Rejoinder for CAEP UPRM

University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez thanks the review team for all their hard work and has prepared a rejoinder on the following recommendations and areas for improvement

AFI	Rationale	Response	Evidence
The EPP does not regularly and systematically review the quality assurance system, investigate differences among programs, use data or evidence to make continuous improvement, and test innovations across all programs. (component R5.3)	There is a lack of evidence for some program areas 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.	Our Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) is committed to enhancing our quality assurance system by ensuring consistency across all programs. We acknowledge the importance of structured, data-driven decision-making and are dedicated to addressing the areas for improvement identified in the CAEP review. More work needs to be done in this area. To improve the continuity and reliability of our processes, we are implementing several key initiatives: Unified Data System: All program data will be integrated into a centralized system to ensure uniform collection, analysis, and reporting. Standardized Assessment Tools: Common rubrics and evaluation measures will be applied consistently across all programs. Validated and Reliable Rubrics: Rubrics that have undergone validation and reliability testing will be identified and utilized. Alignment with CAEP Standards: Adjustments will be made to ensure compliance with CAEP standards, improving the measurement of program impact on candidates, employers, and student learning. We agree with this AFI.	
While multiple measures are part of the data review, the preponderance of evidence indicates EPP's quality assurance	There is not a unified system in place to assess unit operations. The two largest programs had independent systems	To ensure long-term success, the following oversight mechanisms will be implemented:	

system lacks continuity across all programs and consists of measures that are not applied consistently across programs. (component R5.1)	for data collection and analysis.	Regular Quality Assurance Committee Meetings: Quarterly discussions will assess program data and recommend refinements. Stakeholder Feedback Mechanisms: Input from faculty, students, alumni, and school district partners will inform program adjustments. Annual Program Reports: Each program will submit annual summaries of data-driven changes and their impact on student outcomes. We are dedicated to fostering a culture of continuous improvement, ensuring the highest standards of quality in our programs. The steps outlined will enhance our ability to prepare highly effective educators. We look forward to ongoing collaboration with CAEP and stakeholders as we build upon these advancements. We agree with this AFI.	