

University Council on Teacher Education
Agenda for September 17, 2024
3:00-4:00
Zoom

Announcements

Old Business

1. CAEP Review
2. Multiple Measures (Tory)
3. UDTPA Updates

New Business

1. PECB policy changes (Tory)

Meeting Minutes

CAEP (Tory):

- As you are all aware, our CAEP cycle is coming to a close and that means that our CAEP self-study report will be due in early 2026, with the site visit to follow in the fall of 26. I am still trying to get information about the new CAEP review of evidence of Standard 1 for those who do not submit SPA reports. My suspicion is that we are safest if we remain aligned to our content standards even for those of you who are no longer going through the SPA process. I think in order to be safest with CAEP, we also are going to need to be aligned with the InTASC standards. They're very general, and they're things that we are all already doing. Review of Evidence of Standard 1 is a brand new report that we've never had to do before. I need an example of what it looks like.
- Sometime within the next 30 to 60 days, Krissy and I will set up a monthly time to meet so that program coordinators can check in with us regarding where we are on CAEP reports. For those of you who are doing the CAEP Review of evidence of Standard 1, it will be similar in structure to your SPA reports. We are hoping once I get more clarity from CAEP to come up with a generic shell. I've got it in process, but I'm not ready to send it out yet until I get answers to some very important questions.
- Sometime in the next 30 days take a look at those InTASC standards and their sub bullets, and see if there's anything in there that you know you're not doing, and let me know those of you that have gone through SPA since the last time we did CAEP. We can use your SPA approval for part of that. However, if your SPA only requires 2 cycles of data, CAEP will want 3.
- Lastly, the final semester for data collection should be Spring 25. Unless you've been told by me personally, please plan to conclude collection S25 at the latest. I will need your completed report by September 1 of 2025, so that I can integrate it into the larger report.
- Rose, if you would like me to contribute to that, and argue on behalf of postponing your APR, please LMK. Rose: Yes, can you just email Jason? And copy me.

Multiple Measures (TORY):

<https://education.delaware.gov/legacy/home/educators/licensure-and-certification/multiple-measures/>

- In response praxis passage issues, DDOE, along with IHE reps, created Multiple Measures as a pathway to licensure for students who are within the acceptable score range and meet other conditions.
- There are 3 possible ways to be eligible to have that score flexibility. One is, if you graduate with a 3.5, or higher - as long as you're within the score range you're eligible. You can also be eligible if you have completed a teacher residency, completed a performance assessment or completed a DDOE designated micro credential
- The recent changes to 290 allow us to use MM for institutional recommendation. However, these students would be counted as having failing praxis scores per Title 2 because MM does not require the candidate to achieve a passing score.
- I would like to establish an updated IR policy that does not allow for use of MM (with rare exception at the discretion of the Sr. Associate Dir CEETP) for institutional recommendation for the following reasons:
 1. This would lower our praxis passage rates, one of the key differentiators between our programs and other Delaware IHEs
 2. This will greatly increase the workload of the Certification officer as they clear students for Institutional Recommendation, likely delaying student ability to apply for licensure.
 3. **Other states (that require passage of a subject assessment) may not view the adjusted score as "passing"**

PECB (Professional Education Conduct Board):

Proposal: Eliminate PECB, continue to receive conduct updates from CSCR and issue a warning letter to students who violate PECB specified UD policies to inform them that (with further violations) their ability to student teach may be in danger. Manage any "hot list" violations (conduct violations that indicate major lack of judgement, violence etc) via the dispositions process with OCS.

Rationale: In 5 years, PECB has not removed a single student from student teaching. However, the process scares students, is not clearly communicated (CSCR tells students that their case has been completely adjudicated and resolved, only for students to then be contacted by PECB and told their student teaching is in jeopardy) and extends the conduct process, often to more than a year.

UDTPA: CAEP requires us to have 3 key assessments which are assessments that are taken by all teacher prep students. With edTPA and PPAT, we had 3. Now we only have two - the praxis, which is the standard, and the DTGSS student teaching evaluation. We have not had a 3rd for some time and we fully expect to get dinged for it. The UDTPA will be the 3rd key assessment and it will demonstrate that we are engaging in a data-informed continuous improvement cycle. Our previous site visit indicated the following as an area for improvement (AFI): The EPP provided minimal evidence that it regularly and systematically uses data for continuous improvement across all programs. (Component 5.3) Rationale: The EPP provided minimal evidence to show how it regularly and systematically assesses candidates and analyzes data, reports to stakeholders, makes decisions based on data, and identifies changes to inform possible program changes. From evidence provided in the Addendum and in interviews with faculty, accreditation team, the team found that minimal initiatives were in place to analyze assessment data and make appropriate changes. There is no formal system where there is a regular and systematic process to use data for continuous improvement across programs.