

University Council on Teacher Education

Minutes for April 2026

April 8, 2026, at 9:00am

Zoom: <https://udel.zoom.us/j/5076949576?omn=93648007453&from=addon>

Members Present: Mark Akubo, Christina Budde, Suzanne Burton, Trish Hermance, Sarah Mallory, Krissy Najera, Aimee Pearsall, Tory McHugh

Members Not Present: Steve Amendum, Rena Hallam, Rosalyn Washington

Next meeting: Wednesday, May 13, 9-10am

Quick recap: The meeting focused on addressing performance assessment requirements for CAEP and student teaching policies. Tory and Krissy discussed the state's new performance criteria for teacher preparation programs, explaining that while most requirements were already being met through DTGSS implementation, programs need to demonstrate how they measure impact on P-12 student learning. The group clarified that this requirement applies to initial teacher certification programs only, including 4+1 special education and STEM programs but not master's level or non-initial programs.

The discussion also covered proposed changes to EDUC 400 enrollment policies to prevent students from taking excessive courses alongside student teaching, with two potential solutions being considered: requiring completion of all degree requirements except EDUC 400 before enrollment and implementing a permission-based enrollment system.

Finally, the meeting addressed the development of essential functions and accommodation for student teachers, with Sarah and Krissy reporting on their meeting with Disability Support Services about creating program-specific principles based on the Model Code of Ethics for Educators, which would need legal review before implementation.

Next steps:

- **Tory and Krissy: Reach out to all programs to request documentation (e.g., rubric or description) of where and how each program is measuring impact on P12 student learning, and where data for this is being kept, for inclusion on the June 30 deliverable to the department (Pedagogical Performance Measure (PPM)).**
- **Program coordinators: Review current program assessments to identify where P12 student impact is being measured and provide the required documentation (rubric or description) to Tory and Krissy for PPM.**
- **Tory and Krissy: Draft a PPM memo for UCTE members to review and approve, summarizing the plan and findings for the June 30 state deliverable.**
- **Sarah: Send Tory times early next week to meet and discuss evidence of Standard 1 and program-specific implementation for Spec Ed, and coordinate with relevant Spec Ed faculty (e.g., Kristen, Josh) for further discussion.**
- **Tory: Attend upcoming Spec Ed group meeting to clarify requirements and support program-specific planning for P12 student impact assessment.**

- **Krissy: Investigate with Jo Ann Merritt (scheduler) and others the process and language for restricting student enrollment in EDUC 400 (e.g., requiring permission of instructor, prerequisite completion), and report back to the group with recommended language and procedures.**
- **Krissy and Sarah: Develop a draft student-teacher job description with core guiding principles and space for program-specific principles, consult with Nursing and review relevant documents (e.g., MCEE standards, student teaching handbook), and bring to UCTE for review prior to May meeting.**
- **Krissy: Follow up with legal regarding the status of the professional dispositions policy and provide an update at the May meeting.**
- **UCTE members: Review and approve the draft student-teacher job description and guiding principles at the May meeting (or as distributed).**
- **Program coordinators: Begin review over summer/fall of whether program-specific guiding principles are needed, with the possibility of piloting core principles in fall and appending program-specific principles as needed.**

Summary

1. **CAEP Assessment Development Discussion**
 - Krissy and Tory reviewed the development of CAEP assessments, including the use of PRAXIS as a reliable and valid measure of student performance. Krissy explained their decision to scrap the previous UDTPA assessment in favor of the Principles of Learning and Teaching exam. The group is working with Leigh McLean to establish reliability and validity for lesson plan assessments, which will need to include calibration sessions for faculty and field instructors.
2. **Pedagogical Performance Measure (PPM): due Jun 30, 2026**
 - [DDOE Pedagogical Performance Measures Criteria.pdf](#)
3. **PPM Implementation**
 - There are new criteria requiring IHEs and the state to collaborate on a replacement assessment. The team (Tory, Krissy, Leigh, Rose, Trish) determined they were already implementing most of the required criteria through their DTGSS implementation, with the main gap being connection to P-12 student outcomes. The group will deliver a report to the department by June 30th outlining their current DTGSS implementation and collecting information from each program on how they measure impact on P-12 student learning. Tory noted that while this meets the current requirement, the possibility exists to implement one additional assessment in the future to meet CAEP requirements as well as the PPM.
 - The team discussed the implementation of performance measures for IHEs, with a focus on starting any new assessment in the fall. They emphasized opposition to requiring students to pay significant amounts for assessments, especially seniors, and noted that other states have been removing similar requirements. They clarified that the performance measures gap (how we measure impact on P-12 student learning) focuses on moment-to-moment student learning rather than summative data and noted that while there are plans to tie PK-12 student learning outcomes to their work at UD in the future, this is not currently on the table.
 - The team discussed implementing a new performance assessment requirement for teacher certification programs, focusing on moving forward with data collection rather than pulling historical data. Tory clarified that programs need to provide a written plan by June 30th demonstrating how they will measure and maintain data on this performance target, with the

option to identify gaps and plans for addressing them. The discussion confirmed that this applies to the EME program as a whole rather than specific concentration areas, and that existing assessment data can be leveraged to meet the requirement.

4. **Criterion 6 of the PPM Implementation Discussion**

- The team discussed implementing criterion number 6 for measuring how candidates address student outcomes and adjust instruction accordingly. Krissy clarified that while pre-test/post-test data is not specifically required, programs need to demonstrate that students are attending to learner outcomes and making adjustments. Mark raised concerns about collecting this data in seminar classes where student participation is optional, and Tory offered to meet with Mark and Trish to help determine appropriate touchpoints for measurement. The discussion also addressed how to handle special education programs, with Sarah clarifying that their intervention-based approach would need to focus on child-level rather than classroom-level outcomes.

5. **Standard 1 Evidence Requirements Discussion**

- The group discussed requirements for evidence of Standard 1 across different programs. Tory clarified that initial licensure programs, including 4+1 programs and STEM 4+1, would need to demonstrate compliance, while master's programs like TESOL and MLL would also be included but literacy programs would not. The discussion revealed that Special Education programs under the non-SPA umbrella might have been overlooked in the initial communications about evidence requirements. Sarah agreed to schedule a meeting with Tory early the following week to discuss these requirements further and potentially include Kristen and Josh in the conversation. The conversation ended with plans to address professional disposition matters and updates on student teaching accommodation.

6. **Student Enrollment Proposals:**

- Aimee raised concerns about a student who enrolled in 10 additional credits while taking EDUC 400, leading to discussions about implementing restrictions. Krissy agreed to investigate the authority and language needed to restrict course enrollment, potentially requiring all degree requirements except EDUC 400 to be completed before enrolling.
- **PROPOSAL 1:** All degree requirements except for EDUC400 must be satisfied before enrolling in EDUC400.
 - **RATIONALE 1:** Students should not be finishing major course requirements while student teaching. Adding this language will help to align the MUED major with all of the other education majors across the university. They all require that students have finished all degree requirements before enrolling in student teaching. Our seminar course (EDUC 433) is taken along with EDUC 400 and is a program requirement, so we may need to think about how to word this proposal. Additionally, some programs have to allow students to take other courses during student teaching to ensure we do not delay their time to graduation. It is not ideal, but it happens more often than you'd think.
- **PROPOSAL 2:** EDUC400: Requires permission of instructor to enroll.
 - **RATIONALE 2:** All education majors across the university are required to complete a student teaching application prior to enrolling in EDUC400. This application acts as a stopgap for advisors to check to ensure that they have completed all degree requirements except for EDUC400 (see proposal 1). Requiring permission of instructor to enroll will prevent students from registering who have not completed all degree

requirements other than student teaching. I like the idea of a stop gap/degree audit to determine if students have completed all requirements. We would definitely want input from advisors who enroll students in this course to determine feasibility.

7. **Professional Dispositions, Essential Functions, and Student Teaching Accommodations:**

- [Folder for ST Accommodations and Essential Functions](#)
- [Professional Dispositions Policy Folder](#)

Krissy and Sarah met with Office of General Council and DSS on April 6th and received good feedback and clarification. The group also discussed developing core principles for student teacher accommodations, shifting from rigid rules to guiding principles, with plans to create a job description that includes both universal and program-specific requirements. The team will work on drafting these principles for review at the May meeting, with the goal of implementing them by fall if approved. Below are links to review and use to create our student teaching job description and student teaching accommodation principles.

<https://www.ocs.udel.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/STResourceGuide-Candidate-UCTE-7-25-19.pdf>

https://www.nasdtc.net/page/MCEE_Doc

https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nasdtc.net/resource/resmgr/mcee/mcee_brochure_2nd_edition_no.pdf

<https://education.hanover.edu/admitted/model.php>

Meeting adjourned 10:00 a.m.