all means of TEP’s teacher candidates that took PCMAS in 2011 (104.7), 2012 (107.3), 2013 (110.7) and 2014 (120.0) were greater than 2010, the base-line data (104.0).

Table 10

PCMAS Passing Scores: Subject matter Knowledge of Teacher Candidates (College Board^{b,c}, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012- 2013, 2013-2014)

Academic Years		PCMAS Passing Scores for Majors: Subject matter Knowledge					
		Spanish	English	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Mean
		Passing Scores (of 160)					
		93	98	88	94	96	93.8
2010 ^o	TEP	111	119	92	100	98	104.0
	Statewide	95	108	99	103	101	101.2
	Difference TEP vs Statewide	16.0	11.0	-7.0	-3.0	-3.0	2.8
2011	TEP	101.7 (n=3)	113.4 (n=5)	101.8 (n=5)	102.8 (n=4)	104.0 (n=2)	104.7
	Statewide	103	103	96	105	101	101.6
	Difference TEP vs Statewide	-1.3	10.4	5.8	-2.2	3.0	3.1
2012	TEP	112.6 (n=7)	117.0 (n=2)	94.8 (n=5)	101.3 (n=3)	111.0 (n=2)	107.3

Academic Years		PCMAS Passing Scores for Majors: Subject matter Knowledge					
		Spanish	English	Mathematics	Science	Social Studies	Mean
		Passing Scores (of 160)					
		93	98	88	94	96	93.8
2010	Statewide	105	108	95	102	99	101.8
	Difference TEP vs Statewide	7.6	9.0	-0.2	-0.7	12.0	5.5
	TEP	N/A	123.5 (n=2)	100.4 (n=5)	119.0 (n=1)	100.0 (n=1)	110.7
2013	Statewide	100	106	105	106	101	103.6
	Difference TEP vs Statewide	N/A	17.5	-4.6	13.0	-1.0	7.1
	TEP	132.0 (n=1)	127.0 (n=3)	N/A	114.5 (n=2)	106.5 (n=2)	120.0
2014	Statewide	104	104	100	104	106	103.6
	Difference TEP vs Statewide	28.0	13.0	N/A	10.5	0.5	16.4
	TEP	N/A	123.5 (n=2)	100.4 (n=5)	119.0 (n=1)	100.0 (n=1)	110.7

© - Base-line data

N/A – Not applicable, No candidates

Evidence 1.2 Aggregate Assessment Level Pass-Rate for Specialization (Subject matter Knowledge) in PCMAS

The second evidence related to PCMAS and the first accreditation standard of CAEP I is the *Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Program*. This report is submitted by College Board^a (2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014) to the TEP of San Germán Campus. The report certifies the proportion of program teacher candidates who passed all the tests they took in each knowledge area, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area. In Table 11 is presented the aggregate-assessment level pass-rate for Specialization (Subject matter Knowledge). There is a net difference between TEP and Statewide (2011 to 2014) of 11% in favor of TEP. The institution pass rate of TEP's teacher candidates of 2014 (100%) was greater than the base-line data year of 2010 (96%), the other years were lower than the base-line data year (2011=89%, 2012=95%, and 2013=78%).

Table 11

Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data Report of PCMAS for TEP’s Teacher Candidates of San Germán Campus: Specialization (Subject matter Knowledge)

Year of PCMAS Tests	Number of Students Taking Assessment	Number of Students Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate (TEP)	Statewide Pass Rate	Difference (TEP vs Statewide)
2010[Ⓞ]	23	22	96%	92%	4%
2011	19	17	89%	88%	1%
2012	19	18	95%	89%	6%
2013	9	7	78%	86%	-8%
2014	8	8	100%	88%	12%
Difference (2011 to 2014)					11%

Ⓞ - Base-line data

Evidence 1.3 Major (Specialization) Exams in PCMAS and Major’s GPA of Teacher Candidates

The third evidence of the subject matter knowledge is provided by the data analysis of official academic transcripts of the TEP’s teacher candidates as were reported by the Registrar Office. Table 12 presents information about the performance of our teacher candidates in PCMAS, and in major courses. In general terms, the mean in PCMAS of the TEP’s teacher candidates for the major or subject matter (2013 & 2014) was higher than the passing score for the different measured areas (Major: 113.0 vs. 93.8), and their academic performance is interpreted as “above average academic achievement” in subject matter courses (Major mean = 3.37 or “B”) according to the grading system at the University (IAUPR, 2015d). The performance of teacher candidates in 2013 and 2014 in PCMAS was lower than teacher candidates in 2010 (base-line data) but greater in GPA in Major.

Table 12

Data for TEP’s Teacher Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge

Year	N	PCMAS: Majors	GPA in Major	Interpretation
2010 [Ⓞ]	21	116.5	3.26	Accomplished
2013	36	107.3	3.36	Accomplished
2014	36	118.7	3.39	Accomplished
Mean (2013 & 2014)		113.0	3.37	Accomplished
Passing Scores		Mean = 93.8	Minimum “B” (2.50 to 3.49)	

Ⓞ - Base-line data

Evidence 1.4 Subject matter knowledge according to Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates

Other data for the subject matter knowledge was measured with the Questionnaire *Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates*. This instrument has a Likert type scale. Questions A.3 (*I know and understand the concepts, processes, skills and values of the subject I teach*) and A.5 (*I know the philosophical and programmatic principles of my discipline (Standards, Expectations and Curriculum Framework)*) were aligned with Accreditation Standard 1 and with Claim 1.1. Table 13 presents these data. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they did not answer the self-evaluation questionnaire in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920. The teacher candidates (Dec 2012 to May 2014) totally agreed that the TEP developed in them their subject matter knowledge (4.61 in a Likert type scale of 5 points). Their answers were homogeneous (SD=0.51).

Table 13

Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge

Academic Years	N		Items		Mean	Interpretation
			A.3	A.5		
			<i>I know and understand the concepts, processes, skills and values of the subject I teach.</i>	<i>I know the philosophical and programmatic principles of my discipline (Standards, Expectations and Curriculum Framework).</i>		
Dec 2012	14	Mean	4.32	4.39	4.36	Agree
		SD	0.72	0.93	0.83	Homogeneous
May 2013	28	Mean	4.67	4.53	4.60	Totally agree
		SD	0.37	0.38	0.38	Homogeneous
Dec 2013	9	Mean	4.71	4.79	4.75	Totally agree
		SD	0.49	0.39	0.44	Homogeneous
May 2014	35	Mean	4.75	4.60	4.68	Totally agree
		SD	0.37	0.43	0.40	Homogeneous
In General (2012-2014)	86	Mean	4.61	4.60	4.61	Totally agree
		SD	0.49	0.53	0.51	Homogeneous

Likert type scale: 5 = Totally agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Nor agree or disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Totally disagree

Evidence 1.5 Subject matter knowledge according to Portfolios of Teacher Candidates

Another evidence for the subject matter knowledge is the portfolios of teacher candidates in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 12. Information about the Music Education candidates was not

included because they were not evaluated with the portfolio rubric in MUED 4919 and MUED 4920.

As observed in Table 14, the performance of the teacher candidates in the subject matter knowledge (2012 to 2014) was graded as superior academic achievement (3.52 in a 4 points scale or “A”), according to the evaluation with the rubric *Self-check and Check of Portfolios*. The standard deviation indicate homogeneous answers or agreement in the item related to subject-matter knowledge (SD=0.44). Their evaluation was lower than May 2010, the base-line data (3.80, “A”, superior academic achievement).

Table 14

Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Subject matter Knowledge

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	MEAN & SD (2012 to 2014)	Grade	Interpretation
I.1 <i>In his/her educational philosophy shows an acceptable understanding of: the theoretical and philosophical principles to the level and subject matter that teaches, and of the characteristics that distinguish effective teachers (in accordance with Professional Standards of the DEPR), among others.</i>	N	14	26	9	35			
	MEAN	3.61	3.54	3.36	3.57	3.52	A	Superior
	SD	0.35	0.48	0.48	0.43	0.44		Homogeneous

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Summary of evidences for Subject matter Knowledge of TEP’s Teacher Candidates

The summary of the evaluation of the subject-matter knowledge of TEP’s teacher candidates is presented in Table 15. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 1 (5 of 5 assessments, 100.00%).

Table 15

Assessments' Summary for Claim 1

Assessments for Claim 1	Mean	Interpretation
1. PCMAS' Major (College Board ^{b,c} , 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 & 2014)	Passing score mean: 93.8 TEP vs Statewide: 2010 ^o = 104/101.2 2011 = 104.7/101.6 2012 = 107.3/101.8 2013 = 110.7/103.6 2014 = 120.0/103.6	All majors evidenced bigger means than the passing scores and statewide means (Accomplished)
2. Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data Report of PCMAS for TEP's teacher candidates of San Germán Campus: Specialization (Subject matter Knowledge)	TEP vs Statewide: 2010 ^o = 96%/92% 2011 = 89%/88% 2012 = 95%/89% 2013 = 78%/86% 2014 = 100%/88%	A net difference between TEP and Statewide in favor of TEP (Accomplished)
3. PCMAS's Major (2011, 2013 & 2014) in TEP's teacher candidates	Passing score mean: 93.8 2010 ^o = 116.5 2013 = 107.3 2014 = 118.7 Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") 2010 ^o = 3.26 "B" 2013 = 3.36 "B" 2014 = 3.39 "B"	All majors evidenced bigger means than the PCMAS' passing scores and the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
4. Self-evaluation of teacher candidates	Dec 2012 = 4.36 May 2013 = 4.60 Dec 2013 = 4.75 May 2014 = 4.68 In general = 4.61	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
5. Portfolio Rubric of teacher candidates	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") Dec 2012 = 3.61 "A" May 2013 = 3.54 "A" Dec 2013 = 3.36 "B" May 2014 = 3.57 "A" In general = 3.52 "A"	All grades were similar or above the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)

o - Base-line data

Claim 2: Pedagogical Knowledge

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and the required skills to apply them to the teaching of their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.

Evidence 2.1 Pedagogical knowledge in PCMAS (Professional Competencies)

The pedagogical knowledge is evaluated by the Teacher Certification Tests (PCMAS) in the Professional Competencies exams (College Board^{b,c}, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014). The passing scores as reported by College Board are presented in Table 16.

The professional competencies measured in PCMAS for the elementary level include all teacher candidates of the majors PK, K-3, 4th-6th, and Elementary Physical Education. The secondary level includes all teacher candidates or completers of the majors: Spanish, English, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Secondary Physical Education. Teacher candidates or completers of Special Education, School Health, Adapted Physical Education, Art Education, and Music Education took one of the tests (elementary level or secondary level). There are no differences between the various elementary or secondary areas in regard to on this test.

In general terms, the TEP's teacher candidates performance (2011 to 2014) in the Professional Competencies was higher than the passing score required by the Department of Education of Puerto Rico (DEPR, 2007) in all levels (Elementary: 108.7 vs. 89.0; Secondary: 111.5 vs. 87.0). Their performance was also higher than the statewide population performance (Elementary level: 102.8 and Secondary level: 103.8). In the other hand, the performance of teacher candidates in 2011 to 2014 was lower than base-line year of 2010 at the elementary level (108.7 vs 109.0) and greater than base-line year at the secondary level (111.5 vs 103.0).

Table 16

Professional Competencies for Elementary and Secondary Level Performances of Teacher Candidates of the TEP that Passed PCMAS vs. the Statewide Population: Pedagogical Knowledge (College Board^{b,c}, 2011, 2012, 2013 & 2014)

Year	TEP's Teacher Candidates		Statewide Population		Difference of Means (TEP vs Statewide)
	N	Mean (of 160)	N	Mean (of 160)	
Elementary Level					
2010^o	83	109.0	1,815	106.0	3.0
2011	35	105.9	1,737	103.0	2.9
2012	34	113.6	1,759	104.0	9.6
2013	19	100.2	1,507	101.0	-0.8

Year	TEP's Teacher Candidates		Statewide Population		Difference of Means (TEP vs Statewide)
	N	Mean (of 160)	N	Mean (of 160)	
2014	27	114.2	1,367	103.0	11.2
Mean (2011 to 2014)		108.7		102.8	5.9
Passing Score (DEPR, 2007)		89.0		89.0	
Secondary Level					
2010[Ⓞ]	109	103.0	1,458	105.0	-2.0
2011	22	111.5	1,111	101.0	10.5
2012	25	115.7	1,047	107.0	8.7
2013	22	110.2	930	102.0	8.2
2014	21	108.7	840	105.0	3.7
Mean (2011 to 2014)		111.5		103.8	7.7
Passing Score (DEPR, 2007)		87.0		87.0	

Ⓞ - Base-line data

Evidence 2.2 Aggregate Assessment Level Pass-Rate for Professional Competences (Pedagogical Knowledge) in PCMAS

The second evidence related to PCMAS and the second TEP's claim is the *Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data for Regular Teacher Preparation Program*. This report is submitted by College Board^a (2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014) to the TEP of San Germán Campus. It certifies the proportion of program teacher candidates who passed all the tests they took in each knowledge area, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area. In Table 17 is presented the aggregate-assessment level pass-rate for Professional Competencies (Pedagogical Knowledge). TEP in 2011 to 2014 has a net difference with Statewide of 6%. The three of four annual pass rate of TEP were bigger than the base-line year.

Table 17

Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data Report of PCMAS for TEP’s Teacher Candidates of San Germán Campus: Professional Competencies (Pedagogical Knowledge)

Year of PCMAS Tests	Teacher Candidates Taking Assessment	Teacher Candidates Passing Assessment	Institution Pass Rate (TEP)	Statewide Pass Rate	Difference (TEP vs Statewide)
2010^o	86	77	90%	91%	-1%
2011	55	51	93%	91%	2%
2012	59	57	97%	93%	4%
2013	41	36	88%	88%	0%
2014	48	44	92%	92%	0%
Difference (2011 to 2014)					6%

o - Base-line data

Evidence 2.3 Major (Specialization) Exams in PCMAS and Major’s GPA of Teacher Candidates

The third evidence of the pedagogical knowledge is provided by the data analysis of official academic transcripts of the TEP’s teacher candidates as were reported by the Registrar Office. Table 18 presents information about the performance of our teacher candidates in the test of Professional competencies of PCMAS, and in TEP’s courses. In general terms, the mean in the professional competencies of PCMAS for the TEP’s teacher candidates (2013 & 2014) is higher than the passing score for the different measured areas (Major: 109.5 vs. 88.0). The academic performance of TEP’s teacher candidates can be interpreted as “above average academic achievement” in subject matter courses (Major mean = 3.33 or “B” in a scale of 4.0 points) according to the grading system at the University (IAUPR, 2015d). In the other hand, the teacher candidates performance in 2013 was lower than 2010, the base-line data year but greater in 2014. Their GPA was lower than base-line year in 2013 & 2014.

Table 18

Data for TEP’s Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge (Professional Competencies)

Year	N	PCMAS: Professional Competencies	GPA in TEP	Interpretation
2010 ^o	21	109.6	3.47	Accomplished
2013	36	107.8	3.30	Accomplished
2014	36	111.2	3.33	Accomplished
Mean (2013 & 2014)		109.5	3.33	Accomplished
Passing Scores		Mean = 88.0	Minimum “B”	

Year	N	PCMAS: Professional Competencies	GPA in TEP	Interpretation
		(Elementary= 89; Secondary=87)	(2.50 to 3.49)	

⊙ - Base-line data

Evidence 2.4 Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED Courses

The fourth evidence for pedagogical knowledge is the final grades distribution in Education, Arts Education and Music Education courses. The distribution was provided by the Registrar Office in the report *SWGDIS* for academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (IAUPR, 2014^c, 2015^d). Table 19 shows that the Fundamentals of Education courses had a mean of 3.11 (“B”, above average academic achievement), the Methodology courses had a mean of 3.42 (“B”, above average academic achievement), and the students that took the Integration courses obtained a “P” (Approval).

Table 19

Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, HPER, ARED and MUED courses

Semester	Type of Course	Enrollment	Mean	Grade
August-December 2012	Fundamentals in Education	267	3.00	B
	Methodology	344	3.34	B
	Integration	42	N/A	P
January-May 2013	Fundamentals in Education	294	3.12	B
	Methodology	302	3.34	B
	Integration	N/A	N/A	N/A
August-December 2013	Fundamentals in Education	296	3.11	B
	Methodology	328	3.59	A
	Integration	73	N/A	P
January-May 2014	Fundamentals in Education	270	3.20	B
	Methodology	221	3.48	B
	Integration	8	N/A	P
Total/Mean	Fundamentals in Education	831	3.11	B
	Methodology	867	3.44	B
	Integration	123	N/A	P
	In general	1,821	3.27	B

Reference: Registrar Office documento *SWGDIS*.

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

P = Approval, no honor points

N/A = Not applicable/No means

Evidence 2.5 Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses

The fifth evidence for pedagogical knowledge is the final grades in Education core courses of TEP’s teacher candidates (2013-2014). Data was provided by the report *SWGDIS* for academic year 2013-2014 (IAUPR, 2015^e). Table 20 shows that the Fundamentals of Education courses had a mean of 3.03 (“B”, above average academic achievement), the Methodology courses had a mean of 3.16 (“B”, above average academic achievement), and three of the Field and Clinical courses had a mean of 3.70 (“A”, superior academic achievement). In general, the achievement of TEP’s completers in 2013-2014 was 3.30 “B” or above average academic achievement.

Table 20

Final grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC Core Courses (Academic Year 2013-2014)

Course	Credits	Mean	Grade
Fundamentals in Education Courses			
EDUC 2021	3	2.88	B
EDUC 2022	3	2.94	B
EDUC 2031	3	3.18	B
EDUC 2032	3	2.94	B
EDUC 2870	4	3.18	B
Total/Mean in Fundamentals	16	3.03	B
Methodology Courses			
EDUC 3013	2	2.93	B
EDUC 4011	3	2.94	B
EDUC 4050	2	3.15	B
Total/Mean in Methodology	11	3.00	B
Integration Courses: EDUC 4551 & 4552 (N/A)			
Field & Clinical Experiences Courses			
EDUC 1080	1	3.83	A
EDUC 2890	2	3.33	B
EDUC 3015	2	4.00	A
Total/Mean in Field & Clinical Courses	5	3.70	A
General Mean		3.24	B

Reference: Center of Informatics and Telecommunications, IAUPR: SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR (IAUPR, 2015^e).

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

P = Approval, no honor points

N/A = Not applicable/No means/Not taken

Evidence 2.6 Departmental final exams in EDUC core courses

The sixth evidence for pedagogical knowledge is the scores in departmental final exams in Education core courses. These exams are offered at the end of each semester or academic term, and represent the 15% of each course final grade. Table 21 shows the scores. In general, the core courses evidenced a deficiency in academic achievement (mean of 69.9 or “D”). The collected data is different. The data points to a revision of the departmental exams *vis a vis* courses syllabus in order to reexamine their validity and reliability.

Table 21

Departmental Final Exams in EDUC Core Courses

Term	EDUC 2021	EDUC 2022	EDUC 2031	EDUC 2032	EDUC 2870	EDUC 3013	EDUC 4011	EDUC 4050	In General
December 2012									
N	58	40	64	30	38	N/A	32	16	278
Mean	64.0	71.4	65.8	67.1	72.8	N/A	68.3	74.2	69.1
May 2013									
N	47	37	65	49	45	17	28	N/A	288
Mean	73.3	76.5	72.7	67.3	74.1	74.9	62.6	N/A	63.3
December 2013									
N	57	54	55	49	48	26	34	N/A	323
Mean	69.9	73.4	66.4	71.4	73.7	72.5	65.1	N/A	70.3
May 2014									
N	52	38	54	22	40	27	36	N/A	269
Mean	75.4	76.4	68.7	70.3	74.4	69.2	71.9	N/A	72.3
In General									
N	214	169	238	150	171	70	130	16	1,158
Mean	70.6	74.4	68.2	69.0	73.8	54.2	67.0	74.2	68.9

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

N/A – Not offered/not evaluated

Course EDUC 2060 was not included in Departmental Final Exams (2012-2013 & 2013-2014)

Evidence 2.7 Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates

The seventh evidence for pedagogical knowledge is the survey to students of TEP’s teacher candidates. The answers are presented in Table 22. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they were not evaluated with this survey in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920. All surveyed students of the TEP expressed a high level of satisfaction with teacher candidates’ pedagogical knowledge (2.00 in PK, 1.98 in K-3^{er},

and 1.90 in 4th-12th grades of 2 points scale). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.04).

Table 22

Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge

Item	Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		In General	
		N=53		N=142		N=14		N=154		N=363	
		M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
PK											
1	The teacher is cheerful and happy.	N/A		N/A		2.00	Y	N/A		2.00	Y
3	I like the classroom activities.	N/A		N/A		2.00	Y	N/A		2.00	Y
4	I like the activities in the patio.	N/A		N/A		2.00	Y	N/A		2.00	Y
5	The teacher likes my work.	N/A		N/A		2.00	Y	N/A		2.00	Y
	Mean for Pedagogical Knowledge	N/A		N/A		2.00	Y	N/A		2.00	Y
	SD	N/A		N/A		0.00	H	N/A		2.00	H
K-3											
2	He/She keeps us interested in class all the time.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.90	Y	1.97	Y
4	He/She explains how to work.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.97	Y	1.99	Y
5	The class is interesting.	1.98	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.95	Y	1.98	Y
6	He/She corrects our work and explains when we should improve.	1.96	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.94	Y	1.98	Y
7	He/She has a good sense of humor.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.82	Y	1.95	Y
8	In his/her classes we can participate.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.96	Y	1.99	Y
9	When he/she makes a mistake, he/she accepts it.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.88	Y	1.97	Y
	Mean for Pedagogical Knowledge	1.99	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.92	Y	1.98	Y
	SD	0.02	H	0.00	H	0.00	H	0.06	H	0.02	H
4th-12th											
1	He/She helps promote a good learning environment.	1.97	Y	1.98	Y	1.98	Y	1.98	Y	1.98	Y
8	He/She enables the active and spontaneous participation of students during his/her classes.	1.95	Y	1.89	Y	1.97	Y	1.92	Y	1.94	Y
9	He/She keeps students motivated throughout the class.	1.88	Y	1.80	Y	1.98	Y	1.86	Y	1.88	Y
11	He/She is creative in giving his/her classes.	1.94	Y	1.86	Y	1.99	Y	1.92	Y	1.93	Y
12	He/She has a good sense of humor.	1.90	Y	1.84	Y	1.96	Y	1.90	Y	1.90	Y
14	I can observe that he/she is self-secure, enthusiastic, and confident in his/her classes.	1.92	Y	1.91	Y	1.91	Y	1.93	Y	1.92	Y
15	He/She demonstrates knowledge of	1.99	Y	1.94	Y	1.96	Y	1.93	Y	1.96	Y

Item	Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		In General	
		N=53		N=142		N=14		N=154		N=363	
		M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
	the subject content he/she teaches.										
	Mean for Pedagogical Knowledge	1.94	Y	1.89	Y	1.96	Y	1.92	Y	1.90	Y
	SD	0.04	H	0.06	H	0.03	H	0.04	H	0.04	H

M = Mean; Int = Interpretation; 2 = Yes (Y); 1 = Sometimes (S) 0 = No (N); H = Homogeneous;
N/A – Not offered/not evaluated

Evidence 2.8 Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates

The eighth evidence for pedagogical knowledge is provided by the self-evaluation of TEP’s teacher candidates. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they did not answer the self-evaluation questionnaire in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920. The answers are presented in Table 23. TEP’s teacher candidates expressed a high level of satisfaction with how the program developed in then the pedagogical knowledge (4.61 in a Likert style scale, “Totally agree”). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.50).

Table 23

Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogic Knowledge

Academic Years	N		Items			Mean	Interpretation
			A.4	A.6	A.13		
			<i>I use varied methodology in the teaching of curricular content.</i>	<i>I integrate content of my discipline with other curricular content areas.</i>	<i>I use the tools and techniques to assess my student that are suggested in the Curriculum Framework of my subject matter.</i>		
Dec 2012	14	Mean	4.57	4.61	4.64	4.61	Totally Agree
		SD	0.73	0.73	0.56	0.65	Homogeneous
May 2013	28	Mean	4.56	4.73	4.53	4.61	Totally Agree
		SD	0.56	0.39	0.41	0.45	Homogeneous
Dec 2013	9	Mean	4.64	5.00	4.71	4.79	Totally Agree
		SD	0.48	0.00	0.49	0.41	Homogeneous
May 2014	35	Mean	4.14	4.59	4.62	4.45	Agree
		SD	0.84	0.44	0.40	0.62	Homogeneous

Academic Years	N		Items			Mean	Interpretation
			A.4	A.6	A.13		
			<i>I use varied methodology in the teaching of curricular content.</i>	<i>I integrate content of my discipline with other curricular content areas.</i>	<i>I use the tools and techniques to assess my student that are suggested in the Curriculum Framework of my subject matter.</i>		
TOTAL (2012-2014)	86	Mean	4.48	4.73	4.63	4.61	Totally agree
		SD	0.65	0.39	0.47	0.50	Homogeneous

Likert type scale: 5 = Totally agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Nor agree or disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Totally disagree

Evidence 2.9 Portfolios of Teacher Candidates

Another evidence for the pedagogic knowledge is the portfolios of teacher candidates in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 22. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they were not evaluated with the portfolio rubric in MUED 4919 and MUED 4920.

As observed in Table 24, the performance of the teacher candidates in pedagogic knowledge (2012 to 2014) was graded as superior academic achievement (3.66 in a 4 points scale or "A"), according to the evaluation with the rubric *Self-check and Check of Portfolios*. The standard deviation indicate homogeneous answers or agreement in the item related to subject-matter knowledge (SD=0.46).

Table 24

Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogic Knowledge

Item	N	Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Grade	Interpretation
		14	26	9	35	84		
I.2 In his/her educational philosophy explains how to apply theoretical principles to the planning, teaching, assessment, and to guide all areas of its role as an educator, for example: in the community, school and classroom.	MEAN	3.61	3.56	3.50	3.39	3.52	A	Superior
	SD	0.35	0.58	0.50	0.45	0.47		Homogeneous
I.3 The content of the portfolio reflects the	MEAN	3.64	3.54	3.79	3.56	3.63	A	Superior

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Grade	Interpretation
	N	14	26	9	35	84		
<i>ideas outlined in his/her educational philosophy, for example: his/her planning and teaching-learning-assessment show that he/she can apply what is expressed herein.</i>	SD	0.38	0.63	0.39	0.40	0.45		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.79	3.76	3.79	3.82	3.79	A	Superior
II.a.1 <i>In the daily plans of two lessons he/she properly inserts the key ideas/skills/processes of his/her subject matter standards that apply to the content of the lessons, Expectations and level of thought (Norman Webb).</i>	SD	0.39	0.32	0.39	0.29	0.35		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.71	3.60	3.86	3.56	3.68	A	Superior
II.a.2 <i>In daily lessons plans shows integration of knowledge of his/her academic discipline and other disciplines of the curriculum (curriculum integration).</i>	SD	0.76	0.38	0.38	0.72	0.56		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.86	3.71	3.86	3.88	3.83	A	Superior
II.a.3 <i>The daily plans include different methods/techniques of teaching and Assessment that promote learning with understanding of his/her specialty.</i>	SD	0.24	0.52	0.38	0.29	0.36		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.68	3.71	3.64	3.43	3.62	A	Superior
II.b.1 <i>Describes and explains how he/she used educational modes of instruction (methods/techniques) to promote in his/her student learning with understanding.</i>	SD	0.37	0.35	0.75	0.46	0.48		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.46	3.67	3.86	3.58	3.64	A	Superior
II.c.1 <i>Describes and explains at least three modes of Assessment to monitor the learning process and to help students make connections between concepts and skills of his/her discipline.</i>	SD	0.47	0.56	0.38	0.40	0.45		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.32	3.81	3.86	3.82	3.70	A	Superior
II.c.2 <i>For each type of Assessment selected,</i>	MEAN	3.32	3.81	3.86	3.82	3.70	A	Superior

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Grade	Interpretation
	N	14	26	9	35	84		
<i>presents examples of the work of three students properly corrected using criteria presented in rubrics, checklists and keys (a total of nine (9) examples).</i>	SD	0.51	0.26	0.38	0.29	0.36		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.57	3.21	3.71	3.44	3.48	B	Above Average
<i>II.c.4 In at least one of the selected Assessments, explains how the students used the criteria to self-assess their social performance in cooperative learning.</i>	SD	0.45	1.02	0.76	0.44	0.67		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.63	3.62	3.76	3.61	3.66	A	Superior
In General	SD	0.44	0.51	0.48	0.42	0.46		Homogeneous

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Evidence 2.10 Evaluation of Teacher Candidates in Clinical Courses

The tenth evidence is the evaluation of TEP's teacher candidates in clinical course EDUC 4013 and ARED 4013. Table 25 presents the final average allotted by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. In general, the Teacher Candidates were evaluated by their University Supervisors with 93.96% ("A", Superior academic achievement) and by their Cooperating Teachers with 95.05% ("A", Superior academic achievement). The correlation between evaluators was positive adequate ($r = 0.75$).

Table 25

Final average allotted of TEP's Teacher Candidates by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers

Semester	N	SUP		TEA		Δ_{mean} SUP-TEA	Pearson r	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Dec 2012	14	95.21	2.58	95.93	2.64	-0.71		
May 2013	26	93.35	3.17	95.23	2.64	-1.88		

Semester	N	SUP		TEA		Δ_{mean} SUP-TEA	Pearson r	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Dec 2013	9	93.78	4.15	94.44	2.51	-0.67		
May 2014	35	93.52	3.15	94.61	3.47	-1.10		
In general	84	93.96	3.26	95.05	2.81	-1.09	0.75	Positive, Adequate
		A		A				
		Superior		Superior				

SUP = University Supervisor, TEA = Cooperating Teacher

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Evidence 2.11 Final Grades Distribution in Clinical Courses

The eleventh evidence for pedagogical knowledge is the final grades distribution in Education, Arts Education and Music Education clinical courses. The distribution was provided by the Registrar Office in the report *SWGDIS* for academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (IAUPR, 2014^c, 2015^d). Table 26 shows that the clinical courses had a mean of 3.98 (“A”, Superior academic achievement).

Table 26

Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED Clinical Courses

Semester	Clinical Courses	Enrollment	Mean	Grade
August-December 2012	EDUC 4013	12	4.00	A
	ARED 4913	2	4.00	A
	MUED 4915/4919	3	4.00	A
	MUED 4916/4920	5	4.00	A
	Total/Mean in Clinical Courses	22	4.00	A
January-May 2013	EDUC 4013	27	4.00	A
	ARED 4913	2	4.00	A
	MUED 4915/4919	6	4.00	A
	MUED 4916/4920	6	4.00	A
	Total/Mean in Clinical Courses	41	4.00	A
August-December 2013	EDUC 4013	9	3.89	A
	ARED 4913	0	N/A	N/A
	MUED 4915/4919	2	4.00	A
	MUED 4916/4920	2	4.00	A
	Total/Mean in Clinical Courses	13	3.96	A
January-May	EDUC 4013	29	3.90	A

Semester	Clinical Courses	Enrollment	Mean	Grade
2014	ARED 4913	6	4.00	A
	MUED 4915/4919	12	3.83	A
	MUED 4916/4920	1	4.00	A
	Total/Mean in Clinical Courses	48	3.93	A
Total/Mean	EDUC 4013	77	3.95	A
	ARED 4913	10	4.00	A
	MUED 4915/4919	23	3.96	A
	MUED 4916/4920	14	4.00	A
	Total/Mean in Clinical Courses	124	3.98	A

Reference: Registrar Office document to *SWDGDIS*.

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

P = Approval, no honor points

N/A = Not applicable/No means

Summary of evidences for Pedagogical Knowledge of TEP's Teacher Candidates

The summary of the evaluation of the pedagogical knowledge of TEP's teacher candidates is presented in Table 27. The majority of assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 2 (10 of 11 assessments, 90.91%).

Table 27

Assessments' Summary for Claim 2

Assessments for Claim 2	Mean	Interpretation
1. Professional Competences for Elementary and Secondary Level Performances of Teacher Candidates of the TEP that Passed PCMAS vs. Statewide Population: Pedagogical Knowledge	Passing scores: Elementary = 89 Secondary = 87 TEP vs Statewide- Elementary: 2010 ^o = 109.0/106.0 2011 to 2014 = 108.7/102.8 TEP vs Statewide- Secondary: 2010 ^o = 103.0/105.0 2011 to 2014 = 111.5/103.8	Teacher candidates evidenced bigger means than the passing scores and statewide means (Accomplished)
2. Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data Report of PCMAS for TEP's Teacher Candidates of San Germán Campus: Professional Competencies (Pedagogical	TEP vs Statewide: 2010 ^o = 90%/91% 2011 = 93%/91% 2012 = 97%/93% 2013 = 88%/88%	Teacher candidates evidenced bigger percentages than base-line data in three years and

Assessments for Claim 2	Mean	Interpretation
Knowledge)	2014 = 92%/92%	bigger or equal than statewide percentages in four years (Accomplished)
3. Data for TEP's Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge (Professional Competencies)	Passing score mean: 88 In general: 109.5 Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") In general: 3.33 "B"	Teacher candidates evidenced bigger means than the PCMAS' passing scores and bigger than the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
4. Final grades Distribution in EDUC, ARED and MUED courses	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") TEP's courses: Fundamentals = 3.11 "B" Methodology = 3.44 "B" Integration = P In general = 3.27 "B"	All grades were similar or above the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
5. Final grades of TEP's Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses (2013-2014)	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") TEP's courses: Fundamentals = 3.03 "B" Methodology = 3.00 "B" Integration = N/A Field & Clinical courses = 3.70 "A" In general = 3.24 "B"	All grades were similar or above the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
6. Departmental Final Exams in EDUC core courses	Minimum of Passing Grade: 80% or more TEP's core courses: EDUC 2021 = 70.6% "C" EDUC 2022 = 74.4% "B" EDUC 2031 = 68.8 "D" EDUC 2032 = 69.0 "D" EDUC 2870 = 73.8 "C" EDUC 3013 = 54.2 "F" EDUC 4011 = 67.0 "D" EDUC 4050 = 74.2 "C" In general = 68.9 "D"	None of the TEP's core courses obtained the minimum of passing grade for TEP (Not accomplished)
7. Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge	Likert type scale: 2 points PK = 2.00 Yes K-3 = 1.92 Yes	Totally Agree (Accomplished)

Assessments for Claim 2	Mean	Interpretation
	4 th -12 th = 1.90 Yes	
8. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge	Likert type scale: 5 points Dec 2012 = 4.61 May 2013 = 4.61 Dec 2013 = 4.79 May 2014 = 4.45 In general = 4.61	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
9. Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Pedagogical Knowledge	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") Dec 2012 = 3.63 May 2013 = 3.62 Dec 2013 = 3.76 May 2014 = 3.61 In general = 3.66 "A"	All grades were similar o above the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
10. Final Average Allotted of TEP's Teacher Candidates by University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers	Minimum of Passing Grade: 80% or more SUP vs TEA: Dec 2012 = 95.21/95.93 May 2013 = 93.35/95,23 Dec 2013 = 93.78/94.44 May 2014 = 93.52/94.61 In general: 93.96/95.05	TEP's teacher candidates obtained more than the minimum of passing grade for TEP (Accomplished)
11. Final Grade Distributions in EDUC, ARED and MUED Clinical Courses	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") EDUC 4913 = 3.95 "A" ARED 4913 = 4.00 "A" MUED 4915/4919 = 3.96 "A" MUED 4916/4920 = 4.00 "A" In general = 3.98 "A"	All grades were above the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)

⊙ - Base-line data

Claim 3: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate commitment and positive attitudes toward their students and to teaching and professional development by achieving a performance of 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.

Evidence 3.1 Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates

The first evidence for caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) is the survey to students of TEP's teacher candidates and is included in Table 28. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. All surveyed students of the TEP expressed a high level of satisfaction with teachers candidates caring and effective teaching skills or professional dispositions (1.97 in PK, 1.97 in K-3^{er}, and 1.90 in 4th-12th grades of 2 point scales). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.02).

Table 28

Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)

Item	Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		In General	
		N=53		N=142		N=14		N=154		N=363	
		M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
PK											
2	The teacher pays attention to me and invites to participate and play in class; he/she listens to me..	2.00	Y	N/A		N/A		N/A		2.00	Y
6	The teacher corrects and disciplines us with love.	2.00	Y	N/A		N/A		N/A		2.00	Y
7	The teacher is a good person.	1.90	Y	N/A		N/A		N/A		1.90	Y
	Mean for Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	1.97	Y	N/A		N/A		N/A		1.97	Y
	SD	0.06	H	N/A		N/A		N/A		0.06	H
K-3											
1	He/She answers our questions and listens to us.	1.96	Y	2.00	Y	1.93	Y	1.92	Y	1.95	Y
3	He/She assists each one in our class work when we need help.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.93	Y	1.95	Y	1.97	Y
10	The teacher is kind and good with me.	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	2.00	Y	1.97	Y	1.99	Y
	Mean for Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	1.99	Y	2.00	Y	1.95	Y	1.95	Y	1.97	Y
	SD	0.03	H	0.00	H	0.04	H	0.03	H	0.02	H

Item	Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		In General	
		N=53		N=142		N=14		N=154		N=363	
		M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
4th-12th											
2	Is kind and sensitive; has a good relationship with students.	1.99	Y	1.91	Y	1.94	Y	1.95	Y	1.95	Y
3	Allows students to express their ideas and participate in class.	1.89	Y	1.87	Y	1.97	Y	1.95	Y	1.92	Y
4	Assists students individually if needed.	1.94	Y	1.89	Y	1.98	Y	1.88	Y	1.92	Y
5	Appreciates the interests and customs of students.	1.92	Y	1.93	Y	1.95	Y	1.93	Y	1.93	Y
7	Shows flexibility by taking into consideration the points of view of students.	1.95	Y	1.90	Y	1.97	Y	1.91	Y	1.94	Y
10	He/She listens to students' approaches.	1.96	Y	1.89	Y	1.96	Y	1.90	Y	1.93	Y
13	He/She addresses the student with respect and courtesy.	1.97	Y	1.97	Y	1.96	Y	1.96	Y	1.96	Y
	Mean for Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	1.73	Y	1.70	Y	1.74	Y	1.92	Y	1.90	Y
	SD	0.03	H	0.04	H	0.01	H	0.03	H	0.02	H

M = Mean; Int = Interpretation; Scale: 2=Yes (Y); 1=Sometimes (S); 0=No (0); H = Homogeneous; N/A – Not offered/not evaluated

Evidence 3.2 Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates

The second evidence for caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) is provided by the self-evaluation of TEP's teacher candidates. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. The answers are presented in Table 29. All TEP's teacher candidates expressed a high level of satisfaction how the program developed in them the caring and effective teaching skills or professional dispositions (4.63 in a Likert style scale, "Totally agree"). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.55).

Table 29

Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Interpretation
		N	14	28	9	35	
A.8 I know the contributions of my discipline to the social and cultural development of my students.	MEAN	4.61	4.77	4.86	4.73	4.74	Totally Agree
	SD	0.73	0.33	0.38	0.35	0.45	Homogeneous
A.11 I adapt the curricular content to the cognitive development of students.	MEAN	4.61	4.87	5.00	4.39	4.72	Totally Agree
	SD	0.73	0.30	0.00	0.81	0.61	Homogeneous
A.12 I plan using varied methods and techniques in the teaching-learning process.	MEAN	4.64	4.78	4.79	4.17	4.60	Totally Agree
	SD	0.75	0.25	0.39	0.78	0.54	Homogeneous
B.15 In develop in my classes cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills according to my students' stages of development.	MEAN	4.71	4.94	4.86	4.67	4.80	Totally Agree
	SD	0.57	0.16	0.38	0.45	0.39	Homogeneous
B.16 I incorporate life experiences into the educational process.	MEAN	4.61	4.77	4.71	4.82	4.73	Totally Agree
	SD	0.73	0.39	0.76	0.36	0.56	Homogeneous
B.19 I plan considering the involvement of the community in my classes.	MEAN	3.96	4.29	4.57	4.06	4.21	Agree
	SD	1.25	0.63	0.79	0.95	0.91	Homogeneous
In General	MEAN	4.52	4.74	4.80	4.47	4.63	Totally Agree
	SD	0.79	0.34	0.45	0.62	0.55	Homogeneous

Likert type scale: 5 = Totally agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Nor agree or disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Totally disagree

Evidence 3.3 Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity

The third evidence for caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) is the rubric titled *Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity* of administered in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers completed the rubric *Evaluation of the Willingness of the Student Teacher: Affection and Sensitivity* for each teacher candidate. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 30. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers agreed that our teacher candidates accomplished these competences (1.96 of 2.0 points).

Table 30

Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity (Caring and Effective Teaching Skills or Professional Dispositions)

Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		Mean N= 35	Interpreta- tion
	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA		
Q-1 <i>Assesses and responds to the content and feelings reflected in the words of his students and provides thoughtful and meaningful feedback.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.96	1.86	2.00	1.97	2.00	1.97	Accomplished
Q-2 <i>Shows interest in his/her students. Listens with compassion and empathy when they talk about their problems and situations they face, he/she provides support and identifies resources to help them deal with specific issues.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.86	1.86	1.97	2.00	1.96	Accomplished
Q-3 <i>He/She is kind and sensitive, has good relations with his/her students.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	Accomplished
Q-5 <i>Attends to each student separately, if necessary.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.91	2.00	2.00	1.91	2.00	1.98	Accomplished
Q-9 <i>Keeps students motivated throughout the class.</i>	2.00	2.00	1.94	1.94	2.00	1.86	1.86	2.00	1.95	Accomplished
Q-10 <i>Listens to the ideas of students and contributes significantly to the topic under discussion.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.87	1.71	2.00	1.94	2.00	1.94	Accomplished
Q-11 <i>Exhibits a professional attitude when the supervisor, director, or cooperating teacher gives suggestions, opinions, and recommendations.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.95	2.00	1.86	2.00	2.00	1.98	Accomplished
Q-12 <i>Has good sense of humor.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.87	2.00	1.71	1.86	2.00	1.93	Accomplished
Q-13 <i>Addresses the</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	Accomplished

Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		Mean N= 35	Interpreta- tion
	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA		
<i>student with respect and courtesy.</i>										
Q-14 <i>Provides opportunities to discuss issues relevant to the lives of his/her students and their values.</i>	2.00	2.00	1.85	1.97	1.71	1.86	2.00	1.97	1.92	Accomplished
Mean	2.00	2.00	1.98	1.95	1.91	1.92	1.95	1.99	1.96	Accompli- shed

Scale: Yes = 2 (Accomplished, 1.50-2.00 points); No = 0 (Not accomplished, 0.00-0.49 points); Sometimes = 1 (Partially accomplished, 0.50-1.49 points)

Summary of evidences for Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions) of TEP's Teacher Candidates

The summary of the evaluation of the Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions) of TEP's teacher candidates is presented in Table 31. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 3 (3 of 3 assessments, 100%).

Table 31

Assessments' Summary for Claim 3

Assessments for Claim 3	Mean	Interpretation
1. Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	Likert type scale: 2 points PK = 1.97 Yes K-3 = 1.97 Yes 4 th -12 th = 1.90 Yes	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
2. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	Likert type scale: 5 points Dec 2012 = 4.52 May 2013 = 4.74 Dec 2013 = 4.80 May 2014 = 4.47 In general = 4.63	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
3. Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity (Caring and Effective Teaching Skills or Professional Dispositions)	Likert type scale: 2 points SUP vs TEA: Dec 2012 = 2.00/2.00 May 2013 = 1.98/1.95 Dec 2013 = 1.91/1.92 May 2014 = 1.95/1.96 In general = 1.96	Accomplished

Claim 4.1: Cross-cutting theme Learning How to Learn

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned how to access information on their own (research), that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the attitudes and skills that will support life-long learning in their field by achieving a performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.

Evidence 4.1.1 Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, HPER, and ARED Courses

The first evidence for learning how to learn claim is the final grades distribution in research Education courses (EDUC 4012; HPER 4110, HPER 4120, HPER 4130, HPER 4140), and Arts Education courses (ARED 4015). The distribution was provided by the Registrar Office in the report *SWGDIS* for academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (IAUPR, 2014^c, 2015^d). Table 32 shows that the courses related to claim 4.1 had a mean of 3.17 (“B”, above average academic achievement).

Table 32

Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, HPER and ARED courses: Learning How to Learn

Semester	Enrollment	Mean	Grade
August-December 2012	52	2.89	B
January-May 2013	33	2.91	B
August-December 2013	17	3.44	B
January-May 2014	17	3.29	B
Total/Mean	119	3.13	B

Reference: Registrar Office document to *SWGDIS*.

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

P = Approval, no honor points

N/A = Not applicable/No means

Evidence 4.1.2 Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses

The second evidence for learning how to learn claim is the final grades in Education core course EDUC 4012 of TEP’s teacher candidates (2013-2014). Data was provided by the report *SWDCAEPSTD*, *SWBCAPSTD*, *SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR* (IAUPR, 2015^g). The teacher candidates enrolled in EDUC 4012 (n=18) had a mean of 3.17 (“B”, above average academic achievement).

Evidence 4.1.3 Departmental final exams in EDUC 4012

The third evidence for learning how to learn claim is the scores in departmental final exams in Education course EDUC 4012. These exams are offered at the end of each semester or academic term, and represent the 15% of each course final grade. Table 33 shows the scores. In general, the core courses evidenced a deficiency in academic achievement (mean of 69.9 or “D”). The collected data is different. The data points to a revision of the departmental exams *vis a vis* courses syllabus in order to reexamine their validity and reliability.

Table 33

Departmental Final Exams of EDUC 4012

Term	Enrollment	Mean for EDUC 4012	Interpretation
December 2012	16	69.9	“D” (Deficiency in academic achievement)
May 2013	14	56.1	“F” (No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement)
December 2013	15	52.4	“F” (No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement)
May 2014	13	74.9	“C” (2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement)
In General	58	63.3	“D” (Deficiency in academic achievement)

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Evidence 4.1.4 Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates

The fourth evidence for learning how to learn claim is provided by the self-evaluation of TEP’s teacher candidates. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they did not answer the self-evaluation questionnaire in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920. The answers are presented in Table 34. TEP’s teacher candidates expressed a positive level of satisfaction with how the program developed in then the learning how to learn claim (4.49 in a Likert style scale, “Agree”). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.81).

Table 34

Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn

Item		December 2012	May 2013	December 2013	May 2014	In General
		N = 14	N=28	N=9	N=35	N=86
A.7 <i>I promote the search of information and for the knowledge development.</i>	Mean	4.68	4.76	4.29	4.71	4.61
	SD	0.75	0.35	1.89	0.39	0.85
A.9 <i>I offer relevance to the subject knowledge and provide opportunities for action research and experimentation.</i>	Mean	4.50	4.53	4.14	4.35	4.38
	SD	0.76	0.77	1.86	0.89	1.07
A.10 <i>The course content promotes the development of critical, reflective and creative thinking skills.</i>	Mean	4.57	4.85	4.86	4.64	4.73
	SD	0.73	0.25	0.38	0.40	0.44
B.22 <i>I know and understand the structural features of language that makes it a tool to think and express ideas.</i>	Mean	4.61	4.79	4.71	4.55	4.67
	SD	0.73	0.34	0.49	0.46	0.51
B.23 <i>I know and understand my needs for professional development as teacher.</i>	Mean	4.71	4.84	5.00	4.75	4.83
	SD	0.76	0.30	0.00	0.41	0.37
B.24 <i>I have taken courses or trainings for professional development as a teacher.</i>	Mean	4.25	3.69	2.86	4.02	3.71
	SD	1.07	1.27	2.67	1.41	1.61
In General	Mean	4.55	4.58	4.31	4.50	4.49
	SD	0.80	0.55	1.22	0.66	0.81
Interpretation	Mean	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Agree	Totally Agree	Agree
	SD	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Heterogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous

Likert type scale: 5 = Totally agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Nor agree or disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Totally disagree

Evidence 4.1.5 Portfolios of Teacher Candidates

Another evidence for the learning how to learn claim is the portfolios of teacher candidates in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 35. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they were not evaluated with the portfolio rubric in MUED 4919 and MUED 4920.

As observed in Table 35, the performance of the teacher candidates in learning how to learn claim (2012 to 2014) was graded as superior academic achievement (3.61 in a 4 points scale or “A”), according to the evaluation with the rubric *Self-check and Check of Portfolios*. The standard deviation indicate homogeneous answers or agreement in the item related to subject-matter knowledge (SD=0.44).

Table 35

Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Grade	Interpretation
	N	14	26	9	35	84		
II.a.4 <i>In the discussion that accompanies each lesson describes what he/she learned during the process of planning, teaching and carrying out learning Assessment with understanding of his/her students. Recognizes his/her strengths and areas that still need improvement.</i>	MEAN	3.46	3.58	3.64	3.45	3.53	A	Superior
	SD	0.37	0.64	0.48	0.41	0.48		Homogeneous
II.c.3 <i>For each Assessment selected, explains how he/she used the information to improve his/her educational practices.</i>	MEAN	3.46	3.58	3.86	3.81	3.68	A	Superior
	SD	0.42	0.45	0.38	0.32	0.39		Homogeneous
In General	MEAN	3.46	3.58	3.75	3.63	3.61	A	Superior
	SD	0.40	0.55	0.43	0.37	0.44		Homogeneous

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Evidence 4.1.6 Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity

The sixth evidence for the learning how to learn claim is the rubric titled *Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity* of administered in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers completed the rubric *Evaluation of the Willingness of the Student Teacher:*

Affection and Sensitivity for each teacher candidate. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 36. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers agreed that our teacher candidates accomplished these competences (1.96 of 2.0 points).

Table 36

Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn

Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		Mean N= 35	Interpreta- tion
	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA		
Q-10 <i>Listens to the ideas of students and contributes significantly to the topic under discussion.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.86	1.75	2.00	1.94	2.00	1.94	Accomplished
Q-11 <i>Demonstrates professional attitude to opinions and recommendations of the supervisor, cooperating teacher and director.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.93	2.00	1.89	2.00	2.00	1.98	Accomplished
Q-15 <i>Evidences commitment to professional development.</i>	2.00	2.00	1.89	2.00	1.88	1.89	1.94	2.00	1.95	Accomplished
Mean	2.00	2.00	1.96	1.93	1.88	1.93	1.96	2.00	1.96	Accompli- shed

Scale: Yes = 2 (Accomplished, 1.50-2.00 points); No = 0 (Not accomplished, 0.00-0.49 points); Sometimes = 1 (Partially accomplished, 0.50-1.49 points)

Summary of evidences for Cross-cutting theme Learning How to Learn of TEP’s Teacher Candidates

The summary of the evaluation of the Cross-cutting theme Learning How to Learn of TEP’s teacher candidates is presented in Table 37. The majority of assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 4.1 (5 of 6 assessments, 83%).

Table 37

Assessments’ Summary for Claim 4.1

Assessments for Claim 4.1	Mean	Interpretation
1. Final grades Distribution in EDUC, HPER and ARED courses	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) TEP’s courses: December 2012= 2.89 “B”	All grades were similar to the minimum passing GPA for TEP

Assessments for Claim 4.1	Mean	Interpretation
	May 2013 = 2.91 “B” December 2013 = 3.44 “B” May 2014 = 3.29 “B” In general = 3.13 “B”	(Accomplished)
2. Final grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses (2013-2014)	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) TEP’s course: EDUC 4012 (n=18) = 3.17 “B”	All grades were similar to the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
3. Departmental Final Exams in EDUC core courses	Minimum of Passing Grade: 80% or more TEP’s core course: EDUC 4012 December 2012 = 69.9 “D” May 2013 = 56.1 “F” December 2013 = 52.4 “F” May 2014 = 74.9 “C” In general = 63.3 “D”	EDUC 4012 did not obtain the minimum of passing grade for TEP (Not accomplished)
3. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn	Likert type scale: 5 points Dec 2012 = 4.55 May 2013 = 4.58 Dec 2013 = 4.31 May 2014 = 4.50 In general = 4.49	Agree (Accomplished)
4. Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) Dec 2012 = 3.46 May 2013 = 3.58 Dec 2013 = 3.75 May 2014 = 3.63 In general = 3.61 “A”	All grades were similar or above the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
5. Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Learning How to Learn	Likert type scale: 2 points SUP vs TEA: Dec 2012 = 2.00/2.00 May 2013 = 1.96/1.93 Dec 2013 = 1.88/1.93 May 2014 = 1.96/2.00 In general = 1.96	Accomplished

Claim 4.2: Cross-cutting theme Diversity

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of diversity (race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives) by achieving a performance of above average attainment, or satisfactory or more.

Evidence 4.2.1 Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, HPER, and ARED Courses

The first evidence for diversity claim is the final grades distribution in courses: EDUC 2022, EDUC 2031, EDUC 2032, EDUC 2870, and HPER 4370. The distribution was provided by the Registrar Office in the report *SWGDIS* for academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (IAUPR, 2014^c, 2015^d). Table 38 shows that the courses related to claim 4.2 had a mean of 3.11 (“B”, above average academic achievement).

Table 38

Final Grades Distribution in EDUC and HPER courses: Diversity

Semester	Enrollment	Mean	Grade
August-December 2012	197	3.05	B
January-May 2013	243	3.12	B
August-December 2013	229	3.13	B
January-May 2014	205	3.19	B
Total/Mean	874	3.12	B

Reference: Registrar Office document to *SWDGDIS*.

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

Evidence 4.2.2 Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses

The second evidence for diversity claim is the final grades in Education core courses EDUC 2022, EDUC 2031, EDUC 2032 and EDUC 2870 of TEP’s teacher candidates (2013-2014). Data was provided by the report *SWDCAEPSTD*, *SWBCAPSTD*, *SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR* (IAUPR, 2015^e). Data is presented in Table 39. The teacher candidates enrolled in these courses (n=18) had a mean of 3.06 (“B”, above average academic achievement).

Table 39

Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses (Academic Year 2013-2014): Diversity

EDUC Core Course	GPA	Interpretation
EDUC 2022	2.94	B
EDUC 2031	3.18	B
EDUC 2032	2.94	B
EDUC 2870	3.18	B
Mean	3.06	B

Reference: SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR (IAUPR, 2015^g)

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Evidence 4.2.3 Departmental final exams in EDUC 2022, EDUC 2031, EDUC 2032 and EDUC 2870

The third evidence for diversity claim is the scores in departmental final exams in core courses EDUC 2022, EDUC 2031, EDUC 2032 and EDUC 2870. These exams are offered at the end of each semester or academic term, and represent the 15% of each course final grade. Table 21 shows the scores. In general, the core courses evidenced an average academic achievement (EDUC 2022=74.4%, “C”; EDUC 2031=68.2%, “D”; EDUC 2032=69.0%, “D”; EDUC 2870=73.8%, “C”; mean of 71.4% or “C” in a Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69)).

Evidence 4.2.4 Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates

The fourth evidence for diversity claim is the survey to students of TEP’s teacher candidates and is included in Table 40. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. All surveyed students of the TEP expressed a high level of satisfaction with teachers candidates caring and effective teaching skills or professional dispositions (1.96 in 4th-12th grades of 2 point scales). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.01).

Table 40

Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Diversity

Item	Item	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		In General	
		N=53		N=142		N=14		N=154		N=363	
		M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
4th-12th											
6	<i>He/She respects the different ways of being and the habits of their students.</i>	1.95	Y	1.95	Y	1.94	Y	1.97	Y	1.95	Y
16	<i>He/She provides opportunities to discuss issues relevant to the lives of their students and with their values.</i>	1.94	Y	1.97	Y	1.97	Y	1.95	Y	1.96	Y
	Mean for Diversity	1.95	Y	1.96	Y	1.95	Y	1.96	Y	1.96	Y
	SD	0.01	H	0.02	H	0.02	H	0.01	H	0.01	H

M = Mean; Int = Interpretation; 2=Yes (Y); 1 = Sometimes (S); 0= No (N); H = Homogeneous; N/A – Not offered/not evaluated

Evidence 4.2.5 Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates

The fifth evidence for diversity claim is provided by the self-evaluation of TEP's teacher candidates. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they did not answer the self-evaluation questionnaire in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920. The answers are presented in Table 41. TEP's teacher candidates expressed a high level of satisfaction with how the program developed in then the learning how to learn claim (4.78 in a Likert style scale, "Totally Agree"). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.47).

Table 41

Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Diversity

Item		December 2012	May 2013	December 2013	May 2014	In General
		N = 14	N=28	N=9	N=35	N=86
A.14 <i>I integrate into my subject matter teaching the ethical and moral criteria in line with today's society.</i>	Mean	4.68	4.79	4.57	4.79	4.71
	SD	0.75	0.32	0.79	0.32	0.55
B.17 <i>I plan my classes considering the socio-economic context of students.</i>	Mean	4.71	4.86	4.86	4.82	4.81
	SD	0.76	0.38	0.38	0.34	0.47
B.18 <i>I consider cultural,</i>	Mean	4.71	4.80	5.00	4.72	4.81

Item	December 2012		May 2013		December 2013		May 2014		In General	
	N = 14		N=28		N=9		N=35		N=86	
<i>talents, preferences and learning styles differences of my students.</i>	SD	0.76	0.37	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.38	0.38	0.38	0.38
	Mean	4.70	4.82	4.81	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.78	4.78
In General	SD	0.76	0.36	0.39	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.47	0.47
	Mean	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree
Interpretation	SD	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Heterogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous

Likert type scale: 5 = Totally agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Nor agree or disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Totally disagree

Evidence 4.2.6 Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity

The sixth evidence for the learning how to learn claim is the rubric titled *Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Affection and Sensitivity* of administered in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers completed the rubric *Evaluation of the Willingness of the Student Teacher: Affection and Sensitivity* for each teacher candidate. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 42. Information about the Music Education candidates in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920 was not included. The university supervisors and cooperating teachers agreed that our teacher candidates accomplished these competences (1.89 of 2.0 points).

Table 42

Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Diversity

Items	Dec 2012		May 2013		Dec 2013		May 2014		Mean N= 35	Interpretation
	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA	SUP	TEA		
Q-6 <i>Appreciates the interests and habits of their students.</i>	2.00	2.00	1.96	1.89	2.00	1.89	1.94	2.00	1.72	Accomplished
Q-7 <i>Respects the different ways of being and the customs of his/her students.</i>	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	Accomplished
Mean	2.00	2.00	1.98	1.95	2.00	1.95	1.97	2.00	1.98	Accomplished

Scale: Yes = 2 (Accomplished, 1.50-2.00 points); No = 0 (Not accomplished, 0.00-0.49 points); Sometimes = 1 (Partially accomplished, 0.50-1.49 points)

Summary of evidences for Cross-cutting theme Diversity of TEP’s Teacher Candidates

The summary of the evaluation of the Cross-cutting theme Diversity of TEP’s teacher candidates is presented in Table 43. The majority of assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 4.2 (5 of 6 assessments, 83%).

Table 43

Assessments’ Summary for Claim 4.2

Assessments for Claim 4.2	Mean	Interpretation
1. Final Grades Distribution in EDUC and HPER courses: Diversity	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) TEP’s courses: December 2012= 3.05 “B” May 2013 = 3.12 “B” December 2013 = 3.13 “B” May 2014 = 3.19 “B” In general = 3.12 “B”	All grades were similar to the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
2. Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses (Academic Year 2013-2014): Diversity	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) TEP’s course: EDUC 2022=2.94 “B” EDUC 2031=3.18 “B” EDUC 2032=2.94 “B” EDUC 2870=3.18 “B”	All grades were similar to the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
3. Departmental Final Exams in EDUC core courses	Minimum of Passing Grade: 80% or more TEP’s core courses: EDUC 2022, EDUC 2031, EDUC 2032 and EDUC 2870 December 2012 = 74.4 “C” May 2013 = 68.2 “D” December 2013 = 69.0 “D” May 2014 = 73.8 “C” In general = 71.4 “C”	Courses did not obtain the minimum of passing grade for TEP (Not accomplished)
4. Survey to Students of Teacher Candidates: Diversity	Likert type scale: 2 points Students: 4 th -12 th 1.96 Yes	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
5. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Diversity	Likert type scale: 5 points Dec 2012 = 4.70 May 2013 = 4.82 Dec 2013 = 4.81 May 2014 = 4.78	Agree (Accomplished)

Assessments for Claim 4.2	Mean	Interpretation
	In general = 4.78	
6. Evaluation of the Willingness of Teacher Candidates: Diversity	Likert type scale: 2 points SUP vs TEA: Dec 2012 = 2.00/2.00 May 2013 = 1.97/1.95 Dec 2013 = 2.00/1.95 May 2014 = 1.97/2.00 In general = 1.98	Accomplished

Claim 4.3 Cross-cutting theme Technology

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP are able to use classroom technology by achieving performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.

Evidence 4.3.1 Final Grades Distribution in EDUC, HPER, and ARED Courses

The first evidence for technology claim is the final grades distribution in courses: EDUC 2060, EDUC 3470, EDUC 3863, EDUC 3869, EDUC 3875, EDUC 3878, EDUC 3885, EDUC 3886, ARED 3750, and MUED 4436. The distribution was provided by the Registrar Office in the report *SWGDIS* for academic years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 (IAUPR, 2014^c, 2015^d). Table 44 shows that the courses related to claim 4.3 had a mean of 3.56 (“A”, superior academic achievement).

Table 44

Final Grades Distribution in EDUC and HPER courses: Technology

Semester	Enrollment	Mean	Grade
August-December 2012	117	3.44	B
January-May 2013	110	3.64	A
August-December 2013	133	3.59	A
January-May 2014	130	3.58	A
Total/Mean	490	3.56	A

Reference: Registrar Office documento *SWGDIS*.

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

Evidence 4.3.2 Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses

The second evidence for technology claim is the final grades in Education core courses EDUC 2060 and GEIC 1010 of TEP’s teacher candidates (2013-2014). Data was provided by the report SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR (IAUPR, 2015^e). Data is presented in Table 45. The teacher candidates enrolled in these courses (n=18) had a mean of 3.89 (“A”, superior academic achievement).

Table 45

Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates (Academic Year 2013-2014): Technology

Course	Number of Credits	GPA	Grade
EDUC 2060	2	3.72	“A”, Superior
GEIC 1010	3	4.00	“A”, Superior
Total/Mean	5	3.89	“A”, Superior

Reference: SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR (IAUPR, 2015^e)

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Course description: GEIC 1010 INFORMATION AND COMPUTER LITERACY *Development of skills in the use of the computer for the search and processing of information and electronic communication in the teaching and learning processes. Study of the general concepts of computer systems, electronic systems of learning and systems of information organization. Use of data bases to recover bibliographical information. Administration of computer programs, such as operating systems, word processors, electronic graphical presentations, spreadsheets calculations and Web navigators. Requires 45 hours of lecture-lab. Requires additional time in open lab. Required course. 3 credits.* (IAUPR, 2015d)

Evidence 4.3.3 Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates

The third evidence for technology claim is provided by the self-evaluation of TEP’s teacher candidates. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they did not answer the self-evaluation questionnaire in MUED 4915/4919 and MUED 4916/4920. The answers are presented in Table 46. TEP’s teacher candidates expressed a high level of satisfaction with how the program developed in then the learning how to learn claim (4.85 in a Likert style scale, “Totally Agree”). The standard deviation indicates that the answers were homogeneous (SD=0.36).

Table 46

Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Technology

Item		December 2012	May 2013	December 2013	May 2014	In General
		N = 14	N=28	N=9	N=35	N=86
B.20	Mean	4.79	4.69	5.00	4.75	4.81
	SD	0.57	0.47	0.00	0.49	0.39
B.21.	Mean	4.71	4.96	5.00	4.84	4.88
	SD	0.76	0.14	0.00	0.39	0.32
In General	Mean	4.75	4.83	5.00	4.80	4.85
	SD	0.67	0.31	0.00	0.44	0.36
Interpretation	Mean	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Totally Agree	Agree
	SD	Homogeneous	Homogeneous	Heterogeneous	Homogeneous	Homogeneous

Likert type scale: 5 = Totally agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Nor agree or disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Totally disagree

Evidence 4.3.4 Portfolios of Teacher Candidates

The fifth evidence for technology claim is the portfolios of teacher candidates in the final clinical experience course EDUC 4913 and ARED 4913. Data of this type of evaluation are included in Table 47. Information about the Music Education candidates was not included because they were not evaluated with the portfolio rubric in MUED 4919 and MUED 4920. The performance of the teacher candidates in technology claim (2012 to 2014) was graded as superior academic achievement (3.70 in a 4 points scale or “A”), according to the evaluation with the rubric *Self-check and Check of Portfolios*. The standard deviation indicate homogeneous answers or agreement in the item related to subject-matter knowledge (SD=0.42).

Table 47

Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Technology

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Grade	Interpretation
	N	14	26	9	35	84		
II.b.2 Shows how he/she used the technology to facilitate in his/her students the learning with understanding, for	MEAN	3.71	3.59	3.79	3.73	3.71	A	Superior

Item		Dec 2012	May 2013	Dec 2013	May 2014	In General	Grade	Interpretation
	N	14	26	9	35	84		
<i>example, students: using computer, overhead projector in oral presentations, computer programs to produce letters, drawings and graphic organizers and search for information on the Internet.</i>	SD	0.39	0.57	0.39	0.43	0.45		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.86	3.58	3.71	3.59	3.69	A	Superior
II.c.5 Describes how he/she used technology as a means to facilitate the assessment of student learning, such as electronic records, tables or data analysis using computer programs.	SD	0.24	0.26	0.49	0.43	0.36		Homogeneous
	MEAN	3.79	3.59	3.75	3.66	3.70	A	Superior
In General	SD	0.32	0.42	0.44	0.43	0.42		Homogeneous

Standard scale (IAUPR, 2015^d, pp. 68-69):

A = 4 honor points per credit hour, Superior academic achievement (100.0-90.0%)

B = 3 honor points per credit hour, Above average academic achievement (89.9-80.0%)

C = 2 honor points per credit hour, Average academic achievement (79.9-70.0%)

D = 1 honor point per credit hour, Deficiency in academic achievement (69.9-60.0%)

F = No honor points per credit hour, Failure in academic achievement (59.9% or less)

Summary of evidences for Cross-cutting Technology of TEP's Teacher Candidates

The summary of the evaluation of the Cross-cutting theme Technology of TEP's teacher candidates is presented in Table 48. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 4.3 (4 of 4 assessments, 100%).

Table 48

Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.3

Assessments for Claim 4.2	Mean	Interpretation
1. Final Grades Distribution in EDUC and HPER courses: Technology	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 ("B") December 2012= 3.44 "B" May 2013 = 3.64 "A" December 2013 = 3.59 "A" May 2014 = 3.58 "A" In general = 3.56 "A"	All grades were similar or bigger than the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)

Assessments for Claim 4.2	Mean	Interpretation
2. Final Grades of TEP’s Teacher Candidates in EDUC core courses (Academic Year 2013-2014): Technology	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) TEP’s course: EDUC 2060=3.72 “A” GEIC 1010=4.00 “A” In general: 3.89 “A”	All grades were bigger than the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)
3. Self-evaluation of Teacher Candidates: Technology	Likert type scale: 5 points Dec 2012 = 4.75 May 2013 = 4.83 Dec 2013 = 5.00 May 2014 = 4.80 In general = 4.85	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
4. Portfolio Rubric of Teacher Candidates: Technology	Minimum of Passing GPA: 2.50 to 3.49 (“B”) December 2012= 3.79 “A” May 2013 = 3.59 “A” December 2013 = 3.75 “A” May 2014 = 3.66 “A” In general = 3.70 “A”	All grades were bigger than the minimum passing GPA for TEP (Accomplished)

2.4 Standard 4: Program Impact

Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge

Teacher candidates and the completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate knowledge in their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (“B”, above average attainment) or more.

Evidence 1.1: Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers

The first evidence of subject matter knowledge in TEP’s completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to TEP’s graduates or completers (in-service teachers). Data is presented in Table 49. Their perception about the TEP’s impact was very positive (3.82 of 4 points, very good) and in total agreement (4.86 of 5.0 points). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous.

Table 49

Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Subject matter Knowledge

Items			Dec 2012	Dec 2013	Mean	Interpretation
			N=63	N=19	N =82	
10	<i>How do you evaluate the formation received in the TEP?</i>	Mean	3.69	3.95	3.82	Very good
		SD	0.23	0.23	0.23	Homogeneous
A-1	<i>You know and understand the concepts, processes, skills, and values of the subject matter you teach.</i>	Mean	4.78	5.00	4.89	Totally Agree
		SD	0.46	0.00	0.23	Homogeneous
A-3	<i>You know the philosophical and programmatic principles of your discipline (Standards, Outcomes, and Curricular Framework).</i>	Mean	4.68	4.95	4.82	Totally Agree
		SD	0.62	0.23	0.43	Homogeneous
In General: Items A		Mean	4.73	4.98	4.86	Totally Agree
		SD	0.54	0.12	0.33	Homogeneous

Likert type scales:

Item 10: Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1)

Item 11: Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0)

Items A & B: Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)

Evidence 1.2: Survey to School Directors

The second evidence of subject matter knowledge in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to school directors. Data is presented in Table 50. Their perception about the TEP's impact in their teachers from the San Germán Campus was very positive (3.79 of 4 points, excellent). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.25).

Table 50

Survey to School Directors: Subject matter Knowledge

Item	Criteria	December 2012		December 2013		Mean	SD	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
		N=24		N=16		N=40		
7	Planning and Educational Evaluation: Shows mastery when planning the teaching of the subject matter by	3.58	0.50	4.00	0.00	3.79	0.25	Excellent / Homogeneous

Item	Criteria	December 2012		December 2013		Mean	SD	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
		N=24		N=16		N=40		
	<i>organizing and evaluating class activities, by using technological educational resources and by using normative and summative evaluations.</i>							

Likert type scale: Excellent (4); Satisfactory (3); Regular (2); Poor (1)

Summary of evidences for Subject matter Knowledge of TEP's Graduates or Completers

The summary of the evaluation of the subject matter knowledge of TEP's graduates or completers is presented in Table 51. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 2 (2 of 2 assessments, 100.0%).

Table 51

Assessments' Summary for Claim 1

Assessments for Claim 1	Mean	Interpretation
1. Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Subject matter Knowledge	Likert type scales: Item 10: Very good (4) or Good (3) Items A & B: Totally agree (5) or Agree (4) Evidence: Item 10: 3.82 & Items A: 4.86	Very Good & Totally Agree (Accomplished)
2. Survey to School Directors: Subject matter Knowledge	Likert type scale: 4 "Excellent" or 3 "Satisfactory" In general: 3.79	Excellent (Accomplished)

Claim 2: Pedagogical Knowledge

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and the required skills to apply them to the teaching of their subject matter by achieving a performance above the passing scores of standardized test for teacher certification (PCMAS) and 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.

Evidence 2.1: Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers

The first evidence of pedagogical knowledge in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to TEP's graduates or completers (in-service teachers). Data is presented in Table 52. Their perception about the TEP's impact was in total agreement (4.83 of 5.0 points). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.30).

Table 52

Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Pedagogical Knowledge

Items			Dec 2012	Dec 2013	In General	Inter-pretation
			N=63	N=19	N =82	
A-2	<i>You use a varied methodology to teach the curricular content.</i>	Mean	4.68	4.95	4.82	Totally Agree
		SD	0.46	0.23	0.35	Homogeneous
A-4	<i>You integrate your subject matter with other curricular courses.</i>	Mean	4.67	4.95	4.81	Totally Agree
		SD	0.60	0.23	0.42	Homogeneous
A-10	<i>You plan your class by using a variety of methods and techniques in the teaching-learning process.</i>	Mean	4.78	5.00	4.74	Totally Agree
		SD	0.49	0.00	0.25	Homogeneous
A-11	<i>You plan your class by using a variety of methods and techniques in the teaching-learning process.</i>	Mean	4.79	5.00	4.90	Totally Agree
		SD	0.45	0.00	0.23	Homogeneous
B-8	<i>The teacher is aware of and understands the importance of the structural features of language that enable its use as a tool for the expression of thoughts and ideas.</i>	Mean	4.79	5.00	4.90	Totally Agree
		SD	0.45	0.00	0.23	Homogeneous
Mean					4.83	Totally Agree
SD					0.30	Homogeneous

Likert type scales:

Item 10: Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1)

Item 11: Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0)

Items A & B: Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)

Evidence 2.2: Survey to School Directors

The second evidence of pedagogical knowledge in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to school directors. Data is presented in Table 53. Their perception about the TEP's impact in their teachers from the San Germán Campus was very positive (3.99 of 4 points, excellent). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.05).

Table 53

Survey to School Directors: Pedagogical Knowledge

Item	Criteria	December 2012		December 2013		Mean	SD	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
		N=24		N=16		N=40		
3	Teaching-Learning Process: <i>Shows that his/her work as a teacher and the use of his/her innovative strategies have resulted in significant improvement of student learning.</i>	3.96	0.20	4.00	0.00	3.98	0.10	Excellent / Homogeneous
5	Communication Skills: <i>Shows mastery of the fundamental communication skills that any teacher should possess.</i>	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
Mean						3.99	0.05	Excellent / Homogeneous

Likert type scale: Excellent (4); Satisfactory (3); Regular (2); Poor (1)

Summary of evidences for Pedagogical Knowledge of TEP's Graduates or Completers

The summary of the evaluation of the pedagogical knowledge of TEP's graduates or completers is presented in Table 54. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 2 (2 of 2 assessments, 100.0%).

Table 54

Assessments' Summary for Claim 2

Assessments for Claim 2	Mean	Interpretation
1. Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Pedagogical Knowledge	Likert type scales: Items A & B: Totally agree (5) or Agree (4) In general: 4.83	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
2. Survey to School Directors: Pedagogical Knowledge	Likert type scale: 4 "Excellent" or 3 "Satisfactory" In general: 3.93	Excellent (Accomplished)

Claim 3: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate commitment and positive attitudes toward their students and to teaching and professional development by achieving a performance of 80% (above average attainment or satisfactory) or more.

Evidence 3.1: Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers

The first evidence for caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) in TEP's completers (graduates) were collected through a survey to TEP's graduates or completers (in-service teachers). Data is presented in Table 55. Their perception about the TEP's impact was in total agreement (4.86 of 5.0 points). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.29).

Table 55

Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)

Items			Dec 2012	Dec 2013	In General	Inter-pretation
			N=63	N=19	N =82	
A-12	<i>You integrate the teaching of your subject matter with the ethical and moral criteria attuned to our current society.</i>	Mean	4.65	5.00	4.83	Totally Agree
		SD	0.60	0.00	0.30	Homogeneous
B-1	<i>Develops in class the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills according to the developmental stages of the students.</i>	Mean	4.78	5.00	4.89	Totally Agree
		SD	0.55	0.00	0.28	Homogeneous
Mean					4.86	Totally Agree
SD					0.29	Homogeneous

Likert type scales:

Item 10: Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1)

Item 11: Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0)

Items A & B: Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)

Evidence 3.2: Survey to School Directors

The second evidence of caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to school directors. Data is presented in Table 56. Their perception about the TEP's impact in their teachers from the San

Germán Campus was very positive (3.97 of 4 points, excellent). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.07).

Table 56

Survey to School Directors: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)

Item	Criteria	December 2012		December 2013		Mean	SD	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
		N=24		N=16		N=40		
6	Communication Skills: Listens to students and keeps them interested.	3.92	0.28	4.00	0.00	3.96	0.14	Excellent / Homogeneous
10	Leadership: Shows leadership through educational and community activities and is able to do team work.	3.92	0.28	4.00	0.00	3.96	0.14	Excellent / Homogeneous
11	Attendance: Has a high sense of professional commitment and responsibility which is revealed through attendance, punctuality, and compliance with the established norms.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
12	Personal Qualities: Reveals human quality and exemplary conduct in professional and personal endeavors.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
13	Personal Qualities: Reveals self-assurance, enthusiasm, and confidence in performance.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
14	Personal Qualities: Has a good sense of humor.	3.83	0.38	4.00	0.00	3.92	0.19	Excellent / Homogeneous
15	Personal Qualities: Shows respect, creativity, and politeness toward students.	3.83	0.38	4.00	0.00	3.92	0.19	Excellent / Homogeneous
16	Personal Qualities: Accepts his/her mistakes.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
17	Personal Qualities: Shows responsibility.	3.63	0.50	4.00	0.00	3.82	0.25	Excellent / Homogeneous
18	Personal Qualities: Shows punctuality.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
19	Personal Qualities: Shows an ethical conduct with colleagues.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
20	Personal Qualities: Shows solidarity with students and colleagues.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
21	Personal Qualities: Has a true commitment with education and with personal improvement.	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
Mean						3.97	0.07	Excellent / Homogeneous

Likert type scale: Excellent (4); Satisfactory (3); Regular (2); Poor (1)

Summary of evidences for Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions) of TEP’s Graduates or Completers

The summary of the evaluation of the caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) of TEP’s graduates or completers is presented in Table 57. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 3 (2 of 2 assessments, 100.0%).

Table 57

Assessments’ Summary for Claim 3

Assessments for Claim 3	Mean	Interpretation
1. Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	Likert type scales: Items A & B: Totally agree (5) or Agree (4) In general: 4.86	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
2. Survey to School Directors: Caring and Effective Teaching Skills (Professional Dispositions)	Likert type scale: 4 “Excellent” or 3 “Satisfactory” In general: 3.97	Excellent (Accomplished)

Claim 4.1: Cross-cutting theme Learning How to Learn

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned how to access information on their own (research), that they can transfer what they have learned to new situations, and that they have acquired the attitudes and skills that will support life-long learning in their field by achieving a performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.

Evidence 4.1.1: Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers

The first evidence for learning how to learn competences in TEP’s completers (graduates) were collected through a survey to TEP’s graduates or completers (in-service teachers). Data is presented in Table 58. Their perception about the TEP’s impact was positive (1.88 of 2.0 points, yes) and in total agreement (4.86 of 5.0 points). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous.

Table 58

Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Learning How to Learn

Items			Dec 2012	Dec 2013	In General	Interpretation
			N=63	N=19	N =82	
11a	<i>Courses provide for the development of critical and creative thinking.</i>	Mean	1.88	2.00	1.94	Yes
		SD	0.33	0.00	0.17	Homogeneous
11b	<i>Courses provide for the development of critical and creative thinking.</i>	Mean	1.67	2.00	1.84	Yes
		SD	0.50	0.00	0.25	Homogeneous
11c	<i>Courses provide for the development of research skills.</i>	Mean	1.74	2.00	1.87	Yes
		SD	0.48	0.00	0.24	Homogeneous
A-5	<i>He/She promotes the search for information and knowledge development.</i>	Mean	4.67	4.95	4.81	Totally Agree
		SD	0.62	0.23	0.43	Homogeneous
A-7	<i>He/She gives pertinence to the content of his/her subject matter, and gives opportunities for action research and experimentation.</i>	Mean	4.59	5.00	4.80	Totally Agree
		SD	0.66	0.00	0.33	Homogeneous
A-8	<i>His/Her subject matter content promotes the development of critical, reflective, and creative thinking.</i>	Mean	4.65	4.95	4.80	Totally Agree
		SD	0.60	0.23	0.42	Homogeneous
B-9	<i>He/she adapts the content of subject matter to the cognitive level of his/her students</i>	Mean	4.73	5.00	4.87	Totally Agree
		SD	0.54	0.00	0.27	Homogeneous
B-10	<i>He/she adapts the content of subject matter to the cognitive level of his/her students</i>	Mean	4.92	5.00	4.96	Totally Agree
		SD	0.34	0.00	0.17	Homogeneous
In General: Items 11		Mean			1.88	Yes
		SD			0.22	Homogeneous
In General: Items A & B		Mean			4.85	Totally Agree
		SD			0.32	Homogeneous

Likert type scales:

Item 10: Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1)

Item 11: Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0)

Items A & B: Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)

Evidence 4.1.2: Survey to School Directors

The second evidence of caring and effective teaching skills (professional dispositions) in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to school directors. Data is presented in Table 59. Their perception about the TEP's impact their teachers from the San Germán Campus were very positive (3.92 of 4 points, excellent). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.19).

Table 59

Survey to School Directors: Learning How to Learn

Item	Criteria	December 2012		December 2013		Mean	SD	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
		N=24		N=16		N=40		
9	Continuous Education: <i>Shows interest in keeping updated and in professional growth and development. Presents a formal yearly plan for professional development.</i>	3.83	0.38	4.00	0.00	3.92	0.19	Excellent / Homogeneous

Likert type scale: Excellent (4); Satisfactory (3); Regular (2); Poor (1)

Evidence 4.1.3: Continuation of graduate studies at the IAUPR

The third evidence of learning how to learn competencies in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through data analysis of official academic transcripts of the TEP's teacher candidates as were reported by the Registrar Office. Data is presented in Table 60. It indicates that 15.3% (11 of 72) of the TEP's graduates continued graduate studies at the IAUPR. Of them, 100.0% continued graduate studies at San Germán Campus.

Table 60

Continuation of Graduate Studies at IAUPR of TEP's Graduates

Graduation Date	N	Graduate Studies at IAUPR	%	Graduate Studies at IAUPR, SG	%
May, 2013	36	6	16.7%	6	100.0%
May, 2014	36	5	13.9%	5	100.0%
Total	72	11	15.3%	11	100.0%

Summary of evidences for Learning How to Learn Competencies of TEP’s Graduates or Completers

The summary of the evaluation of the learning how to learn competencies of TEP’s graduates or completers is presented in Table 61. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 4.1 (3 of 3 assessments, 100.0%).

Table 61

Assessments’ Summary for Claim 4.1

Assessments for Claim 4.1	Mean	Interpretation
1. Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers: Learning How to Learn	Likert type scales: Items A & B: Totally agree (5) or Agree (4) In general: 4.85	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
2. Survey to School Directors: Learning How to Learn	Likert type scale: 4 “Excellent” or 3 “Satisfactory” In general: 3.92	Excellent (Accomplished)
3. Continuation of Graduate Studies at IAUPR of TEP’s Graduates	In general: 15.3% continued graduate studies at IAUPR 100% of them continued graduate studies at San Germán Campus	Yes (Accomplished)

Claim 4.2: Cross-cutting theme Diversity

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP demonstrate that they have learned accurate and sound information on matters of diversity (race, gender, individual differences, and ethnic and cultural perspectives) by achieving a performance of above average attainment, or satisfactory or more.

Evidence 4.2.1: Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers

The first evidence for diversity competencies in TEP’s completers (graduates) were collected through a survey to TEP’s graduates or completers (in-service teachers). Data is presented in Table 62. Their perception about the TEP’s impact was in total agreement (4.82 of 5.0 points). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.30).

Table 62

Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Diversity

Items			Dec 2012	Dec 2013	In General	Interpretation
			N=63	N=19	N =82	
A-6	<i>He/she knows the contribution of his/her discipline to the students social and cultural formation.</i>	Mean	4.68	5.00	4.84	Totally Agree
		SD	0.59	0.00	0.30	Homogeneous
A-9	<i>He/she adapts the content of subject matter to the cognitive level of his/her students.</i>	Mean	4.73	5.00	4.87	Totally Agree
		SD	0.54	0.00	0.27	Homogeneous
B-2	<i>He/She integrates life experiences in the teaching and learning process.</i>	Mean	4.77	5.00	4.89	Totally Agree
		SD	0.53	0.00	0.27	Homogeneous
B-3	<i>He/She considers the socio-economical context of his/her students in the planning process.</i>	Mean	4.59	4.95	4.77	Totally Agree
		SD	0.67	0.23	0.45	Homogeneous
B-4	<i>He/She takes into consideration the differences in the culture, talents, preferences, and styles of his/her students.</i>	Mean	4.73	5.00	4.87	Totally Agree
		SD	0.58	0.00	0.29	Homogeneous
B-5	<i>He/she incorporates the community in his/her class planning.</i>	Mean	4.41	4.95	4.68	Totally Agree
		SD	0.80	0.23	0.52	Homogeneous
In General: Items A & B		Mean			4.82	Totally Agree
		SD			0.30	Homogeneous

Likert type scales:

Item 10: Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1)

Item 11: Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0)

Items A & B: Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)

Evidence 4.1.2: Survey to School Directors

The second evidence of diversity competencies in TEP's completers (graduates) was collected through a survey to school directors. Data is presented in Table 63. Their perception about the TEP's impact their teachers from the San Germán Campus were very positive (3.93 of 4 points, excellent). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.11).

Table 63

Survey to School Directors: Diversity

Item	Criteria	December 2012		December 2013		Mean	SD	Interpretation
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
		N=24		N=16		N=40		
4	<i>Teaching- Learning Process: The activities of the teacher are geared towards the development of knowledge among the students keeping in mind the level of teaching and the individual differences among students.</i>	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	Excellent / Homogeneous
8	Planning and Educational Evaluation: <i>Uses evaluation criteria that respond to student diversity.</i>	3.72	0.42	4.00	0.00	3.86	0.21	Excellent / Homogeneous
In General						3.93	0.11	Excellent / Homogeneous

Likert type scale: Excellent (4); Satisfactory (3); Regular (2); Poor (1)

Summary of evidences for Diversity Competencies of TEP's Graduates or Completers

The summary of the evaluation of the diversity competencies of TEP's graduates or completers is presented in Table 64. All assessments evidenced an accomplishment of Claim 4.1 (3 of 3 assessments, 100.0%).

Table 61

Assessments' Summary for Claim 4.2

Assessments for Claim 4.2	Mean	Interpretation
1. Survey to TEP's Graduates or Completers: Diversity	Likert type scales: Items A & B: Totally agree (5) or Agree (4) In general: 4.82	Totally Agree (Accomplished)
2. Survey to School Directors: Diversity	Likert type scale: 4 "Excellent" or 3 "Satisfactory" In general: 3.93	Excellent (Accomplished)

Claim 4.3 Cross-cutting theme Technology

Teacher candidates and completers (graduates) of the TEP are able to use classroom technology by achieving performance of above average attainment or satisfactory or more.

Evidence 4.3.1: Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers

Only one evidence is presented in this annual report for technology competencies in TEP’s completers (graduates). It was collected through a survey to TEP’s graduates or completers (in-service teachers). Data is presented in Table 65. Their perception about the TEP’s impact was positive (1.83 of 2.0 points, yes) and in total agreement (4.82 of 5.0 points). The standard deviations indicate that the answers were homogeneous (0.21). **(Accomplished)**

Table 65

Survey to TEP’s Graduates or Completers: Technology

Items			Dec 2012	Dec 2013	In General	Inter-pretation
			N=63	N=19	N =82	
11d	<i>Courses provide for the use of technology in teaching, research, and communication.</i>	Mean	1.66	2.00	1.83	Yes
		SD	0.61	0.00	0.31	Homogeneous
B-6	<i>He/She incorporates technology in his/her classes.</i>	Mean	4.52	5.00	4.76	Totally Agree
		SD	0.76	0.00	0.12	Homogeneous
B-7	<i>He/She incorporates technology in his/her classes.</i>	Mean	4.74	5.00	4.87	Totally Agree
		SD	0.60	0.00	0.30	Homogeneous
In General: Items B		Mean			4.82	Totally Agree
		SD			0.21	Homogeneous

Likert type scales:

Item 10: Very good (4); Good (3); Regular (2); Deficient (1)

Item 11: Yes (2); Partially (1); No (0)


Items A & B: Totally agree (5); Agree (4); Do not agree nor disagree (3); Disagree (2); Totally disagree (1)

Consumer information

1. Link to Students Right to Know information =

First: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/>

Second, in “Enlaces”’: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/index.php?page=student-right-to-know-act>



Universidad Interamericana de Puerto Rico - Recinto de San German - Student Right to Know - Windows Internet Explorer

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

www.sg.inter.edu

Student Right to Know


Información Requerida por el Gobierno Federal

De acuerdo a Student Right to Know Act (P.L. 101-542) de 1990, las universidades que administran fondos de Título IV deben proveer la siguiente información relevante para la toma de decisiones de estudiantes y sus padres:

- > Catálogo General: Información de Admisiones, Información para Estudiantes Transferidos, Programas Académicos, Facultad, Política de Privacidad de la Información de los Estudiantes (FERPA)
- > Decanato de Estudiantes
- > Centro de Orientación y Consejería
- > Consorcios e Intercambios Estudiantiles
- > Educación a Distancia
- > Programa de Clases
- > Calendario Académico
- > Reglamento de Estudiantes: Comportamiento Sujeto a Sanciones Disciplinarias, Política sobre Abuso de Drogas y Alcohol
- > Tasas de Retención y Graduación (IPEDES)
- > Información de Seguridad y Estadísticas de Actos Delictivos
- > Información sobre Ayudas Económicas
- > Documentos Normativos sobre Derechos de Autor

Internet | Protected Mode: On

02:28 a.m.



2. Student Default Rate of TEP’s Students = 25.61% (IAUPR, 2014^b)

[31 students in default of 121 TEP’s students, according to the *Draft Cohort Default Rate 2011 (3 years)* of February 2014. The San Germán Campus has 885 students in the report.]

3. Cohort Default Rate of the Inter American University of Puerto Rico, San Germán Campus:

<http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=PR&zc=00683&zcd=0&of=3&id=242617#fedloans>

Fiscal Year	2011	2010	2009
Default Rate	19.5%	28.9%	27.9%
Number in Default	1,743	2,496	2,473
Number in Repayment	8,914	8,614	8,841

The screenshot shows the College Navigator website for the Inter American University of Puerto Rico, San Germán Campus. The 'COHORT DEFAULT RATES' section is expanded, showing a table with the following data:

FISCAL YEAR	2011	2010	2009
Default rate	19.5%	28.9%	27.9%
Number in default	1,743	2,496	2,473
Number in repayment	8,914	8,614	8,841

Below the table, there are notes: 'These default rates apply to all locations of this institution.' and 'For further information on default rates please visit the Cohort Default Rate Home Page. This school system's six-digit OPE ID is 003938.' The 'AID PROGRAMS' section lists 'Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan)'.

4. **Information about Retention and Graduation Rates of the Inter American University of Puerto Rico, San Germán Campus =**

Link:

<http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?s=PR&zc=00683&zd=0&of=3&id=242617#retgrad>

5. **Link for TEP's information:** <http://www.sg.inter.edu/index.php?page=dpto-educacion-y-educacion-fisica>

6. **Link for economic assistance:** <http://asistencia.inter.edu/a/index.php>

7. **Link for information about net price calculator:**
<http://asistencia.inter.edu/calculadora/>

8. **Link for information about university costs (*Boletín de costos del Recinto de San Germán, 2012-2013*):**
<http://documentos.inter.edu/docs/index.php?category=12>

9. **Link for information about Basis for Student Budgets:**
<http://www.inter.edu/documentos.inter.edu/docs/index.php?article=126>

10. **Link for information about employment at the Department of Education of Puerto Rico:** <http://www.de.gobierno.pr/convocatorias>

11. **Link for information about Teacher Certification at the Department of Education of Puerto Rico:** <http://www.de.gobierno.pr/tags/certificacion-de-maestros>
12. **Link for information about employment at the Inter American University of Puerto Rico:** <http://www.inter.edu/i/empleos>
13. **Link for information about the Bureau of Labor Statistics:** <http://www.bls.gov/>

References

- College Board^a (2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014). *Aggregate-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data, Regular Teacher Preparation Program. Institution: Universidad Interamericana de PR, Recinto de San Germán.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author.
- College Board^b (2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014). *Institutional-Level Pass-Rate Data Report on Teacher Certification Test, List of Program Completers. Institution: Universidad Interamericana de PR, Recinto de San Germán.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author.
- College Board^c (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014). *Informe Institucional: Resultados de las Pruebas para Certificar Maestros.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Autor.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013, August 29). *CAEP Accreditation Standards.* Washington, DC: Author.
- Council of Chief State School Officers, CCSSO (2011, April). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards.* Washington, DC: Author.
- Departamento de Educación, DEPR (2006, 6 de septiembre). *Reglamento para la Clasificación de los Programas de Preparación de Maestros en Puerto Rico conforme a los Requisitos del Programa de Título II, Secciones 207 y 208 de la Ley Federal de Educación Superior.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Autor.
- Departamento de Educación, DEPR (2007, 7 de noviembre). *Carta Circular Núm. 6-2007-2008 Política Pública sobre las Pruebas de Certificación de Maestros.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Autor.
- Departamento de Educación, DEPR (2008). *Estándares Profesionales de los Maestros de Puerto Rico.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Autor.
- Departamento de Educación, DEPR (2012). *Reglamento de Certificación del Personal Docente de Puerto Rico.* San Juan, Puerto Rico: Autor.

- Inter American University of Puerto Rico, IAUPR (2011, December). *Inquiry Brief of the Teacher Education Program (TEP)*. San Germán, Puerto Rico: San Germán Campus, Department of Education and Physical Education.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2014^a, April). *Cohort Default rate*. [Electronic communication] San Juan, Puerto Rico: Institutional Office of Economic Assistance.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2014^b, March). *Default rate/PEM*. [Electronic communication] San Juan, Puerto Rico: Institutional Office of Economic Assistance.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2014^c, April). *Informe de Retención por Programa Académico del Área de Educación*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Office of Planning, Academic Information and of Research.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2014^e). *Matriz de articulación del Programa de Educación de Maestros: Metas, Objetivos Generales, Perfil de Competencias del Egresado, Cursos Medulares, Estándares Profesionales de los Maestros del DEPR y Estándares de Acreditación del CAEP*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Vicepresidency of Academic, Students and Systemic Planning Affairs.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^a, April). *Egresados del programa de Educación-Recinto de San Germán-Año Académico 2013-14*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Office of Planning, Academic Information and of Research.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^b, April). *Estudiantes admitidos y matriculados en el programa de Educación-San Germán-Año Académico 2013-14*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Office of Planning, Academic Information and of Research.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^c, April). *Estudiantes Matriculados en el PEM-San Germán. Primer Semestre 2011-12 al 2014-15*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Office of Planning, Academic Information and of Research.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico, IAUPR (2015^d, January). *General Catalog 2013-2015*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Author.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^e). *Grade Distribution Report: SWDGDIS*. San Germán, Puerto Rico: Registrar Office.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^f, March 18). *Graduation rates for the Annual Report (2015) of the Council for the Accreditation Educator Preparation "CAEP", San Germán Campus*. San Germán, Puerto Rico: Vice Presidency of Academic and Students Affairs and Systemic Planning, Institutional Office for Student Retention.
- Inter American University of Puerto Rico, IAUPR (2015^g, March). *Reports: SWDCAEPSTD, SWBCAPSTD, SWBCAPSTD_MAJOR*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Center of Informatics and Telecommunications.

Inter American University of Puerto Rico (2015^h, March 18). *Retention rates for the Annual Report (2015) of the Council for the Accreditation Educator Preparation “CAEP”, San Germán Campus*. San Germán, Puerto Rico: Vice Presidency of Academic and Students Affairs and Systemic Planning, Institutional Office for Student Retention.

Teacher Education Accreditation Council, TEAC. (2005, July). *Guide to Accreditation*. Washington, DC: Author.

Contact persons

Dr. Miriam Padilla-Rodríguez
Director
Department of Education and Physical Education
(787) 264-1912, ext. 7350, 7351, 7464
miriam_padilla_camacho@intersg.edu

Dr. Elba T. Irizarry-Ramírez
Coordinator of Accreditation TEP-
TEAC/CAEP
(787) 264-1912, ext. 7388, 7357
elba_irizarry_ramirez@intersg.edu

(April 17, 2015)