

# 2021 Annual Accreditation Report

CAEP ID: 32359

AACTE SID:

Institution: Inter American University of Puerto Rico - San Germán

Unit: Department of Education and Physical Education

## Section 1. EPP 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 persons	<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"/>

1.2 [For EPP seeking Continuing CAEP Accreditation] Please provide a link to your webpage that accurately lists the Initial Licensure programs and/or Advanced Level programs currently offered by the EPP that were reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) during the EPP's last site review.

**Document link:** [http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/departamentos/educacion\\_y\\_educacion\\_fisica/CAEP/2021\\_CAEP\\_Initial\\_Licensure\\_programs\\_and\\_Advanced\\_Level\\_programs\\_currently\\_offered.pdf](http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/departamentos/educacion_y_educacion_fisica/CAEP/2021_CAEP_Initial_Licensure_programs_and_Advanced_Level_programs_currently_offered.pdf)

**Web Page link:** <http://www.sg.inter.edu/decanato-de-asuntos-academicos/departamentos-academicos/educacion-y-educacion-fisica/caep-informacion/>

## 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 2019-2020?

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:

Total number of program completers

---

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the scope for Initial and Advanced programs, see Policy II 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 2019-2020 academic year?**

- 3.1 Changes in the established mission or objectives of the institution/organization or the EPP **None.**
- 3.2 Any change in the legal status, form of control, or ownership of the EPP. **None.**
- 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.**
- 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 **Not applicable.**
- 3.5 A contract with other providers for direct instructional services, including any teach-out agreements Any change that means the EPP no longer satisfies accreditation standards or requirements: **Not applicable.**
- 3.6 Change in regional accreditation status **No**
- 3.7 Change in state program approval **No**

### 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)

#### Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4):

##### 1. Impact on P-12 learning and development(Component 4.1)

The impact on P-12 learning and development (Component 4.1) was measured in Local Assessment instrument PD-11 Survey to Employers (n=12). The areas evaluated in Term Fall 2019 by the on-line survey platform Survey Monkey were organized using InTASC standards: *The Learner and Learning and Instructional Practice*. The measure scale was a 4.00-points scale, and the expected point average was 2.50. Data evidenced the following:

Table 1

*Employers Survey, Fall 2019*

Majors of Completers (Employees)	Learner and Learning		Instructional Practice	
	Media	DE	Media	DE
1. Music Education: General	3.00	0.000	3.33	0.577
2. Música General: Vocal	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
3. Special Education	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
4. Secondary: History	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
5. Secondary: Spanish	4.00	0.000	3.83	0.408
6. Secondary: Biology	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
7. Secondary: Chemistry			3.00	0.000
8. Secondary: Physical Education	3.31	0.480	4.00	0.000
9. Adapted Physical Education	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
10. Secondary: TESL	3.73	0.467	4.00	0.000
11. Elementary: TESL			4.00	0.000
12. K-3	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
13. 4 <sup>th</sup> to 6 <sup>th</sup>	3.67	0.577	4.00	0.000
14. Pre-School	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
15. Arts Education	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>0.117</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>0.066</b>
<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Accomplished Excellent</b>	<b>Homogeneous</b>	<b>Accomplished Excellent</b>	<b>Homogeneous</b>
<b>In general: Impact on P-12 learning and development</b>	<b>Mean = 3.85 Excellent</b> <b>SD = 0.090 Homogeneous</b> <b>Accomplished</b> <b><math>p(Z \leq z)</math> one-tail = 0.4799</b> <b>No significant differences between the evaluation</b>			

1. In general: All majors of completers that were evaluated by their employers (School Directors) in their impact on P-12 learning and development accomplished the expected point average.

2. In general: The evaluation of completers by employers (School Directors, n=12) in their impact on P-12 learning and development was homogeneous.

3. In specific: The evaluation of the InTASC standard *Instructional Practice* (3.91 of 4-point scale) was bigger than *The Learner and Learning* (3.85 of 4-point scale).

4. In specific: The evaluation of the InTASC standards *Instructional Practice* and *The Learner and Learning* had no statistical significant differences ( $p(Z \leq z)$  one-tail = 0.4799).

**Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4): 2. Indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2)**

The impact in indicators of teaching effectiveness (Component 4.2) was measured in Local Assessment instrument PD-11 Survey to Employers (n=12). The areas evaluated in Term Fall 2019 by the on-line survey platform Survey Monkey were organized using InTASC standards: *Content Knowledge* and *Professional Responsibility*. The measure scale was a 4.00-points scale, and the expected point average was 2.50. Data evidenced the following:

Table 2

*Employers Survey, Fall 2019 (n=12)*

Majors of Completers (Employees)	Content Knowledge		Professional Responsibility	
	Media	DE	Media	DE
1. Music Education: General	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
2. Música General: Vocal	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
3. Special Education	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
4. Secondary: History	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
5. Secondary: Spanish	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
6. Secondary: Biology	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
7. Secondary: Chemistry	4.00	0.000	3.50	0.707
8. Secondary: Physical Education	4.00	0.000	3.75	0.500
9. Adapted Physical Education	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
10. Secondary: TESL	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
11. Elementary: TESL	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
12. K-3	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
13. 4 <sup>th</sup> to 6 <sup>th</sup>	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
14. Pre-School	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
15. Arts Education	4.00	0.000	4.00	0.000
<b>Mean</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>0.080</b>
<b>Interpretation</b>	<b>Accomplished Excellent</b>	<b>Homogeneous</b>	<b>Accomplished Excellent</b>	<b>Homogeneous</b>
<b>In general: Indicators of teaching effectiveness</b>	<b>Mean = 3.98 Excellent</b> <b>SD = 0.040 Homogeneous</b> <b>Accomplished</b> <b><math>p(Z \leq z)</math> one-tail = 0. 04539</b> <b>No significant differences between the evaluations</b>			

1. In general: All majors of completers that were evaluated by their employers (School Directors) in the indicators of teaching effectiveness accomplished the expected point average.
2. In general: The evaluation of completers by employers (School Directors, n=12) in their teaching effectiveness was homogeneous.
3. In specific: The evaluation of the InTASC standard *Content Knowledge* (4.00 of 4-point scale) was bigger than *Professional Responsibility* (3.95 of 4-point scale).
4. In specific: The evaluation of the InTASC standards *Content Knowledge* and *Professional Responsibility* had no statistical significant differences in the evaluations by employers ( $p(Z<=z)$  one-tail = 0.4539).

**Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4): 3. Satisfaction of employers and employment milestones (Component 4.3)**

The general satisfaction of Employers (n=12 in Fall 2019) was also measured in Local Assessment instrument PD-11 Survey to Employers. The general satisfaction of Employers accomplished the expected point average (3.91 in a 4.00-point scale Excellent, SD = 0.065 Homogeneous).

The employment milestones were measured in Local Assessment instrument PD-13B Survey to Completors (n=26). The areas evaluated in term Fall 2019 by the on-line survey platform Survey Monkey were: time after graduation to obtain a teaching position, actual teaching position in their major, and actual areas of work. Data evidenced the following:

Table 3

*Completors Milestones (n=26) according to on-line survey PD-13B Survey to Completors, Fall 2019 (n=26)*

Questions	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage
<i>How long it took you from graduating to getting your first teaching job?</i>			
0-6 months	12	46.2	85.7
10-12 months	1	3.8	7.1
More than 12 months	1	3.8	7.1
Total	14	53.8	100.0
Missing answers	12	46.2	
Total	26	100.0	
<i>Are you currently teaching in the major with which you graduated?</i>			
Yes	10	38.5	58.8
No	7	26.9	41.2
Total	17	65.4	100.0
Missing answers	9	34.6	
Total	26	100.0	
<i>If your answer was "No", where are you working on?</i>			
In my minor concentration (minor).	1	3.8	20.0
In other school / academic functions, but	1	3.8	20.0

Questions	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage
not as a teacher.			
In a job not directly related to education.	3	11.5	60.0
Total	5	19.2	100.00
Missing answers	21	80.8	
Total	26	100.0	

In general, for employment milestones according to Completers revealed the following data:

1. The 85.7% of completers (N=14) indicated that they get their first teaching job 0-6 months after graduation. The 7.1% took 10-12 months.
2. The 58.8% of completers (N=17) indicated that they are were teaching in Fall 2019.
3. The 3.8% of those completers who were not working in their major in Fall 2019 (N=26, n=1) were teaching in their minor, and other 3.8% were working in other school/academic functions, but not as a teacher.

#### **Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4): 4. Satisfaction of completers (Component 4.4)**

The satisfaction of Completers with TEP (EPP-Initial Level) was measured in on-line Local Assessment instrument PD-13-B Survey to Completers (N=26, n=18). The areas evaluated in Term Fall 2019 by the on-line survey platform Survey Monkey were: *Content Knowledge Learning, Methodology in Courses Offered, Pedagogical Knowledge and Competencies Development, Attention to Diversity in the Classroom Competencies Development, Classroom Management Competencies Development, Assessment in the Classroom Competencies Development, Faculty of the EPP-Initial Level*. The measure scale was a 5.00-points scale, and the expected point average was 4.00.

Data evidenced that TEP-Initial Level completers were satisfied with the Program (Mean=4.15, Good; SD=0.715 Homogeneous). Findings are presented in Table 4.

The inferential statistical analysis (ANOVA one-way) is presented in Table 5. Data evidenced that:

1. There was a significant statistical difference in the *Content Knowledge* satisfaction between and within majors ( $p=0.035$ ).
2. All other areas evaluated by completers (N=26, n=18) had no significant statistical difference in satisfaction between and within majors: *EPP Methodology* ( $p=0.167$ ), *Pedagogical Knowledge* ( $p=0.331$ ), *Attention to Diversity* ( $p=0.475$ ), *Classroom Management* ( $p=0.367$ ), *Assessment* ( $p=0.144$ ), and *EPP Faculty* ( $p=0.878$ ).

Table 4

*Employees (Completers) Survey, Fall 2019 (n=18)*

Majors of Completers (Employees)	n	Content Knowledge		EPP Methodology		Pedagogical Knowledge		Attention to Diversity		Classroom Management		Assessment		EPP Faculty		Mean	
B.A. Secondary Education in Mathematics - 128	1	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	3.75	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	<b>5.00</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.A. Special Education - 136	1	3.50	.000	3.67	.000	3.00	.000	3.00	.000	2.25	.000	3.00	.000	4.00	.000	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.A. Secondary Education in Spanish - 145	1	2.83	.000	3.00	.000	2.67	.000	3.00	.000	2.25	.000	3.00	.000	4.00	.000	<b>2.96</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Secondary Level - 147	4	4.83	.333	4.75	.319	4.33	.943	3.92	1.067	3.13	.433	4.63	.479	4.50	.707	<b>4.30</b>	<b>0.612</b>
B.A. Physical Education at the Elementary Level - 178	1	4.67	.000	4.00	.000	4.67	.000	4.67	.000	3.25	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	<b>4.47</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.M. Music Education: Instrumental - 191	2	3.58	.118	2.83	1.179	3.83	.236	3.17	.236	3.00	.707	4.50	.707	4.25	1.061	<b>3.59</b>	<b>0.606</b>
B.M. Music Education: General-Vocal - 192	1	4.00	.000	4.00	.000	4.00	.000	3.33	.000	2.50	.000	4.00	.000	4.00	.000	<b>3.69</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.A. Teaching English as a Second Language at the Elementary Level - 206	1	4.67	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	3.75	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	<b>4.77</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (K-3) - 236	4	4.42	.500	4.08	.687	4.42	.500	4.00	.720	3.13	.520	4.75	.500	4.63	.479	<b>4.20</b>	<b>0.558</b>
B.A. Early Childhood: Elementary Level (4-6) - 237	1	4.83	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	4.67	.000	3.75	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	<b>4.75</b>	<b>0.000</b>
B.A. Early Childhood: Pre-school Level - 243	1	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	3.75	.000	5.00	.000	5.00	.000	<b>4.82</b>	<b>0.000</b>
<b>Total/Mean</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.37</b>	<b>.670</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>.857</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>.786</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>.867</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>.564</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>.696</b>	<b>4.56</b>	<b>.566</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>0.715</b>
<b>Interpretation</b>		<b>Good Homo. Accom.</b>		<b>Good Homo. Accom.</b>		<b>Good Homo. Accom.</b>		<b>Regular Homo. NA</b>		<b>Regular Homo. NA</b>		<b>Good Homo. Accom.</b>		<b>Good Homo. Accom.</b>		<b>Good Homo. Accom.</b>	
<b>Homo = Homogeneous</b>									<b>Interpretation Scale:</b>								
<b>Accom. = Accomplished</b>									<b>5.00-4.50 Excellent; 4.49-4.00 Good; 3.99-3.50 Regular;</b>								
<b>NA = Not accomplished</b>									<b>3.49-3.00 Deficient; 2.00-0.00 Failure</b>								

Table 5

*Inferential Statistical Analysis (ANOVA)*

		Square Addition	lg	Quadratic Mean	F	Sig.
Content Knowledge	Between groups	6.545	10	0.654	4.175	0.035
	Within groups	1.097	7	0.157		
	Total	7.642	17			
EPP Methodology	Between groups	9.364	10	0.936	2.107	0.167
	Within groups	3.111	7	0.444		
	Total	12.475	17			
Pedagogical Knowledge	Between groups	7.028	10	0.703	1.417	0.331
	Within groups	3.472	7	0.496		
	Total	10.500	17			
Attention to Diversity	Between groups	7.744	10	0.774	1.078	0.475
	Within groups	5.028	7	0.718		
	Total	12.772	17			
Classroom Management	Between groups	3.531	10	0.353	1.318	0.367
	Within groups	1.875	7	0.268		
	Total	5.406	17			
Assessment	Between groups	6.299	10	0.630	2.276	0.144
	Within groups	1.937	7	0.277		
	Total	8.236	17			
EPP Faculty	Between groups	2.132	10	0.213	.451	0.878
	Within groups	3.312	7	0.473		
	Total	5.444	17			

**Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4): 5. Graduation Rates (initial & advanced levels)****Graduation Rates for EPP-Initial Level**

According to the Research, Assessment and Planning Office at the Central Administration of the Inter American University of Puerto Rico, to calculate graduation rates, the follow-up cohort is first selected. In this report, the follow-up cohort for high school students was defined as follows:

- New students to high school level programs.
- Admission type is Regular
- Enrolled full time (Full Timers) in their first term of FALL.

Once the cohorts for each year of entry were selected, they were followed up over the next six academic years to determine how many of these students graduated from the Teacher Education



Program. Then, the number of students graduating was divided by the cohort base and multiplied by one hundred to calculate the cumulative graduation rate. The six-year cumulative graduation rate reflects the percentage of students in the cohort who graduated in six years or less from a Department of Education program.

Table 6

*Accumulative Graduation Rate at 6 years or less of studies, EPP-Initial Level, All majors*

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
<b>2012</b>	57	15	26%
<b>2013</b>	66	16	24%
<b>2014</b>	50	15	30%

Tabla 7

*Accumulative Graduation Rate at 6 years or less of studies, EPP-Initial Level*

<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2012 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
128-SEC EDUC: TEACH OF MATHEMATICS	1	0	0%
136-SPECIAL EDUCATION	3	2	67%
144-SEC EDUC: TEACHING OF HISTORY	1	0	0%
145-SEC EDUC: TEACHING OF SPANISH	1	0	0%
147-SEC ED: TEACH ENG 2ND LANG	5	2	40%
176-PHYS ED: SECONDARY LEVEL	4	0	0%
177-SEC EDUC: TEACH SOCIAL STUDIES	2	1	50%
178-PHYS ED: ELEMENTARY LEVEL	2	0	0%
191-MUSIC EDUCATION: INSTRUMENTAL	9	2	22%
192-MUSIC EDUC: GENERAL - VOCAL	12	4	33%
206-ELEM ED: TEACH ENGLISH SEC LANG	2	2	100%
207-PHYS EDUC: ADAPTED PHYS EDUC	2	0	0%
236-EARLY CHILDHOOD: ELEM LVL K-3	5	0	0%
243-EARLY CHILDHOOD: PRESCHOOL LVL	5	1	20%
254-VISUAL ARTS: TEACHING ART	3	1	33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26%</b>

<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2013 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
128 - SEC EDUC: TEACH OF MATHEMATICS	2	2	100%
136 - SPECIAL EDUCATION	4	2	50%
144 - SEC EDUC: TEACHING OF HISTORY	1	0	0%
145 - SEC EDUC: TEACHING OF SPANISH	4	2	50%
147 - SEC ED: TEACH ENG 2ND LANG	10	3	30%
176 - PHYS ED: SECONDARY LEVEL	3	0	0%
178 - PHYS ED: ELEMENTARY LEVEL	1	0	0%
187 - SEC EDUC: TEACHING OF CHEMISTRY	1	0	0%
191 - MUSIC EDUCATION: INSTRUMENTAL	13	3	23%
192 - MUSIC EDUC: GENERAL - VOCAL	10	0	0%
207 - PHYS EDUC: ADAPTED PHYS EDUC	4	0	0%
236 - EARLY CHILDHOOD: ELEM LVL K-3	7	3	43%
243 - EARLY CHILDHOOD: PRESCHOOL LVL	3	0	0%
254 - VISUAL ARTS: TEACHING ART	2	1	50%
267 - EDUC: SCHOOL HEALTH	1	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2014 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
136 - SPECIAL EDUCATION	3	1	33%
144 - SEC EDUC TEACHING OF HISTORY	1	0	0%
145 - SEC EDUC TEACHING OF SPANISH	4	3	75%
147 - SEC ED TEACH ENG 2ND LANG	2	2	100%
176 - PHYS ED SECONDARY LEVEL	6	0	0%
178 - PHYS ED ELEMENTARY LEVEL	3	1	33%
191 - MUSIC EDUCATION INSTRUMENTAL	8	2	25%
192 - MUSIC EDUC GENERAL VOCAL	10	2	20%
206 - ELEM ED TEACH ENGLISH SEC LANG	2	1	50%
207 - PHYS EDUC ADAPTED PHYS EDUC	5	0	0%
236 - EARLY CHILDHOOD ELEM LVL K3	3	2	67%
237 - TEACH ELEM FOUR TO SIX 4 6	1	0	0%
254 - VISUAL ARTS TEACHING ART	2	1	50%
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>30%</b>

## Graduation Rates for EPP-Advanced Levels: Master's degrees

To calculate graduation rates, the follow-up cohort is first selected. In this report, the follow-up cohort for master's level students was defined as follows:

- New students entering master's level programs.
- Your type of admission is Regular
- They enrolled full time (Full Timers) in their first term of FALL.

Once the cohorts were selected for each year of admission, they were followed up for the next four academic years to determine how many of these students graduated from the Institution. The number of graduating students was then divided by the cohort base and multiplied by one hundred to calculate the cumulative graduation rate. The cumulative four-year graduation rate reflects the percentage of students in the cohort who graduated in four years from any Department of Education master's level program.

Tabla 8

*Accumulative Graduation Rate at 4 years of studies, EPP-Advanced Level (Masters), All majors*

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>Master's Degrees Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
<b>2012</b>	52	23	<b>44%</b>
<b>2013</b>	51	30	<b>59%</b>
<b>2014</b>	97	76	<b>78%</b>

Tabla 9

*Accumulative Graduation Rate at 4 years of studies, EPP-Advanced Level (Masters),*

<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2012 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
300-TEACH ENG AS SEC LANG	10	5	50%
309A-EDUCATION: COUNSELING	8	5	63%
324-PSYCHOLOGY: SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY	9	1	11%
329-SPECIAL EDUCATION	4	2	50%
339-BUSINESS EDUCATION	1	0	0%
343-EDUC: TEACHING OF SCIENCE	5	3	60%
393-MUSIC EDUCATION	5	4	80%
395-TEACHING ELEMENTARY LEVEL	2	1	50%
400-ED: PHYS ED: SPORT TRAIN-PERFORM	6	1	17%
401-ED: PHY ED: TEACH OF PHYSICAL ED	1	0	0%
402-ED: EDUC MGMT & LEADERSHIP	1	1	100%

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2013 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
300 - TEACH ENG AS SEC LANG	6	3	50%
309A - EDUCATION: COUNSELING	7	4	57%
324 - PSYCHOLOGY: SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY	7	3	43%
329 - SPECIAL EDUCATION	10	7	70%
339 - BUSINESS EDUCATION	4	2	50%
343 - EDUC: TEACHING OF SCIENCE	1	0	0%
393 - MUSIC EDUCATION	5	3	60%
395 - TEACHING ELEMENTARY LEVEL	5	5	100%
400 - ED: PHYS ED: SPORT TRAIN- PERFORM	3	2	67%
401 - ED: PHY ED: TEACH OF PHYSICAL ED	1	0	0%
402 - ED: EDUC MGMT & LEADERSHIP	2	1	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>59%</b>
<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2014 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
300 - TEACH ENG AS SEC LANG	10	9	90%
309A - EDUCATION COUNSELING	16	13	81%
329 - SPECIAL EDUCATION	21	14	68%
343 - EDUC TEACHING OF SCIENCE	9	6	67%
393 - MUSIC EDUCATION	11	8	73%
395 - TEACHING ELEMENTARY LEVEL	15	14	93%
400 - ED:PHYS ED SPORT TRAIN PERFORM	7	7	100%
401 - ED:PHY ED TEACH OF PHYSICAL ED	1	1	100%
402 - EDUC MGMT LEADERSHIP	7	4	57%
<b>Total</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>78%</b>

### Graduation Rates for EPP-Advanced Levels: Doctoral degrees

To calculate graduation rates, the follow-up cohort is first selected. In this report, the follow-up cohort for PhD level students was defined as follows:

- New students entering doctoral level programs.
- Your type of admission is Regular
- They enrolled full time (Full Timers) in their first term of Fall.

Once the cohorts were selected for each year of admission, they were followed up for the next six academic years to determine how many of these students graduated from the Institution. The number of graduating students was then divided by the cohort base and multiplied by one hundred to calculate the cumulative graduation rate. The cumulative six-year graduation rate reflects the percentage of students in the cohort who graduated in six years from any Department of Education master's level program.

Tabla 10

*Accumulative Graduation Rate to the 6th year of studies - Doctorate Level in Education Programs*

<b>Cohort</b>	<b>Base</b>	<b>Master's Degrees Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
<b>2012</b>	22	2	<b>9%</b>
<b>2013</b>	18	4	<b>22%</b>
<b>2014</b>	86	16	<b>18%</b>

Tabla 9

*Accumulative Graduation Rate to the 6th year of studies - Doctorate Level in Education Programs*

<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2012 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
520C-EDUC: ED MGMT & LEADERSHIP	11	0	0%
530C-EDUCATION: COUNSELING	1	0	0%
540C-EDUC: CURRICULUM & TEACHING	9	1	11%
587-BUSINESS EDUCATION	1	1	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2013 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
520C - EDUC: ED MGMT & LEADERSHIP	5	1	20%
530C - EDUCATION: COUNSELING	3	0	0%
540C - EDUC: CURRICULUM & TEACHING	10	3	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>Academic Programs (Majors)</b>	<b>Base 2014 Cohort</b>	<b>Completers</b>	<b>% of Graduation</b>
520C - EDUC ED MGMT LEADERSHIP	45	5	11%
530C - EDUCATION COUNSELING	5	0	0%
540C - EDUC CURRICULUM TEACHING	36	11	31%
<b>Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>18%</b>

**Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4): 6. Ability of completers to meet licensing(certification) and any additional state requirements; Title II (initial level)**

Available data is of completers at the Initial-Level EPP. The ability of completers to meet licensing (certification) is measured through PCMAS (standardized test called *Pruebas para la Certificación de Maestros*). The most recently information of PCMAS is for 2018 and 2019. Due to COVID-19 pandemic, PCMAS was not offered in 2020. Data available are in Tables 10, 11 and 12.

Data evidenced:

1. For *Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data for Teacher Preparation Program: Subject matter Knowledge (Specialization) of Teacher Candidates at Completion* (Table 10):
  - The performance of Candidates at Completion in subject matter knowledge measured in PCMAS was consistently bigger in 2018 and 2019 than Statewide, as measured in the *Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate, for Spanish and English as a Second Language majors*.
  - It is important to remark that the small number of test takers could affected the variance of the group of takers and affected the percentage obtained.
  - Faculty must analyze this performances and possible causes to make arraigments in courses and academic orientations.
  - The 93.2% of Candidates at Completion in 2018 and the 62.5% in 2019 evidence accomplishment of subject matter knowledge as measured in PCMAS.
  - The performance of Spanish and English as a Second Language is consistently bigger in 2018 and 2019 than Statewide, as measured in the *Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate*.
  
2. For *Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate for Professional Competences: Pedagogical Knowledge of Teacher Candidates al Completion* (Table 11).
  - The performance of Candidates at Completion in the two last measures (2018 and 2019) of **PCMAS (new general test) is bigger than Statewide, and best in 2019**, as measured in the *Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate for Professional Competences Assessment Level Pass-Rate*.
  - If compared secondary level with elementary level, the performance of secondary level is bigger than statewide in 2018 but smaller in 2019.
  - The performance of elementary level is smaller than statewide in both test years.
  - It is important to investigate the reasons of the performance at the elementary and secondary levels. TEP will contact the candidates at completion to participate in a focal group to clarify their difficulties in PCMAS.
  - In general, the 86.0% of Candidates at Completion from the Initial-Level EPP at the San Germán Campus of the IAUPR in 2018 and the 90.0% in

2019 evidence accomplishment of the professional competencies (pedagogical knowledge) as measured in PCMAS.

- Of them, the Candidates at Completion at the Secondary Level evidence better performance than Candidates at Completion at the Elementary Level in both years.

3. For *Summary Pass Rate and Aggregate Assessment Pass Rate Data* (Table 12):

- The performance of Candidates at Completion in 2018 PCMAS was bigger than Statewide in specialization or majors' competencies but not in pedagogical knowledge (professional competencies), as measured in the *Aggregate Assessment Pass Rates*.
- The Summary Pass Rate in 2018 of San Germán Campus Candidates at Completion is also less small than Statewide.
- On the other hand, **the performances in specialization/majors, the PCMAS general (pedagogical competencies), and PCMAS (elementary/secondary) in 2019 are smaller than Statewide.**
- Still Candidates at Completion of TEP at the San Germán Campus performance is excellent in the *Aggregate Assessment Pass Rate* but good in the *Summary Pass Rate*.
- The TEP have investigate and analyze the reasons of the performance of their Candidates at Completion to take decisions according to reliable data.
- The performance of Candidates at Completion of TEP at the San Germán Campus standard (classification of the Initial-Level EPP at San Germán Campus) was good (83%) as evidenced in the *Summary Pass Rate*.

The Teacher Report Card also evidenced our Candidates and Completers data. The links for the Teacher Report Card are:

- Teacher Report Card, Traditional Report AY 2019-2020:  
[http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Teacher\\_Report\\_Card\\_Tradicional\\_2019-20\\_Certificado\\_2021.pdf](http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Teacher_Report_Card_Tradicional_2019-20_Certificado_2021.pdf)
- Teacher Report Card, Alternative, IHE-based Report AY 2019-20:  
[http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Teacher\\_Report\\_Card\\_Alternative\\_Program\\_2019-2020\\_2021\\_Certificado.pdf](http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Teacher_Report_Card_Alternative_Program_2019-2020_2021_Certificado.pdf)

**PCMAS UPDATED INFORMATION FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM SAN GERMAN CAMPUS  
(2018 & 2019)**

Table 10

*Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate Data for Teacher Preparation Program: Subject matter Knowledge (Specialization) of Teacher Candidates at Completion*

Academic year	Spring 2018			Spring 2019			San Germán Campus: Differences 2019 vs 2018
	Specialties or Majors	TEP in IAUPR, San Germán Campus	Statewide (Puerto Rico) Differences	TEP in IAUPR, San Germán Campus	Statewide (Puerto Rico) Differences	Differences	
<b>Spanish</b>	3/3 = 100%	89%	<b>+11%</b>	3/3 = 100%	89%	<b>+11%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>English</b>	2/2 = 100%	94%	<b>+6%</b>	3/3 = 100%	95%	<b>+5%</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	1/1 = 100%	77%	<b>+23%</b>	0/1 = 0%	88%	<b>-88%</b>	<b>- 100%</b>
<b>Social Studies</b>	N/A	100%	<b>N/A</b>	N/A	92%	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Science</b>	1/1 = 100%	100%	<b>0%</b>	1/2 = 50%	88%	<b>-38%</b>	<b>- 50%</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>93.2%</b>	<b>86.4%</b>	<b>+6.8%</b>	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>90%</b> <b>(Social Studies not counted)</b>	<b>-27.5%</b>	<b>- 31%</b>

N/A: No students



Table 11

*Single-Assessment Level Pass-Rate for Professional Competences: Pedagogical Knowledge of Teacher Candidates at Completion*

<b>Academic year</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>			<b>Spring 2019</b>			<b>San Germán Campus: Differences 2019 vs 2018</b>
<b>Professional Competences</b>	<b>TEP in IAUPR San Germán Campus</b>	<b>Statewide (Puerto Rico)</b>	<b>Differences (TEPvsPR)</b>	<b>TEP in IAUPR San Germán Campus</b>	<b>Statewide (Puerto Rico)</b>	<b>Differences (TEPvsPR)</b>	
<b>PCMAS general-Elementary</b>	5/7 = 71%	91%	- 20%	13/15 = 87%	94%	- 7%	+ 16%
<b>PCMAS general-Secondary</b>	7/7 = 100%	97%	+ 3%	14/15 = 93%	98%	- 5%	- 2%
<b>PCMAS general</b>	12/14 = 86%	82%	+ 4%	27/30 = 90%	94%	- 4%	+ 4%

Table 12

*Summary Pass Rate and Aggregate Assessment Pass Rate Data*

<b>Academic year of PCMAS Tests</b>	<b>TEP San Germán Campus</b>	<b>Performance Standard (Classification of TEP at San Germán Campus)</b>	<b>Statewide</b>	<b>Performance Standard*</b>	<b>Difference (TEP vs Statewide)</b>
<b>2018-Professional competencies</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>-4%</b>
<b>2018- Specialization</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>+10%</b>
<b>Summary Pass Rate (2018)</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>-4%</b>
<b>2019- Specialization</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>- 15%</b>
<b>2019- PCMAS general (Elementary &amp; Secondary)</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>- 4%</b>
<b>2019- PCMAS general (Pedagogical competencies)</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>- 4%</b>
<b>Summary Pass Rate (2019)</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>- 9%</b>

\* Performance standard according to: Department of Education of Puerto Rico & the College Board Puerto Rico y América Latina Office. (2016, 12 de diciembre): *Boletín Informativo Número 18 de la Red Colaborativa – Actividades y Calendario de Trabajo Año Académico 2016-2017 para la preparación de los informes requeridos para el Teacher Preparation Report Card (TRC) sobre los Programas de Preparación de Maestros.*

Note 1: The *Summary Pass Rate* is the proportion of program completers who passed all the tests they took in each of the skill or knowledge areas, among all program completers who took one or more tests in each area (PCMAS General or PCMAS General Elementary-Secondary).

Note 2: The *Aggregate Assessment Pass Rate* is the proportion of program completers who passed all tests they took for their areas of specialization among those who took one or more tests in their specialization areas.

**Outcome Measures: 7. Ability of completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared (initial level)**

The ability of Completers to be hired in education positions for which they have prepared was to be measured in on-line Local Assessment instrument PD-13-B Survey to Completers, as presented in Table 3:

1. The 85.7% of completers (N=14) indicated that they get their first teaching job 0-6 months after graduation. The 7.1% took 10-12 months.
2. The 58.8% of completers (N=17) indicated that they are were teaching in Fall 2019.
3. The 3.8% of those completers who were not working in their major in Fall 2019 (N=26, n=1) were teaching in their minor, and other 3.8% were working in other school/academic functions, but not as a teacher.

On the other hand, other measures related to the ability of completers to be hired in education positions can be related to the professional development and/or graduate studies they are studying after BA graduation. This data was collected by the on-line in Local Assessment instrument PD-13-B Survey to Completers (Fall 2019). Table 13 shows the information:

Table 13

*Completers Survey, PD-13B, Fall 2019*

Questions	Frequency	Percentage of 26	Valid Percentage
<i>Are you currently studying?</i>			
Yes	4	15.4	23.5
No	13	50.0	76.5
Total	17	65.4	100.0
Missing	9	34.6	
Total	26	100.0	
<i>If studying, what are you study?</i>			
Master degree	3	11.5	100.0
Doctoral degree	0		
Missing	23	88.5	
Total	26		
<i>If not studying, do you plan to study in the future?</i>			
Yes, soon	3	11.5	20.0
Yes, but I do not know when	11	42.3	73.3
No, I am not interested	1	3.8	6.7
Total	15	57.7	100.0
Missing	11	42.3	
Total	26	100.0	
<i>As a completer of the EPP-Initial Level of the San Germán Campus Teacher Education Program, how you have developed in your profession and in your school?</i>			

Questions	Frequency	Percentage of 26	Valid Percentage
I have continued graduate studies.	5	19.2	50.0
I offer workshops and trainings to colleagues for their professional development, demonstrating academic leadership skills.	2	7.7	20.0
I have been coach and/or mentor to colleagues in my area of expertise.	3	11.5	30.0
Total	10	38.4	100.0
Missing	16	61.6	
Total	26	100	

**Impact Measures (CAEP Standard 4): 8. Student loan default rates and other consumer information (initial & advanced levels)**

This information can be obtained at: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/students-achievementsstudent-right-know/>

*4.1 Provider shares a direct link to the EPPs website where data relevant to each of the 8 Annual Reporting Measures are clearly tagged, explained, and displayed. Additional links will be provided only if data on any specific measure is not on the same webpage as the one already provided. The additional link should also lead to a page on the EPPs own website.*

**Relevant links shared in this 2021 Annual Report:**

- Response to 2020 Annual Report Reviewer Feedback (Staff Review Report, December 2020): <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/RESPONSE TO 2020 ANNUAL REPORT EXAMINERS FEEDBACK 04-20-21.pdf>
- 2021 Annual Accreditation Report:
- Licensure programs and/or Advanced Level programs currently offered by the EPP that were reviewed and accredited by CAEP (NCATE or TEAC) during the EPP's last site review. Document link: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/departamentos/educacion y educacion fisica/CAEP/2021 CAEP Initial Licensure programs and Advanced Level programs currently offered.pdf>
- Web Page link: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/decanato-de-asuntos-academicos/departamentos-academicos/educacion-y-educacion-fisica/caep-informacion/>
- PCMAS 2018 Data: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/PCMAS Data 2018 04 26 2021.pdf>
- PCMAS 2019 Data: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/PCMAS Data 2019 04 26 2021.pdf>
- Teacher Report Card, Traditional Report AY 2019-2020: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Teacher Report Card Tradicional 2019-20 Certificado 2021.pdf>
- Teacher Report Card, Alternative, IHE-based Report AY 2019-20:

<http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Teacher Report Card Alternative Program 2019-2020 2021 Certificado.pdf>

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?*

The annual reporting to CAEP is very important for the continuous improvement of EPP programs. But our Program could not gather all the information needed to complete our Annual Reports and our Self-Study Report. For the past three-years we have been affected with two hurricanes and an earthquake, culminating with COVID-19 pandemic, and the closing of schools and Universities, and the on-line education. Due to that problems we ask to CAEP to lapse our Accreditation status in December 2021, and CAEP approved it.

Official letters were posted in San Germán Campus Web Page in the following links:

- Letter to CAEP to voluntarily allow Accreditation to lapse: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter to CAEP for voluntary to allow Accreditation to lapse.pdf>
- Letter from CAEP accepting San Germán Campus decision: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter from CAEP accepting San German Campus decision.pdf>

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

Waived

This section was waived by CAEP in 2021 Annual Report due to our decision to voluntarily allow the CAEP Probatory Accreditation to lapse. Dr. Christopher Koch, President of CAEP accepted our decision in his letter on March 4, 2021. Official letters were posted in San Germán Campus Web Page in the following links:

- Letter to CAEP to voluntarily allow Accreditation to lapse: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter to CAEP for voluntary to allow Accreditation to lapse.pdf>
- Letter from CAEP accepting San Germán Campus decision: <http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter from CAEP accepting San German Campus decision.pdf>
- Letter to Faculty about decision to lapse Accreditation with CAEP (Spanish text): [http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter to Faculty about decision to lapse Accreditation with CAEP \(Spanish text\).pdf](http://www.sg.inter.edu/wp-content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter to Faculty about decision to lapse Accreditation with CAEP (Spanish text).pdf)

[content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter\\_to\\_Faculty\\_about\\_decision\\_to\\_lapse\\_Accreditation\\_with\\_CAEP.pdf](content/uploads/Documentos/CAEP/Letter_to_Faculty_about_decision_to_lapse_Accreditation_with_CAEP.pdf)

## Section 6. Continuous Improvement

Waived

This section was waived by CAEP in 2021 Annual Report due to our decision to voluntarily allow the CAEP Probatory Accreditation to lapse. Dr. Christopher Koch, President of CAEP accepted our decision in his letter on March 4, 2021. Official letters were posted in San Germán Campus Web Page as indicated above.

## 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 2021 EPP Annual Report.*

I am authorized to complete this report.

## Report Preparer's Information

Name: Dr. Elba T. Irizarry Ramírez

Position: Associate Professor and Accreditation Coordinator until May 31<sup>st</sup> 2021

Phone: (787) 264-1912, exts. 7351, 7358; (787) 383-4939 (cellular)

E-mail: [elba\\_irizarry\\_ramirez@intersg.edu](mailto:elba_irizarry_ramirez@intersg.edu)

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

## CAEP Accreditation Policy:

### Policy V.3.01 Annual Accreditation Report

The Annual Accreditation Report (Annual Report) process, along with CAEP's review of any complaint against an EPP, is used to monitor and evaluate an EPP's continued compliance with CAEP's Standards. The Annual Accreditation Report requires, at a minimum:

- a. Information demonstrating that the EPP is correcting or has corrected any conditions leading to the identification of Areas for Improvement and Stipulations from prior accreditation decisions;
- b. Key data and indicators, including but not limited to, fiscal information and measures of candidates' effectiveness and impact on P-12 student learning;
- c. Current headcount enrollment data which will be used to monitor overall growth of the EPP; and
- d. Report substantive changes that may affect an EPP's accreditation status or eligibility.

In January of each year, CAEP will notify an EPP with an accreditation status that the Annual Accreditation Report has been opened. Such notification may be dispatched through CAEP's electronic accreditation platform. No later than 90 days after receiving access to the Annual Report template, an EPP must submit a complete Annual Accreditation Report using CAEP's reporting form.

An EPP's Annual Accreditation Report will be reviewed and evaluated by CAEP staff and a team of volunteer Annual Report Reviewers, selected pursuant to Section VI.2, and the EPP Transparency, Accountability, and

Improvement Committee of the Accreditation Council.

Following receipt of information from CAEP regarding an Annual Report deficiency, an EPP must take timely action to correct the deficiency in accordance with instructions provided by CAEP staff and, if applicable, provide any additional information requested so that CAEP can adequately monitor the growth of programs at any freestanding EPP experiencing significant enrollment growth. Any deficiency identified as serious must be corrected within a timeline established by CAEP. Evidence of an EPP's correction of any deficiency not identified as serious may be included in the EPP's next annual report.

Neither the lack of any Annual Report deficiencies nor an EPP's correction of Annual Report deficiencies are to be considered an assurance that an EPP is prepared or on track to successfully demonstrating compliance with CAEP Standards.

An Evaluation Team assigned to review the EPP and the Accreditation Council may consider an EPP's Annual Reports as evidence in making any accreditation decision or in instituting a Warning action.

### **Policy V.3.02 Continued Compliance with Standards**

Failure to maintain compliance with all applicable Standards will be considered cause for immediate initiation of an Accreditation Council decision to revoke accreditation by issuing a directive that the EPP bring itself into compliance within a period of time specified by the Accreditation Council. The period of time specified for an EPP to take corrective action and come into compliance will not exceed:

- a. 12 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP is less than 1 year in length;
- b. 18 months, if the longest program offered by the EPP is at least 1 year, but less than 2 years, in length; or
- c. 2 years, if the longest program offered by the EPP is at least 2 years in length.

If the EPP does not bring itself into compliance within the specified period, the Accreditation Council will take immediate Adverse Action unless it, for good cause, extends the period for achieving compliance.

CAEP may consider any concerns raised about an EPP by any nationally recognized accrediting agency as evidence of any EPP's failure to maintain compliance. The CAEP President may request, and the Accreditation Council may consider, a report from any such accreditor that describes the nature of the issues giving rise to concerns.

If the Accreditation Council determines that a Virtual Site Review or On-Site Review is required in order to verify that an EPP has come into compliance, it may require an Special Review and the EPP must undergo the Review within the timeline specified by the Council and remit payment for CAEP's invoice of all costs directly associated with the Review.

**Acknowledge**