

# 2018 EPP Annual Report

<b>CAEP ID:</b>	32355	<b>AACTE SID:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>	Inter American University of Puerto Rico - Fajardo		
<b>Unit:</b>	Education & Social Sciences		

## Section 1. AIMS Profile

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

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

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

## Section 2. Program Completers

2.1 How many candidates completed programs that prepared them to work in preschool through grade 12 settings during Academic Year 2016-2017 ?

Enter a numeric value for each textbox.

2.1.1 Number of completers in programs leading to initial teacher certification or licensure<sup>1</sup>

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

Total number of program completers 23

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

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

## Section 3. Substantive Changes

Have any of the following substantive changes occurred at your educator preparation provider or institution/organization during the 2016-2017 academic year?

3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP.  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.3 The addition of programs of study at a degree or credential level different from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.4 The addition of courses or programs that represent a significant departure, in terms of either content or delivery, from those that were offered when most recently accredited  
No Change / Not Applicable

3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements  
No Change / Not Applicable

Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements:

3.6 Change in regional accreditation status

No Change / Not Applicable

3.7 Change in state program approval

No Change / Not Applicable

## Section 4. Display of Annual Reporting Measures.

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

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

1

**Link:** <http://fajardo.inter.edu/contenido/academicos/caep.htm>

**Description of data accessible via link:** Fajardo TEP Data Annual Report Measures

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

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

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

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

Discuss any emerging, long-term, expected, or unexpected trends? Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?  
 Are benchmarks available for comparison?  
 Are measures widely shared? How? With whom?

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

The Provider has been analyzing the data reported through the Annual report measures and the results over the past three years has been positive in terms of verifying that our completers can demonstrate they master the competencies developed by the TEP, can effectively apply the content knowledge learned and that our graduates seem to be Moderately satisfied to Very Satisfied with the mastery of the Professional Competencies. We also have learned that the results need to be discussed with the stakeholders, Faculty and also the Fajardo Clinical Educators in order to receive feedback for quality suggestions in regard to programs improvements, weaknesses of the program but also strengths of the Program.

Discuss any programmatic/provider-wide changes being planned as a result of these data?

The TEP does not have any programmatic/provider-wide changes as a result of these data, but it has some remediation activities to improv weaknesses demonstrated in some measures such as the PCMAS Test results from 2013-2016. Also, the UAUPR , incorporated in the Curriculum two courses related to the Test , to help in increasing the scores for our candidates.

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

Summarize EPP activities and the outcomes of those activities as they relate to correcting the areas cited in the last Accreditation Action/Decision Report.

**TEAC:** Weakness

0.1 Evidence of candidates' subject matter knowledge

Subject matter knowledge is by some measures an area of weakness.

The Fajardo TEP revised the measures to evaluate the Subject Matter of our candidates using the following measures:  
Grade of B or above or above in Educ. 4013- Average of 3.0 or above as a measure of mastery of Content knowledge in their specialty

Mean of 3.0 or above in TEP Professional area courses measuring content knowledge the following categories:

- Content Knowledge
- Learner and Learning
- Instructional Practice
- Professional Responsibility and Ethics

Alignment and revision of Clinical Practice Instruments by the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor, Employer Questionnaire and Graduate questionnaire to CAEP standards , In Tasc Standards and DEPR Professional Standards measuring: Subject Matter Knowledge by specialties and Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

Use of official data of Passing score from the Puerto Rico State Certification Battery Test in Fundamental Content Knowledge (PCMAS) as an indicator of mastery of Content Knowledge. and Pedagogical Knowledge

**TEAC:** Weakness

1.5 Evidence of valid interpretations of the assessments

Evidence indicates that some of the assessments are not yet reliable and valid.

The Fajardo TEP revised the 2015-16 EPP created assessments , tagged them to CAEP Standards, INTasc Standards and DEPR Professional Standards. Also we are collecting accurate data related to Content Knowledge, Pedagogical Knowledge, Use of Technology, Research Skills and Knowledge , and Diversity and confirm the Validity and Reliability of the revised instruments . We concluded in the 2016 Brief that the TEP will revise existing assessments for year 2018 , and include a four point Lickert Scale( Increase existing scales in the assessments ) and revise existing premises by including more actionable cognitive verbs to measure mastery( profoundness ) of the professional Competencies . The TEP have evidence of present validations of instruments and reliability performed each time the instrument is administered .

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

CAEP Standard 5

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.

CAEP Standard 5, Component 5.3

The provider regularly and systematically assesses performance against its goals and relevant standards, tracks results over time, tests innovations and the effects of selection criteria on subsequent progress and completion, and uses results to improve program elements and processes.

6.1 Summarize any data-driven EPP-wide or programmatic modifications, innovations, or changes planned, worked on, or completed in the last academic year. This is an opportunity to share targeted continuous improvement efforts your EPP is proud of. Focus on one to three major efforts the EPP made and the relationship among data examined, changes, and studying the results of those changes.

- Describe how the EPP regularly and systematically assessed its performance against its goals or the CAEP standards.
- What innovations or changes did the EPP implement as a result of that review?
- How are progress and results tracked? How will the EPP know the degree to which changes are improvements?

The following questions were created from the March 2016 handbook for initial-level programs sufficiency criteria for standard 5, component 5.3 and may be helpful in cataloguing continuous improvement.

- What quality assurance system data did the provider review?
- What patterns across preparation programs (both strengths and weaknesses) did the provider identify?
- How did the provider use data/evidence for continuous improvement?
- How did the provider test innovations?
- What specific examples show that changes and program modifications can be linked back to evidence/data?

- How did the provider document explicit investigation of selection criteria used for Standard 3 in relation to candidate progress and completion?
- How did the provider document that data-driven changes are ongoing and based on systematic assessment of performance, and/or that innovations result in overall positive trends of improvement for EPPs, their candidates, and P-12 students?

The following thoughts are derived from the September 2017 handbook for advanced-level programs  
How was stakeholders' feedback and input sought and incorporated into the evaluation, research, and decision-making activities?

The TEP have examined closely the results of the PCMAS battery Test, the TEP utilized as a measure of Subject Matter Knowledge. These results were compared to the Years 2014, 15, 16 and 17 from the PR college Board Institutional report to the TEP. The TEP have systematically been observing a trend of low scores in the Battery Test against our goals of utilizing this measure. As a result, we modified the requisites for Test Taking in the Fajardo Campus due to limitations encountered with our candidates such as:

- Passing the PCMAS Test is not mandatory for IAUPR Graduation purposes.
- Candidates are prioritizing more graduating and getting a job in a private school system from the program and does not necessarily take the test immediately. (private schools do not require DEPR Professional Licenses to be hired)
- Time factor in taking the test is more than two years without preparing and therefore the results are not positive in terms of passing.

The provider incorporated 2 remediate actions in regards to the PCMAS Test taking such as: mandatory reviews from the Fajardo TEP and the Puerto Rico Teachers association review and a protocol for this test taking approval by the Program. The candidate or graduate must demonstrate that they are taking both reviews to be able to be permitted or approved by the Fajardo TEP to take the PCMAS TEST. As a result of these two remediate alternative the PCMAS results as of 2017 was that the Aggregate Pass Rate increased to 86 % Institution Passing Score (previous years was 50 to 62%) compared to a 93 % Aggregate Pass Rate score statewide. We can infer that due to this mandatory remediation alternatives, our candidates now are giving more attention to take the test and pass both reviews for the Program to be approved by the Program, to take the test. Otherwise the Program does not approve the candidate to take the PCMAS TEST. The TEP is aware that this alternative for the candidate is costly since they must pay for the PRTA review and pay for taking the PCMAS Test. The Program understands that the candidate is giving more attention to pass the PCMAS Test in order to avoid going through the Program protocol for the PCMAS test taking. We are planning to incorporate an evaluation from the candidates or graduates regarding the pertinence of the reviews in helping to pass the test. This alternative will be discussed in Fall 2018 with the Fajardo TEP Faculty.

In regard to the Impact of Graduate in K-12 Learning , The Fajardo TEP initiated the Impact Project with one (1) graduate from the Program in September to November 2016. As a result, the Program designed two instruments which went through content validity from three Campus Faculty. Results are kept in each campus. Once the Impact Instrument of the research was approved, the Program initiated this project as a pilot study. The results were positive, and our graduate demonstrated impact in their students in a secondary Biology Class. The graduate demonstrated through a Portfolio all the activities performed in order to demonstrate her effectiveness in students learning. The Program also developed an instrument to receive feedback from the students that are participating in the research in relation to their perceptions of the effectiveness of the graduate in their learning and the results also showed that the students evaluated the effectiveness of the graduate in promoting learning. However, due to the lack of participation from the DEPR of providing data of our graduate's performance regarding students learning, the research performed provided the information for our program. We have evaluated this project and found some limitations such as: Problems in convincing our graduates to participate in the research due to: lack of economic incentives to participate, graduates perceive that it is a lot of work besides all of the duties there are currently doing in the schools, graduates start the research project and at the middle of the project they decide not to continue for personal or health issues and other related problems. One example is that for the semester from January to May 2017, the graduate who decided to participate in the research at the middle of the project, she got sick and decided to stop the participation.

At present we are in the process of continuing with the present research, but the TEP is also considering evaluating other ways that could be more attractive to the graduates to participate such as Focus Groups participation. The Program from August to December 2018, will start considering alternatives of obtaining information of impact of our graduates the trend of graduates not wanting to participate will continue, because they find that the participation adds more work to what they already have in the schools. The TEP regularly assessed the performance of the candidates during Clinical Practice Course using the Cooperative Teacher Instrument and University Supervisors Instruments measuring STD 1 CAEP Component. Both Instruments went through content and face validity from three IAUPR Campus Faculty. The TEP systematically evaluated the results of these administrations and resulted that in some cases scoring from both Clinical educators were not performed jointly, and therefore in some specialties such as 206-English Secondary, the Cooperative Teacher evaluated lesser scoring and sometimes did not find Good mastery of some Competencies and on the other hand the University Supervisor scored it differently.

TEP is enforcing to score the candidates performance jointly to avoid differences in scoring and looking for more collaboration in scoring the candidates for the TEP to have more objective collective evaluations. As a result, the TEP started in 2016, performing inter-reliability of the Two Clinical Practice Portfolios using the PD-7 and PD-8A Instrument. For the Year 2016, the TEP evaluated 50% of the Portfolios (4 out of eight) and the results were very positive in reaching consensus in scoring. Both Clinical Educators that participated found the experience as rewarding and that it helped them in being more conscious in the scoring of the Portfolios and being more objective since they had to participate collaboratively. The TEP will continue to perform the inter reliability of both Clinical Practice Portfolios for the Year 2017.

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the data or changes apply.

4.1 Completer impact on student growth and learning  
4.2 Completer effectiveness via observations and/or student surveys  
4.3 Employer satisfaction  
4.4 Completer satisfaction  
5.1 Effective quality assurance system that monitors progress using multiple measures  
A.4.2 Satisfaction of Completers  
A.5.3 Continuous Improvement  
x.1 Diversity  
x.2 Technology

Upload data results or documentation of data-driven changes.

 SATISFACTION\_SURVEY\_TO\_TEP\_GRADUATES\_201617.xlsx  
 SURVEY\_\_TO\_TEP\_GRADUATES\_20162017.xlsx  
 SURVEY\_TO\_TEP\_EMPLOYERS\_201617.xlsx  
 FAJARDO\_TEP\_ANUAL\_REPORT\_2018.pdf

6.2 Would the provider be willing to share highlights, new initiatives, assessments, research, scholarship, or service activities during a CAEP Conference or in other CAEP Communications?

Yes  No

6.3 Optional Comments

---

## Section 7: Transition

In the transition from legacy standards and principles to the CAEP standards, CAEP wishes to support a successful transition to CAEP Accreditation. The EPP Annual Report offers an opportunity for rigorous and thoughtful reflection regarding progress in demonstrating evidence toward CAEP Accreditation. To this end, CAEP asks for the following information so that CAEP can identify areas of priority in providing guidance to EPPs.

7.1 Assess and identify gaps (if any) in the EPP's evidence relating to the CAEP standards and the progress made on addressing those gaps. This is an opportunity to share the EPP's assessment of its evidence. It may help to use the Readiness for Accreditation Self-Assessment Checklist, the CAEP Accreditation Handbook (for initial level programs), or the CAEP Handbook: Guidance on Self-Study Reports for Accreditation at the Advanced Level.

If there are no identified gaps, click the box next to "No identified gaps" and proceed to question 7.2.

No identified gaps

If there are identified gaps, please summarize the gaps and any steps planned or taken toward the gap(s) to be fully prepared by your CAEP site visit in the text box below and tag the standard or component to which the text applies.

---

Tag the standard(s) or component(s) to which the text applies.

Not applicable

7.2 I certify to the best of my knowledge that the EPP continues to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

Yes  No

7.3 If no, please describe any changes that mean that the EPP does not continue to meet legacy NCATE Standards or TEAC Quality Principles, as applicable.

---

## Section 8: Preparer's Authorization

Preparer's authorization. *By checking the box below, I indicate that I am authorized by the EPP to complete the 2018*

*EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

Report Preparer's Information

Name: **Dr. Migdalia Cardona**

Position: **CAEP Coordinator**

Phone: **787-863-2390 EXT 2215 EXT 2237**

E-mail: **migcard@hotmail.com**

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

CAEP Accreditation Policy

Policy 6.01 Annual Report

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

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

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

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

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

Policy 8.05 Misleading or Incorrect Statements

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

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

Acknowledge