

edTPA Data Report

Table of Contents:

Section I. edTPA Rubric Items

Section II. edTPA Counts and Data by Gender

Section III. Overall Analysis of Scores on edTPA

Section IV. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Agriculture

Section V. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Elementary

Section VI. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for English

Section VII. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Math

Section VIII. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Physical Education

Section IX. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Science

Section X. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Social Studies

Section I. edTPA Rubric Items

Candidates must develop a series of lessons and assessments and then video tape themselves as part of this assessment. Within planning content understanding (1), planning (2), knowledge of students (3), academic language development (4), and assessment (5) are all evaluated. The instruction portion assesses candidates' abilities associated with learning environment (6), engaging students (7), designing student learning (8), subject specific pedagogy (9), and analyzing teaching effectiveness (10). While assessment portion looks at their abilities to analyze student learning and assessments (11), provide feedback (12), student's use of feedback (13), analyze students' academic language understanding and use (14), and use of assessment to inform instruction (15). Students are scored on a five-point Likert scale. Students must have a total edTPA score of 36/75 on a 15 rubric test according to WVDE to be considered for certification. That means that candidates must score at least a 2.4/5 on every rubric to pass. Each of these rubrics has been aligned to InTASC standards (Table 1). The EPP requires students to send their edTPA submission to Pearson so for CAEP purposes this assessment is proprietary.

Table 1. InTASC Alignment to Rubrics

edTPA Rubrics	InTASC Standards									
	Learner and Learning			Content		Instructional Practice			Professional Responsibility	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Planning										
1: Planning for Content Understandings		X	X	X			X	X		
2: Planning to Support Varied Student Needs	X	X		X			X	X		
3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	X	X		X			X			
4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	X	X		X	X			X		
5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	X					X		X		
Instruction										
6: Learning Environment		X	X					X		
7: Engaging Students in Learning		X	X	X	X			X		
8: Deepening Student Learning			X	X	X			X		
9: Subject---Specific Pedagogy			X	X	X			X		
10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness									X	
Assessment										
11: Analysis of Student Learning						X				
12: Providing Feedback to Guide Learning						X				
13: Student Use of Feedback						X				
14: Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Content Learning	X	X		X	X					
15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction						X	X	X	X	

Section II. edTPA Counts and Data by Gender

Tables 3- 9 outline WVU's data as it relates to edTPA.

Table 3. edTPA Counts by Gender and TPP

Academic Year	All	Agr	Elem-Lit w/ Math	Elem-Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
2024-2025	115	3		30	42	7	2	11	1	17
Female	94	2		30	42	5	2	3	1	9
Male	21	1		-	-	2	-	8	-	8
2023-2024	134	3		32	42	7	2	15	8	25
Female	99	1		30	41	6	2	5	6	9
Male	35	2		2	1	1	-	10	2	16
2022-2023	103	10	48			8	6	11	4	15
Female	79	8	41			7	1	5	0	8
Male	24	2	7			1	7	6	4	7
2021-2022	104	11	45			7	5	14	12	10
Female	74	9	41			6	3	3	8	4
Male	30	2	4			1	2	11	4	6

Agr=Agricultural Education

Elem=Elementary Education

English=Secondary English Education

Math-Secondary Math Education

PE=Physical Education

Science=Secondary Science Education

SS=Secondary Social Studies Education

Table 4. Average Total Overall Scores on edTPA by Gender and TPP.

Average Total Overall Score	Semesters	All	Agr	Elem-Lit w/ Math	Elem- Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
	2024-2025	43.5	45.5		43.1	42.8	47.6	38.5	42.4	42.0	46.5
Female		43.8	45.5		43.1	42.8	48.0	38.5	44.7	42.0	49.3
Male		42.2	40.0		-		46.5	-	41.5	-	43.4
	2023-2024	41.3	42.0		41.4	39.9	42.1	37.0	42.0	43.0	42.2
Female		41.0	34.0		41.4	39.7	43.0	37.0	42.2	43.5	43.1
Male		41.9	46.0		41.0	46.0	37.0	-	41.9	41.5	41.8
	2022-2023	43.1	44.3	42.7			44.3	39.4	43.9	44.0	43.8
Female		43.1	44.4	42.8			44.4	40.7	43.0	44.0	43.8
Male		43.0	44.0	42.1			43.0	32.0	44.7	-	43.9
	2021-2022	43.8	46.2	43.0			46.3	42.0	44.8	42.0	44.4
Female		43.8	46.4	43.4			45.3	40.0	48.3	41.4	43.5
Male		43.8	45.0	39.0			52.0	45.0	43.8	43.3	44.4

(Scores are out of 75 with cutoff for certification being 36)

Table 5. Average Total Score on edTPA Tasks by Gender and TPP.

Overall Task Average	Semesters	All	Agr	Elem-Lit w/ Math	Elem- Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Planning	2024-2025	14.2	15.0		14.3	13.7	15.9	12.0	14.2	13.0	15.7
Female		14.3	15.0		14.3	13.7	15.9	12.0	15.3	13.0	16.6
Male		14.0	13.0		-	-	15.8	-	13.8	-	14.8
	2023-2024	13.6	15.7		13.6	12.5	14.3	13.0	14.3	13.8	14.3
Female		13.4	14.0		13.5	12.4	15.0	13.0	14.8	14.0	14.8
Male		14.1	16.5		14.5	16.0	10.0	-	14.1	13.0	14.1
	2022-2023	14.2	15.0	13.6			15.0	12.7	15.3	15.0	14.7
Female		14.2	15.1	13.8			15.1	13.0	15.4	15.0	14.4
Male		14.0	14.5	12.1			14.0	11.0	15.2	-	15.0
	2021-2022	14.4	14.7	13.7			16.0	14.2	15.6	14.2	14.9
Female		14.2	14.3	13.8			15.7	13.3	15.7	14.3	14.5
Male		15.0	16.5	12.8			18.0	15.5	15.4	14.0	15.2
Instruction	2024-2025	14.4	14.0		14.3	14.3	15.1	12.5	14.3	14.0	15.4
Female		14.5	14.0		14.3	14.3	15.1	12.5	14.7	14.0	15.9
Male		14.4	12.0		-	-	15.0	-	14.2	-	14.9
	2023-2024	14.1	13.7		14.3	13.9	13.4	12.5	14.5	14.6	14.3
Female		14.0	12.0		14.3	13.9	13.3	12.5	14.6	14.8	14.3
Male		14.4	14.5		14.0	15.0	14.0	-	14.5	14.0	14.4
	2022-2023	14.2	14.7	14.1			14.3	12.9	14.5	13.8	14.4
Female		14.2	14.6	14.4			14.3	1.2	13.4	13.8	14.1
Male		14.0	15.0	12.4			14.0	11.0	15.3	-	14.7
	2021-2022	14.3	14.8	14.4			13.9	13.2	15.2	12.9	14.9
Female		14.3	14.9	14.5			13.8	12.3	16.7	12.3	14.5
Male		14.5	14.5	13.8			14.0	14.5	14.8	14.3	15.2
Assessment	2024-2025	14.8	16.5		14.5	14.8	16.6	14.0	13.8	15.0	15.4
Female		15.0	16.5		14.5	14.8	17.0	14.0	14.7	15.0	16.9
Male		13.8	15.0		-	-	15.8	-	13.5	-	13.8
	2023-2024	13.5	12.7		13.5	13.4	14.4	11.5	13.1	14.6	13.6
Female		13.4	8.0		13.6	13.4	14.7	11.5	12.8	14.7	14.1
Male		13.5	15.0		12.5	15.0	13.0	-	13.3	14.5	13.3
	2022-2023	14.5	14.6	14.3			15.0	13.9	14.2	15.3	14.7
Female		14.8	14.6	14.7			15.0	14.5	14.2	15.3	15.3
Male		13.4	14.5	12.0			15.0	10.0	14.2	-	14.1
	2021-2022	14.8	15.3	14.8			16.4	14.6	13.9	14.9	14.7
Female		15.0	15.6	15.0			15.8	14.3	15.0	14.9	14.1
Male		14.3	14.0	12.5			20.0	15.0	13.9	15.0	15.0

(Scores are out of 25 with cutoff for certification being 12)

Table 6. Overall Average Rubric Scores on the edTPA

Overall Average Rubric	Semesters	All	Agr	Elem-Lit w/ Math	Elem- Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
	2024-2025	2.9	3.0		2.9	2.9	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.8	3.1
Female		2.9	3.0		2.9	2.9	3.2	2.6	3.0	2.8	3.3
Male		2.8	2.7		-	-	3.1	-	2.8	-	2.9
	2023-2024	2.8	2.8		2.8	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.8
Female		2.7	2.3		2.8	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.9
Male		2.8	3.1		2.8	3.1	2.5	-	2.8	2.8	2.8
	2022-2023	2.9	3.0	2.8			3.0	2.6	2.9	2.9	2.9
Female		2.9	3.0	2.8			3.0	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.9
Male		2.8	3.0	2.5			2.9	2.1	3.0	-	2.9
	2021-2022	2.9	3.1	2.9			3.2	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0
Female		2.9	3.1	2.9			3.1	2.7	3.2	2.8	2.9
Male		2.9	3.0	2.6			3.5	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0

(Scores are out of 5 with cutoff for certification being 2.4)

Table 7. Planning Rubric Average Score Results by Gender and TPP

EdTPA Rubric	InTASC	Academic Year	All	Agr	Elem- Lit w/ Math	Elem- Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
1	2,3,4,7,8	2024-2025	3.0	3.0		2.9	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2
Female			3.1	3.0		2.9	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3
Male			3.0	3.0		-	-	3.5	-	2.9	-	3.0
		2023-2024	2.9	3.0		2.9	3.0	3.3	3.0	2.8	3.1	3.0
Female			2.9	3.0		2.9	2.9	3.3	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.0
Male			2.9	3.0		3.0	4.0	3.0	-	2.8	3.0	2.9
		2022-2023	2.9	3.0	2.7			3.5	2.7	3.2	3.0	3.1
Female			2.9	3.0	2.8			3.6	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.0
Male			2.9	3.0	2.4			3.0	2.0	3.3	-	3.1
		2021-2022	3.1	3.6	2.9			3.3	2.6	3.2	3.0	3.0
Female			3.1	3.6	2.9			3.2	2.7	3.7	3.0	3.0
Male			3.1	4.0	2.8			4.0	2.5	3.1	3.0	3.0
2	1,2,4,7,8	2024-2025	2.6	3.0		2.6	2.4	2.8	2.0	2.9	2.0	3.1
Female			2.6	3.0		2.6	2.4	2.7	2.0	3.3	2.0	3.1
Male			2.7	2.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.7	-	3.1
		2023-2024	2.5	3.0		2.5	2.2	2.4	2.5	3.1	2.4	2.6
Female			2.4	2.0		2.5	2.1	2.7	2.5	3.4	2.5	2.8
Male			2.6	3.5		2.5	4.0	1.0	-	2.9	2.0	2.4
		2022-2023	2.6	2.8	2.5			2.8	2.6	3.2	2.5	2.7
Female			2.6	2.9	2.5			2.9	2.5	3.4	2.5	2.6
Male			2.6	2.5	2.1			2.0	3.0	3.0	-	2.7
		2021-2022	2.7	3.0	2.4			2.9	3.0	3.3	2.4	3.0
Female			2.6	3.0	2.4			2.8	2.7	3.3	2.0	2.9
Male			2.9	3.0	2.3			3.0	3.5	3.3	2.3	3.0
3	1,2,4,7	2024-2025	3.0	3.0		3.1	3.0	3.6	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.1
Female			3.1	3.0		3.1	3.0	3.8	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.2
Male			2.9	3.0		-	-	3.3	-	3.0	-	2.9
		2023-2024	3.0	3.3		3.0	2.8	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.4	3.1
Female			2.9	3.0		2.9	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.1
Male			3.1	3.5		3.5	3.0	3.0	-	2.8	3.5	3.1
		2022-2023	3.0	3.3	3.0			3.0	2.4	2.7	3.5	3.1
Female			3.1	3.5	3.1			3.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.0
Male			2.8	3.3	2.6			3.0	2.0	2.5	-	3.1
		2021-2022	3.1	3.2	3.1			3.3	3.2	2.9	3.4	2.9
Female			3.1	3.1	3.1			3.2	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.5
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0			4.0	4.0	2.8	3.5	3.3
4	1,2,4,5,8	2024-2025	2.8	3.0		3.0	2.5	2.9	2.0	2.7	2.0	3.2
Female			2.8	3.0		3.0	2.5	2.9	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.6
Male			2.6	2.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.6	-	2.8
		2023-2024	2.6	3.0		2.7	2.3	3.0	2.0	2.7	2.4	2.8
Female			2.6	3.0		2.7	2.4	3.2	2.0	2.4	2.3	3.0
Male			2.7	3.0		2.5	2.0	2.0	-	2.8	2.5	2.6
		2022-2023	2.8	2.7	2.8			3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0	2.9
Female			2.8	2.8	2.8			3.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.8
Male			2.8	2.6	2.6			3.0	2.0	3.0	-	3.0
		2021-2022	2.8	2.9	2.7			3.3	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.7

Female			2.8	3.0	2.5			3.3	2.3	3.3	2.8	2.8
Male			2.8	2.5	2.7			3.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.7
5	1,6,8	2024-2025	2.8	3.0		2.8	2.7	3.0	2.5	2.6	3.0	3.2
Female			2.8	3.0		2.8	2.7	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.3
Male			2.8	3.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.5	-	3.0
		2023-2024	2.6	3.3		2.5	2.3	2.7	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.9
Female			2.5	3.0		2.4	2.2	3.0	2.5	3.2	2.7	2.9
Male			2.9	3.5		3.0	3.0	1.0	-	2.9	2.0	2.9
		2022-2023	2.8	3.2	2.5			2.8	2.4	3.2	3.0	3.0
Female			2.7	3.3	2.6			2.7	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
Male			2.9	3.0	2.4			3.0	2.0	3.3	-	3.0
		2021-2022	2.9	3.4	2.6			3.3	2.6	3.3	2.8	3.0
Female			2.8	3.3	2.6			3.2	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.0
Male			3.0	3.5	2.3			4.0	2.0	3.3	3.0	3.0

(Scores are out of 5 with cutoff for certification being 2.4)

Table 8. Instruction Rubric Average Score Results by Gender and TPP

EdTPA Rubric	InTASC	Academic Year	All	Agr	Elem- Lit w/ Math	Elem- Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
6	2,3,8	2024-2025	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.0
			3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
			2.9	3.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.7	-	3.0
		2023-2024	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.0
Female			2.9	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.1
Male			3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	-	2.7	3.0	3.0
		2022-2023	3.0	3.0	3.0			3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.2
Female			3.0	3.0	3.0			3.0	3.0	2.2	3.0	3.0
Male			3.1	3.0	3.0			3.0	3.0	3.3	-	3.1
		2021-2022	3.0	3.0	3.0			2.9	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.1
Female			3.0	3.0	3.0			2.9	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.0
Male			3.1	3.0	3.0			3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.2
7	2,3,4,5,8	2024-2025	2.9	3.0		2.9	2.9	3.1	2.5	2.9	2.0	3.1
			2.9	3.0		2.9	2.9	3.2	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.3
			2.9	3.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.9	-	2.9
		2023-2024	3.0	3.0		2.9	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.0
Female			2.8	3.0		2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.8	3.0	3.0
Male			3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	-	3.0	3.0	3.0
		2022-2023	2.8	2.9	2.8			2.9	2.1	3.1	3.0	2.9
Female			2.8	2.9	2.9			2.9	2.2	3.0	3.0	2.9
Male			2.8	3.0	2.4			3.0	2.0	3.2	-	3.0
		2021-2022	2.9	3.4	2.9			2.9	2.6	3.3	2.6	3.1
Female			2.9	3.3	2.9			2.8	2.3	3.1	2.4	3.3
Male			3.0	3.5	2.8			3.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.1
8	3,4,5,8	2024-2025	2.9	2.0		2.9	2.8	3.1	2.5	3.1	3.0	3.2
Female			2.9	2.0		2.9	2.8	3.2	2.5	3.3	3.0	3.4
Male			2.9	1.0		-	-	3.0	-	3.0	-	3.0
		2023-2024	2.8	2.7		2.9	2.8	2.7	2.0	3.1	3.3	2.8
Female			2.8	2.0		2.9	2.8	2.7	2.0	3.0	3.3	2.8
Male			2.9	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0	-	3.1	3.0	2.8
		2022-2023	2.9	2.8	2.9			3.0	2.4	2.9	3.0	2.9
Female			2.9	2.8	3.0			3.0	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.8
Male			2.9	3.0	2.6			3.0	2.0	3.2	-	3.0
		2021-2022	2.8	2.7	2.9			2.9	2.6	3.4	2.5	3.1
Female			3.0	2.8	2.9			2.9	2.3	3.7	2.4	3.0
Male			2.9	2.5	2.8			3.0	3.0	3.3	2.8	3.2
9	3,4,5,8	2024-2025	2.9	3.0		2.8	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0
Female			2.9	3.0		2.8	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.1
Male			3.0	3.0		-	-	3.0	-	3.0	-	2.9
		2023-2024	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.6	3.0	3.1	2.9	2.7
Female			2.8	2.0	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.7
Male			2.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	-	3.2	2.5	2.8
		2022-2023	2.8	3.2	2.7			3.0	2.6	3.2	2.5	2.8
Female			2.7	3.3	2.8			3.0	2.7	3.2	2.5	2.8
Male			2.8	3.0	2.1			3.0	2.0	3.2	-	2.9
		2021-2022	2.8	3.1	2.8			2.6	2.8	3.0	2.5	3.0

Female			2.8	3.0	2.9			2.7	2.7	3.3	2.3	2.9
Male			2.9	3.1	2.5			2.0	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.0
10	9	2024-2025	2.7	3.0		2.6	2.7	2.6	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.1
Female			2.7	3.0		2.6	2.7	2.5	2.0	2.3	3.0	3.1
Male			2.8	2.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.6	-	3.1
		2023-2024	2.6	2.3		2.6	2.5	2.4	2.0	2.6	2.3	2.8
Female			2.6	2.0		2.7	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.8	2.2	2.7
Male			2.6	2.5		2.0	3.0	2.0	-	2.5	2.5	2.8
		2022-2023	2.6	2.8	2.7			2.4	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.7
Female			2.7	2.8	2.7			2.4	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.6
Male			2.5	3.0	2.3			2.0	2.0	2.5	-	2.9
		2021-2022	2.7	2.6	2.8			2.6	2.0	2.6	2.5	2.6
Female			2.7	2.7	2.8			2.5	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.8
Male			2.5	2.5	2.8			3.0	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5

(Scores are out of 5 with cutoff for certification being 2.4)

Table 9. Assessment Rubric Average Score Results by Gender and TPP

EdTPA Rubric	InTASC	Academic Year	All	Agr	Elem- Lit w/ Math	Elem-Literacy	Elem-Math	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
11	6	2024-2025	2.9	3.5		2.8	3.0	3.2	2.5	3.1	3.0	3.1
Female			3.0	3.5		2.8	3.0	3.3	2.5	3.3	3.0	3.3
Male			2.6	3.0		-	-	3.0	-	3.0	-	2.9
		2023-2024	2.8	2.0		2.8	2.8	2.9	2.5	2.7	3.3	2.9
Female			2.8	1.0		2.8	2.8	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.2	2.9
Male			2.7	2.5		2.0	3.0	3.0	-	2.6	3.5	2.9
		2022-2023	2.9	3.0	2.9			2.9	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.1
Female			3.0	3.0	3.0			2.9	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.0
Male			3.4	3.0	2.6			3.0	2.0	2.8	-	3.1
		2021-2022	3.0	3.0	3.0			3.3	3.0	2.7	3.2	3.1
Female			3.1	3.1	3.1			3.2	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.0
Male			2.8	2.5	2.5			4.0	3.0	2.6	3.0	3.2
12	6	2024-2025	3.3	3.5		3.3	3.3	3.7	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.4
Female			3.4	3.5		3.3	3.3	3.6	4.0	2.7	3.0	3.6
Male			3.2	4.0		-	-	4.0	-	2.5	-	3.3
		2023-2024	3.0	2.7		2.9	2.8	3.4	3.0	3.0	3.6	2.9
Female			2.9	1.0		2.9	2.8	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.2
Male			3.0	3.5		3.0	3.0	3.0	-	3.0	3.5	2.8
		2022-2023	3.4	3.1	3.3			3.8	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.3
Female			3.5	3.1	2.9			2.7	4.0	3.4	3.5	3.6
Male			3.0	3.0	3.3			4.0	3.0	3.2	-	3.0
		2021-2022	3.3	3.3	3.3			3.6	3.8	3.2	3.7	3.0
Female			3.4	3.2	3.3			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.6	3.0
Male			3.3	3.5	3.0			4.0	3.5	3.2	3.8	3.0
13	6	2024-2025	2.7	3.5		2.6	2.7	3.2	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.7
Female			2.7	3.5		2.6	2.7	3.4	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.9
Male			2.5	3.0		-	-	2.8	-	2.6	-	2.4
		2023-2024	2.5	3.0		2.5	2.6	2.9	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.4
Female			2.5	2.0		2.5	2.6	3.0	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.6
Male			2.4	3.5		3.0	3.0	2.0	-	2.3	2.5	2.3
		2022-2023	2.7	2.5	2.6			2.7	2.4	2.8	2.8	2.7
Female			2.7	2.5	2.7			3.0	2.5	3.0	2.8	3.0
Male			2.4	2.5	2.1			2.8	2.0	2.7	-	2.4
		2021-2022	2.6	2.9	2.6			3.0	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.7
Female			2.7	3.0	2.7			2.8	2.3	2.7	2.5	2.4
Male			2.5	2.5	2.0			4.0	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.8
14	1,2,4,5		2.8	2.5		2.9	2.8	3.3	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.9
Female			2.9	2.5		2.9	2.8	3.3	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.3
Male			2.6	2.0		-	-	3.0	-	2.6	-	2.5
		2023-2024	2.6	2.3		2.5	2.6	2.4	2.0	2.6	2.8	2.7
Female			2.6	2.0		2.6	2.6	2.5	2.0	2.4	2.8	2.8
Male			2.6	2.5		2.0	3.0	2.0	-	2.7	2.5	2.5
		2022-2023	2.7	3.0	2.6			2.9	2.4	2.5	3.3	2.7
Female			2.8	3.0	2.7			2.9	2.7	2.4	3.3	2.8

Male			2.4	3.0	2.0			3.0	1.0	2.5	-	2.7
		2021-2022	2.9	3.0	2.8			3.6	2.6	2.8	3.0	2.9
Female			2.9	2.5	2.9			3.5	2.3	2.7	3.1	2.8
Male			2.8	3.1	2.3			4.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.0
15	6,7,8,9	2024-2025	3.0	3.5		3.0	2.9	3.3	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.2
Female			3.0	3.5		3.0	2.9	3.4	2.5	2.7	3.0	3.7
Male			2.8	3.0		-	-	3.0	-	3.1	-	2.8
		2023-2024	2.7	2.7		2.8	2.6	2.9	2.0	2.6	2.5	2.7
Female			2.6	2.0		2.8	2.6	2.8	2.0	2.4	2.5	2.6
Male			2.7	3.0		2.5	3.0	3.0	-	2.7	2.5	2.8
		2022-2023	2.9	3.0	2.9			2.8	2.3	2.9	2.8	2.9
Female			2.7	3.0	2.9			2.9	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.9
Male			2.8	3.0	2.4			2.0	2.0	3.0	-	2.9
		2021-2022	2.9	3.1	3.0			2.9	2.8	2.8	2.37	3.0
Female			2.9	3.1	3.0			2.8	2.7	3.3	2.4	3.0
Male			2.9	3.0	2.8			4.0	3.0	2.6	3.3	3.0

(Scores are out of 5 with cutoff for certification being 2.4)

Section III. Overall Analysis of Scores on edTPA

The institution's overall edTPA performance reveals significant variability across programs, with scores ranging from a concerning low of 38.5 in Secondary Mathematics Education to an exceptional high of 47.6 in Secondary English Education, representing a 9.1-point spread that indicates dramatic differences in program quality and effectiveness. This substantial variation demonstrates that program-level factors rather than institutional characteristics or edTPA design primarily determine outcomes, as candidates within the same institution with access to shared resources, similar admission standards, and common institutional culture produce markedly different results depending on their specific program. The institutional average across all programs and candidates shows relatively stable performance in the 41 to 44 range over the four-year period, with 2024-2025 achieving 43.5, representing adequate performance well above the 36 certification threshold but also revealing significant room for improvement toward the excellence demonstrated by top-performing programs.

Historical trends across the four-year period from 2021-2022 through 2024-2025 reveal an institution experiencing both volatility and overall stability, with some programs showing dramatic improvement, others demonstrating concerning decline, and many maintaining relatively consistent performance. The 2021-2022 academic year produced an institutional average of 43.8, representing the highest overall performance across the period. This was followed by 43.1 in 2022-2023, showing slight decline, then a more concerning drop to 41.3 in 2023-2024, before recovery to 43.5 in 2024-2025. The 2023-2024 dip appears to have affected multiple programs simultaneously, suggesting possible institutional factors such as clinical placement disruptions, pandemic-related challenges affecting student teaching, changes in institutional support systems, or cohort characteristics across multiple programs. The recovery in 2024-2025 to near-peak performance indicates institutional capacity to identify and address challenges, though understanding what caused both the decline and recovery could inform quality assurance processes and prevent future institution-wide performance issues.

Examination of performance by task area reveals differential institutional strengths and weaknesses that provide insight into where candidates generally excel and where they consistently struggle. Planning tasks show institutional averages ranging from 13.6 to 14.4 out of 25 across the four

years, indicating adequate but not exceptional performance in instructional design, differentiation, and assessment planning. The 2024-2025 planning average of 14.2 places most candidates comfortably above the 12-point threshold for this section but well below the potential for excellence demonstrated by programs like English at 15.9 and Social Studies at 15.7. Instruction tasks similarly show moderate performance, with institutional averages ranging from 14.1 to 14.4 out of 25 across years, suggesting candidates develop adequate teaching skills but have room for improvement in engaging students, deepening learning, and analyzing teaching effectiveness. Assessment tasks reveal the strongest relative performance, with institutional averages ranging from 13.5 to 14.8 out of 25, indicating candidates generally demonstrate better competency in evaluation, feedback, and using assessment to inform instruction compared to planning and instruction domains.

The overall rubric averages across all candidates and programs reveal patterns in which specific competencies candidates master and which represent persistent institutional challenges requiring attention. The average rubric score across all 15 rubrics has remained remarkably stable in the 2.7 to 2.9 range out of 5 over the four-year period, with 2024-2025 achieving 2.9. This indicates most candidates score in the adequate range well above the 2.4 cutoff but rarely approaching excellence at 4.0 or higher. This consistency suggests both institutional stability in preparation quality and limited progress toward excellence, as the average has not improved substantially over time despite ongoing program efforts and data review processes. The stability could reflect either appropriate performance plateau where further improvement faces diminishing returns, or stagnation where insufficient attention to quality enhancement prevents meaningful progress toward higher achievement levels.

The distribution of programs across performance levels reveals an institution with a few high performers, a cluster of adequate programs, and concerning low performers requiring intervention. At the excellence level above 45, English Education at 47.6 and Social Studies at 46.5 demonstrate that high-quality preparation producing exceptional outcomes is achievable within this institutional context. The strong performance level between 42 and 45 includes Agricultural Education at 45.5, Elementary Literacy at 43.1, Elementary Math at 42.8, Science at 42.0, Physical Education at 42.4, and several historical performances, representing adequate preparation meeting certification standards with room for improvement. The concerning performance level below 42 includes only Mathematics Education at 38.5, representing crisis-level outcomes requiring immediate intervention. This distribution suggests most programs achieve adequate quality, a few reach excellence, and isolated programs face serious quality challenges.

Examination of specific rubric performance across all programs and candidates reveals which competencies the institution prepares well and which represent systematic challenges. Providing Feedback consistently emerges as relative institutional strength, with many programs scoring in the 3.0 to 3.7 range, indicating candidates generally can craft specific, actionable feedback communicating clearly about student learning needs. Content Understanding similarly shows reasonable performance across most programs, typically in the 2.9 to 3.2 range, suggesting candidates possess adequate subject matter knowledge in their teaching fields. Learning Environment maintains consistent performance around 3.0 across most programs, indicating candidates develop basic classroom management skills and create physically and emotionally safe spaces for learning.

Conversely, several rubrics represent persistent institutional challenges where most programs struggle to achieve excellence. Planning for Student Needs emerges as the most significant weakness, with most programs scoring in the 2.4 to 2.8 range and many candidates falling at or below certification thresholds on this critical competency. This suggests institutional need for enhanced attention to differentiated instruction, understanding of student variability, and designing responsive teaching across all programs. Only Social Studies exceeds 3.0 on this rubric, indicating that effective preparation in differentiation is possible but rare. Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness represents another consistent challenge, with most programs in

the 2.4 to 2.7 range, suggesting candidates struggle to develop reflective practice skills, critically examine their teaching, and identify specific improvements. The institution may need enhanced focus on teaching analysis protocols, video review processes, structured reflection, and coaching conversations to develop this essential professional competency.

Student Use of Feedback shows concerning weakness across nearly all programs, typically scoring in the 2.4 to 2.7 range despite generally adequate performance in providing feedback. This disconnect indicates candidates can identify what students need to improve but lack strategies for ensuring students engage with and implement suggestions. This pattern suggests institutional curriculum gaps in formative assessment implementation, student self-regulation, and creating classroom cultures where feedback drives learning rather than simply marking performance. Enhanced attention to complete formative assessment cycles, not just feedback provision but also student response and instructional adjustment, could address this systematic weakness.

Task-level analysis across programs reveals differential institutional capacity in the three major domains. Assessment tasks represent relative institutional strength, with programs generally achieving higher scores in evaluation, feedback, and assessment literacy compared to planning and instruction. This suggests methods courses, clinical experiences, and faculty expertise may emphasize assessment more effectively than other competencies, or that assessment tasks align better with candidate strengths and program preparation. The strength in assessment provides foundation for improvement in other areas, as effective evaluation and data use should inform planning and instruction. Planning tasks show the weakest relative performance, with programs generally scoring lowest in this domain and many showing specific weaknesses in planning for diverse student needs. This suggests institutional need for enhanced focus on differentiated instruction, Universal Design for Learning, understanding student variability, and designing responsive teaching that addresses diverse learner characteristics, readiness levels, and needs.

The overall institutional performance suggests a teacher preparation program of adequate quality with pockets of excellence and areas of concern requiring attention. The institution successfully prepares most candidates for certification, maintains performance above minimum standards, demonstrates capacity for improvement when problems are identified, and has developed several programs achieving exceptional outcomes. However, the institution also shows troubling inability to address chronic problems in struggling programs, significant variability in program quality suggesting unequal preparation across content areas, persistent weaknesses in critical competencies like differentiated instruction affecting most programs, and quality assurance systems that may not consistently trigger effective intervention when concerning patterns emerge.

Section IV. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Agriculture

The Agricultural Education program presents a striking paradox of academic excellence paired with an enrollment crisis that threatens its very existence. Despite consistently performing above the institutional average and well above certification requirements, the program has experienced a catastrophic 73% enrollment decline over four years, dropping from 11 candidates in 2021-2022 to just 3 candidates in 2024-2025.

Academically, the program demonstrates impressive strength and consistency. The program's overall performance has ranged from 42.0 to 46.2 over the four-year period, with scores of 46.2 in 2021-2022, 44.3 in 2022-2023, 42.0 in 2023-2024, and a recovery to 45.5 in 2024-2025. These scores place the program consistently 6 to 10 points above the certification cutoff of 36 and typically 2 to 4 points above the institutional average. The 2024-

2025 performance of 45.5 represents strong recovery from the previous year's temporary dip, demonstrating the program's capacity to identify and address performance issues effectively. This level of sustained academic quality makes the enrollment crisis particularly troubling, as the program clearly possesses the faculty expertise and curriculum quality necessary for candidate success.

The program's most exceptional strength lies in assessment tasks, where it achieved an average of 16.5 out of 25 in 2024-2025, the highest among all institutional programs. This represents a particular area of excellence that distinguishes Agricultural Education from other programs and provides valuable institutional learning opportunities. Most notably, the program scored 3.5 out of 5 on Student Use of Feedback, significantly outperforming all other programs where this rubric consistently represents a weakness. While most programs struggle to help candidates translate feedback provision into actual student implementation, Agricultural Education candidates demonstrate mastery of this critical formative assessment skill. This suggests the program effectively develops practical teaching competencies and real-world application skills that translate directly to classroom effectiveness. The program's assessment strengths extend across all five assessment rubrics, with Analysis of Learning at 3.5, Providing Feedback at 3.5, Student Use of Feedback at 3.5, Language Analysis at 2.5, and Assessment to Inform Instruction at 3.5, demonstrating comprehensive assessment literacy.

Planning tasks reveal remarkable consistency across all five rubrics in 2024-2025, with each scoring exactly 3.0 out of 5. This includes Content Understanding, Planning for Student Needs, Knowledge of Students, Academic Language Development, and Assessment Planning all at the 3.0 level. While not exceptional, this consistency well above the 2.4 cutoff demonstrates balanced preparation across all planning competencies without significant gaps or weaknesses. The uniformity of scores suggests systematic program approaches that ensure all candidates develop adequate planning skills across multiple dimensions. This consistency provides a stable foundation for teaching practice, as candidates enter the profession with balanced competencies rather than strength in some areas offset by critical weaknesses in others.

However, instruction tasks reveal a critical and puzzling weakness that requires immediate attention. While the program averaged 14.0 out of 25 on instruction tasks, which falls within acceptable range, one specific rubric stands out as dramatically problematic. Deepening Student Learning scored only 2.0 out of 5 in 2024-2025, representing a severe weakness that could jeopardize individual candidate certification. This score sits 0.4 points below the certification cutoff and dramatically contradicts the program's otherwise strong performance. The sudden emergence of this weakness is particularly concerning given that other instruction rubrics show adequate performance: Learning Environment at 3.0, Engaging Students at 3.0, Subject-Specific Pedagogy at 3.0, and Analyzing Teaching at 3.0. The isolated nature of this failure suggests either a specific curriculum gap in helping candidates deepen student understanding, an assessment or scoring issue, or possibly the impact of a single low-performing candidate on the small cohort average.

The program's small cohort size of just 3 candidates in 2024-2025 creates significant statistical reliability challenges that complicate interpretation of performance data. With only 2 female candidates and 1 male candidate, individual performance variations appear as program trends, making it difficult to distinguish systematic program issues from individual candidate characteristics. The apparent gender performance gap, with females averaging 45.5 and the single male candidate scoring 40.0, likely reflects individual differences rather than meaningful program patterns. Similarly, the dramatic weakness in Rubric 8 could represent a single candidate's struggle rather than a systematic program failure. This small sample size

problem extends to year-over-year comparisons, where cohort composition changes can create apparent trends that don't reflect actual program quality shifts.

The Agricultural Education program represents a cautionary tale about the relationship between academic quality and program sustainability. The program's exceptional assessment practices, balanced planning preparation, and consistent academic quality demonstrate that with adequate enrollment, this program can thrive and contribute significantly to institutional excellence and the agricultural education workforce. The challenge lies in reversing enrollment decline before the program becomes impossible to maintain, requiring urgent strategic action that balances quality preservation with practical viability constraints.

Section V. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Elementary

The elementary candidates demonstrate concerning volatility, particularly when taking the edTPA focused on Math, which experienced a severe performance dip in 2023-2024 with a 39.9 average before recovering to 42.8 in 2024-2025. The Literacy focused edTPA showed more stability, moving from 41.4 in 2023-2024 to 43.1 in 2024-2025. Both maintain scores well above the certification threshold of 36, but the volatility raises questions about program consistency and quality assurance.

In planning tasks for 2024-2025, candidates who took the Literacy edTPA averaged 14.3 out of 25, with their strongest performance in Knowledge of Students at 3.1 out of 5 and their weakest in Planning for Student Needs at 2.6. The program shows relatively consistent performance across content understanding, academic language, and assessment planning, all hovering around 2.8 to 2.9. Candidates who took the Math edTPA averaged 13.7 out of 25 in planning, with a critical weakness in Planning for Student Needs at exactly 2.4, placing them at the certification cutoff threshold. This represents a high-risk situation where any individual candidate scoring below this level would fail certification. Math shows strength in content understanding at 3.1 but struggles with academic language at 2.5, barely above the cutoff. Both programs demonstrate that planning for diverse student needs represents their most significant challenge, suggesting gaps in differentiated instruction preparation.

Both elementary programs performed similarly in instruction tasks during 2024-2025, with Literacy averaging 14.3 out of 25 and Math averaging 14.3 as well. Both programs maintain solid performance in creating learning environments at 3.0 and engaging students at 2.9, indicating competency in fundamental classroom management and student interaction. However, both struggle with analyzing teaching effectiveness, with Literacy at 2.6 and Math at 2.7, suggesting insufficient development of reflective practice skills. The programs show adequate performance in deepening student learning and subject-specific pedagogy, hovering around 2.8 to 2.9 across both programs. This consistency across instruction tasks suggests shared clinical experiences or common methods courses may be contributing to similar outcomes, but also indicates shared weaknesses in developing candidates' abilities to critically examine their own teaching practice.

Assessment tasks reveal relative strengths for both elementary edTPA exams compared to their planning and instruction performance. Literacy averaged 14.5 out of 25 in assessment tasks, while Math averaged 14.8. Both programs excel at providing feedback, with identical scores of 3.3 out of 5, representing their strongest rubric performance across all areas. However, both struggle with helping students effectively use that feedback, scoring 2.6 for Literacy and 2.7 for Math. This disconnect between providing feedback and ensuring its implementation suggests candidates can

identify what students need to improve but lack strategies for supporting students in acting on those suggestions. Analysis of student learning and assessment to inform instruction show adequate performance in the 2.8 to 3.0 range for both programs, indicating candidates can interpret assessment results but need stronger skills in formative assessment cycles.

Despite the concerns, both edTPA results demonstrate notable strengths. Their consistent performance in providing feedback at 3.3 represents excellence in a fundamental teaching competency, suggesting strong preparation in assessment literacy and communication with students. Both programs maintain solid learning environments at 3.0, indicating effective classroom management preparation. Elementary Literacy shows particular strength in Knowledge of Students at 3.1 and Assessment to Inform Instruction at 3.0, demonstrating good understanding of learner characteristics and data-driven instruction. Elementary Math excels in Content Understanding at 3.1 and Analysis of Learning at 3.0, showing strong subject matter knowledge and ability to interpret student work. These strengths provide a foundation upon which to build improvements in weaker areas, particularly if the programs can leverage their assessment strengths to improve student feedback implementation.

Section VI. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for English

The Secondary English Education program demonstrates remarkable transformation and stands as the institution's highest-performing program, achieving an exceptional 47.6 average in 2024-2025. This represents a dramatic 5.5-point improvement from the previous year's concerning performance of 42.1 and establishes English Education as the institutional model for excellence in teacher preparation. The program's trajectory over four years shows both volatility and capacity for recovery, with scores of 46.3 in 2021-2022, 44.3 in 2022-2023, a troubling decline to 42.1 in 2023-2024, and the current outstanding performance of 47.6. This pattern reveals a program capable of identifying weaknesses and implementing effective interventions, though the 2023-2024 dip raises questions about what caused the temporary decline and what factors contributed to the dramatic recovery.

The program maintains stable enrollment of 7 candidates across most years, ranging from 6 to 8 candidates over the four-year period, providing consistency without the volatility seen in programs like Science or Agricultural Education. However, this small cohort size, while manageable and sustainable, limits the program's institutional impact and creates vulnerability to individual candidate performance variations affecting program averages. The gender composition shows strong female majority, with 71% to 88% female representation across the four years, reflecting broader patterns in English education nationally but raising concerns about recruitment and retention of male candidates. In 2024-2025, the program enrolled 5 female candidates and 2 male candidates, with females averaging 48.0 and males 46.5, a modest 1.5-point gap that likely reflects individual differences rather than systematic gender effects given the small sample size. Historical gender patterns show inconsistency, with some years favoring females and others showing male advantages, but small numbers of male candidates make reliable gender analysis impossible.

The program's exceptional performance manifests most clearly in assessment tasks, where it leads the institution with an average of 16.6 out of 25 in 2024-2025. This represents the highest assessment task performance among all programs and demonstrates English Education's mastery of critical teaching competencies related to evaluating student learning, providing feedback, and using assessment to inform instruction. Most notably, the program achieves an outstanding 3.7 out of 5 on Providing Feedback to students, the highest score across all programs and all rubrics in the institution. This exceptional performance in feedback provision significantly exceeds other programs, with the next highest scores around 3.3 to 3.4,

demonstrating that English candidates possess superior skills in communicating with students about their learning, identifying specific areas for improvement, and crafting actionable feedback that students can understand and implement. This strength aligns naturally with English education's emphasis on writing instruction, revision processes, and literacy development, where feedback represents a cornerstone of effective teaching practice.

Analysis of student learning shows similarly strong performance at 3.2 out of 5, indicating English candidates can effectively interpret student work, identify patterns of understanding and misunderstanding, and draw meaningful conclusions about learning outcomes. The program scores 3.2 on Student Use of Feedback, significantly above the institutional norm where this rubric consistently represents a weakness for most programs. This suggests English candidates not only provide quality feedback but also implement strategies to ensure students engage with and act upon that feedback, representing complete mastery of formative assessment cycles. Language analysis achieves 3.3 out of 5, appropriately reflecting English candidates' expertise in examining how students use academic language, vocabulary, and discourse patterns. Assessment to Inform Instruction scores 3.3, demonstrating candidates' capacity to translate assessment results into instructional modifications and responsive teaching decisions.

Planning tasks reveal exceptional performance averaging 15.9 out of 25, second only to Social Studies among institutional programs. English candidates demonstrate outstanding knowledge of students at 3.6 out of 5, the highest score across all programs and rubrics, suggesting superior understanding of learner characteristics, backgrounds, interests, and needs. This exceptional student knowledge likely contributes to the program's overall effectiveness, as candidates who deeply understand their learners can design more responsive and engaging instruction. Content understanding scores 3.5 out of 5, tied for highest institutional performance, indicating English candidates possess strong command of literary analysis, writing instruction, language study, and communication skills. This content expertise provides the foundation for effective pedagogical decision-making and allows candidates to help students develop sophisticated literacy skills.

However, even this exemplary program shows persistent weaknesses in specific planning competencies. Planning for Student Needs scores 2.8 out of 5, above many programs but still representing relative weakness within English Education's otherwise exceptional performance. This suggests candidates struggle with differentiated instruction, adapting lessons for diverse learners, and designing instruction that addresses varied student needs, learning styles, and readiness levels. While 2.8 sits comfortably above the 2.4 certification cutoff, it represents a 0.8-point gap from the program's knowledge of students score, indicating a disconnect between understanding who students are and planning instruction that responds to that understanding. Academic language development scores 2.9, adequate but below the program's performance in other areas, suggesting opportunities to strengthen how candidates identify and support language demands within English curriculum. Assessment planning achieves 3.0, solid but not exceptional, indicating room for improvement in designing assessments that align with learning objectives and provide meaningful data about student progress.

Instruction tasks show strong performance at 15.1 out of 25, significantly above institutional average and demonstrating English candidates' effectiveness in classroom teaching. Learning environment scores 3.2 out of 5, indicating candidates create positive classroom climates conducive to learning, with effective routines, respectful interactions, and engaging physical and social environments. Engaging students achieves 3.1, suggesting candidates effectively capture student interest, maintain participation, and create interactive learning experiences that motivate student involvement. Deepening student learning scores 3.1, demonstrating candidates can move students beyond surface understanding to analytical thinking, synthesis, and application. Subject-specific pedagogy achieves 2.9, indicating adequate but not exceptional use of English-specific teaching strategies for

Consistent strengths emerge across the four-year period, providing confidence that recent excellence reflects genuine program quality rather than temporary anomalies. Content understanding has remained above 3.0 in all years, ranging from 3.0 to 3.5, demonstrating sustained strength in subject matter preparation. Providing feedback has consistently ranked as the program's highest rubric, ranging from 3.4 to 3.8 across years, indicating systematic program emphasis on this critical competency. Knowledge of students has maintained strong performance in the 2.8 to 3.6 range, though with some volatility, suggesting general strength with occasional cohort variations. Assessment tasks have consistently outperformed planning and instruction tasks, indicating the program's particular expertise in evaluation and formative assessment practices.

The program's subject-specific advantages align naturally with edTPA requirements in ways that benefit English candidates. The assessment's emphasis on academic language development plays to English education's core mission of literacy instruction, giving candidates natural familiarity with vocabulary development, discourse patterns, and language structures. The extensive written commentary required throughout edTPA favors candidates with strong writing skills, allowing English candidates to articulate their pedagogical reasoning with clarity and sophistication. The focus on providing and using feedback aligns with writing instruction's emphasis on revision and improvement cycles, where feedback represents essential teaching practice. Analysis of student work samples draws on English candidates' training in textual analysis and close reading, translatable skills that support interpretation of student learning artifacts. These natural alignments may partially explain English Education's exceptional performance, though they don't diminish the program's genuine excellence in developing these competencies.

Comparative analysis reveals English Education's institutional leadership and outlier status. The program's 47.6 average exceeds the institutional mean by approximately 4 points and surpasses all other programs except Social Studies, which achieves 46.5. The 9.1-point gap between English at 47.6 and Mathematics at 38.5 demonstrates dramatic program-level differences in outcomes that cannot be explained by edTPA design alone. English candidates score 1.2 points higher than Physical Education on providing feedback (3.7 vs 2.5), 0.8 points higher than the next best program on knowledge of students, and consistently exceed other programs across multiple rubrics. This sustained excellence across multiple competencies indicates comprehensive program quality rather than strength in isolated areas.

The program should document success factors contributing to exceptional performance, conducting systematic analysis of curriculum, clinical experiences, faculty practices, and candidate support systems that produce outstanding outcomes. This documentation could inform program improvement across the institution and provide evidence for accreditation, external recognition, or grant opportunities. Modest enrollment expansion through targeted recruitment could enhance sustainability while maintaining quality, with particular focus on diversifying the candidate pool by gender, race, and background. The program should establish mechanisms to prevent future performance dips like 2023-2024, including regular data review, early intervention systems for struggling candidates, and continuous improvement processes that identify and address emerging weaknesses before they affect cohort-level outcomes.

The Secondary English Education program represents institutional excellence and demonstrates that high-quality teacher preparation producing exceptional edTPA outcomes is achievable. The program's transformation from concerning 42.1 performance to outstanding 47.6 in a single year proves that programs can identify weaknesses and implement effective improvements rapidly when leadership, faculty expertise, and quality assurance systems align. The sustained strengths in assessment, student knowledge, and content understanding provide a stable foundation for continued excellence, while identified weaknesses in planning differentiation and teaching analysis offer clear improvement targets. With attention to

sustainability through enrollment management and gender diversity, the program can maintain its position as institutional leader while expanding its positive impact on teacher preparation quality and the future English teaching workforce.

Section VII. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Math

The Secondary Mathematics Education program faces an immediate and severe crisis requiring urgent intervention at the highest administrative levels. With an overall average of just 38.5 out of 75 in 2024-2025, the program sits precariously only 2.5 points above the certification failure threshold of 36, placing individual candidates at extreme risk of failing to achieve teaching certification despite completing their program requirements. The gap between Mathematics and the institutional average demonstrates that this is not a general institutional problem but rather a program-specific crisis requiring targeted and immediate intervention.

The program's historical performance reveals persistent struggle and alarming decline rather than temporary setback or anomalous poor cohort. Over the four-year period, Mathematics Education scored 42.0 in 2021-2022, declined to 39.4 in 2022-2023, recovered slightly to 42.0 in 2023-2024, and then fell to the current crisis level of 38.5 in 2024-2025. While the program has occasionally achieved adequate performance just above 42, it has never demonstrated sustained excellence or stability. The overall trajectory shows decline, with the most recent performance representing the lowest in the four-year period. This pattern indicates fundamental program deficiencies rather than isolated problems, suggesting systematic issues with curriculum design, faculty expertise, clinical placement quality, candidate selection, or instructional approaches that have not been adequately addressed despite years of concerning data.

The crisis manifests most dramatically in three rubrics scoring below the 2.4 certification threshold, representing automatic certification failure regardless of performance in other areas. Planning for Student Needs scores only 2.0 out of 5 in 2024-2025, falling 0.4 points below the minimum requirement and indicating candidates cannot adequately differentiate instruction for diverse learners. Academic Language Development similarly scores 2.0, demonstrating candidates lack the skills to identify and support the language demands essential for mathematical reasoning, discourse, and problem-solving. Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness scores 2.0, revealing candidates cannot critically examine their instruction, analyze relationships between teaching decisions and learning outcomes, or identify specific improvements for future practice. These three failing rubrics represent fundamental teaching competencies, not peripheral skills, making it highly probable that individual candidates are failing certification entirely rather than simply scoring low on overall averages.

The systematic decline in Planning for Student Needs from 3.0 in 2021-2022 to 2.0 in 2024-2025 demonstrates deteriorating program quality over time rather than isolated cohort issues. This four-year erosion of a critical competency suggests progressive program weakening, possibly related to faculty turnover, reduced clinical placement quality, curriculum gaps, or insufficient attention to differentiated instruction in methods courses. The fact that this decline occurred gradually rather than suddenly indicates missed opportunities for intervention and quality assurance failures, as ongoing data should have triggered programmatic responses before reaching crisis levels. Academic Language has similarly declined from marginal adequacy in earlier years to outright failure, particularly concerning for mathematics where academic vocabulary, symbolic representation, and mathematical discourse represent essential components of content understanding and student learning.

Beyond individual rubric failures, the program performs below standards across all three task areas. Planning tasks average only 12.0 out of 25, well below the certification threshold of 12 for this section, placing candidates at immediate risk. Instruction tasks fare marginally better at 12.5 out of 25, just barely meeting minimum requirements but leaving no margin for individual variation. Assessment tasks represent the program's relative strength at 14.0 out of 25, but even this performance falls significantly below institutional norms and other programs' assessment competency. The consistency of poor performance across all task domains indicates pervasive program weakness rather than isolated deficiencies in specific areas, suggesting comprehensive program redesign rather than targeted fixes may be necessary.

Within the weak overall performance, examining individual rubric scores reveals both the scope of the crisis and the one isolated bright spot. Content Understanding scores 3.0, indicating candidates possess adequate mathematical knowledge, though this represents minimum expectations for mathematics specialists. Learning Environment similarly achieves 3.0, suggesting candidates can establish basic classroom management and create physically safe learning spaces. The program's single area of genuine strength appears in Providing Feedback, which scores an exceptional 4.0 out of 5, representing the highest score for Mathematics Education across all rubrics and matching the best institutional performance in this area. This isolated excellence in feedback provision seems paradoxical given failures in other assessment and instructional areas, suggesting candidates can write quality feedback comments but lack the deeper pedagogical skills to plan differentiated instruction, support academic language, or analyze their teaching effectiveness comprehensively.

Subject-Specific Pedagogy scores only 2.5, barely above the certification cutoff and deeply concerning for candidates specializing in mathematics education. This suggests candidates lack the pedagogical content knowledge essential for effective mathematics instruction, including understanding of common student misconceptions, ability to select appropriate representations and models, capacity to sequence mathematical concepts developmentally, and skill in facilitating mathematical discourse and reasoning. For mathematics specialists, pedagogical content knowledge represents the unique expertise that distinguishes them from general teachers or content experts without teaching training, making this weakness particularly troubling. Engaging Students scores 2.5, indicating candidates struggle to motivate participation, maintain interest, and create interactive learning experiences, all critical for mathematics where student engagement significantly predicts learning outcomes and many students experience anxiety or disengagement.

The program faces severe enrollment and sustainability crisis compounding academic performance problems. The program has shrunk to just 2 candidates in recent years (both female in 2024-2025), down from 5-6 candidates in earlier years. This represents enrollment too small to sustain dedicated faculty, specialized coursework, or program-specific resources. The cost per candidate becomes prohibitive when program expenses are divided among only two students, raising serious questions about resource allocation and institutional willingness to maintain a program serving so few candidates with such poor outcomes. The complete loss of male representation represents additional concern, particularly given historical data suggesting male candidates performed better when enrolled. In 2022-2023, male candidates averaged 44.7 compared to a single female candidate at 32.0, and in 2021-2022, males averaged 45.0 compared to females at 40.0, suggesting the program may have historically served male candidates more effectively than female candidates.

The gender pattern reversal demands investigation, as the program shifted from male majority with relatively better performance to exclusively female enrollment with crisis-level outcomes. This raises questions about whether program changes inadvertently disadvantaged certain populations,

whether recruitment patterns shifted in ways that affected candidate quality, or whether the loss of male candidates correlates with other program changes affecting overall quality. The small sample sizes make definitive conclusions impossible, but the pattern suggests investigating whether program modifications, faculty changes, or clinical placement shifts disproportionately affected different candidate populations. Understanding these dynamics could inform both improvement efforts and recruitment strategies.

Comparison to successful programs reveals dramatic gaps that cannot be explained by edTPA design or content area differences alone. English Education, scoring 47.6, exceeds Mathematics by 9.1 points, indicating program-level factors beyond content differences. Social Studies achieves 46.5, Agricultural Education 45.5, and even Elementary programs score in the 42-43 range, all substantially exceeding Mathematics performance. The consistency of Mathematics underperformance across years and the gap from all other programs strongly suggests program-specific problems rather than external factors like edTPA bias against mathematics or inadequate candidate pool quality. Other institutions successfully prepare mathematics teachers who pass edTPA, demonstrating that the assessment can be navigated successfully with appropriate program design and support.

The stark contrast between Mathematics Education at 38.5 and English Education at 47.6 demonstrates that program quality varies dramatically within institutions and that effective teacher preparation producing strong edTPA outcomes is achievable with appropriate program design, faculty expertise, clinical partnerships, and candidate support. The Mathematics program's crisis does not reflect inevitable outcomes of content area difficulty or edTPA bias, but rather represents program-specific failures requiring accountability, intervention, and either substantial improvement or responsible closure to protect candidate interests and institutional reputation.

Section IX. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Science

The Secondary Science Education program faces an existential crisis that extends beyond academic performance to fundamental questions of program survival and viability. The program has experienced enrollment collapse, declining from 12 candidates in 2021-2022 to just 1 candidate in 2024-2025, representing a staggering 92% enrollment drop over three years.

The single remaining candidate in 2024-2025 demonstrates academic performance that mirrors the enrollment crisis, showing three certification failures that place the individual at extreme risk of not achieving teaching licensure despite program completion. Planning for Student Needs scores 2.0 out of 5, falling 0.4 points below the certification threshold and indicating inability to differentiate instruction for diverse learners. Academic Language Development similarly scores 2.0, revealing inadequate skills to identify and support the language demands essential for scientific discourse, reasoning, and understanding. Engaging Students scores 2.0, demonstrating inability to motivate participation, maintain interest, and create interactive learning experiences. These three failing rubrics represent fundamental teaching competencies, meaning the candidate faces probable certification failure unless intensive intervention and remediation occur before final assessment submission. The concentration of failures in planning and engagement suggests particular weakness in proactive instructional design and student motivation, though with only one candidate, it remains unclear whether these failures reflect individual candidate struggles or systematic program deficiencies.

The single-candidate data creates severe statistical reliability problems that make program-level conclusions essentially impossible. Individual performance variations that would be averaged out in larger cohorts appear as program trends, making it unclear whether observed weaknesses reflect program quality, candidate characteristics, clinical placement conditions, or random variation. The three rubrics scoring at failing levels could represent a struggling individual who would perform poorly in any program, or they could indicate systematic program gaps that affect all candidates but are only visible now with one candidate enrolled. Similarly, areas of adequate performance scoring 3.0 across multiple rubrics including Content Understanding, Learning Environment, Subject-Specific Pedagogy, and most assessment rubrics could represent either program strengths or simply this individual's particular competencies. The impossibility of distinguishing program effects from individual effects fundamentally limits what can be concluded from 2024-2025 data, making historical trends and enrollment patterns more informative than current academic performance.

Historical performance data reveals concerning volatility and persistent weaknesses that predate the current enrollment crisis. The program achieved its peak performance of 44.0 in 2022-2023 with an all-male cohort of 4 candidates, demonstrating the program can produce adequate outcomes when conditions align. However, this was preceded by 42.0 in 2021-2022 with 12 candidates and followed by 43.0 in 2023-2024 with 8 candidates, before the current crisis of 42.0 with a single candidate. While these scores remain above the certification threshold, they show no pattern of sustained excellence or consistent improvement. More concerning, examination of individual rubric performance across years reveals persistent weaknesses in Planning for Student Needs, which consistently scores in the 2.0 to 2.5 range across all years, and Academic Language, which shows similar chronic weakness. These patterns suggest systematic curriculum or clinical preparation gaps that have affected multiple cohorts over time, indicating the current candidate's failures in these areas likely reflect program deficiencies rather than solely individual shortcomings.

Task-level historical analysis reveals both areas of relative strength and persistent challenges that have characterized the program across multiple cohorts. Assessment tasks have generally represented the program's strongest area, ranging from 14.9 in 2021-2022 to 15.3 in 2022-2023 to 14.6 in 2023-2024 to 15.0 in 2024-2025, showing reasonable consistency in evaluation, feedback, and assessment literacy. Planning tasks show more volatility, ranging from 14.2 in 2021-2022 to 15.0 in 2022-2023 to 13.8 in 2023-2024 to 13.0 in 2024-2025, with a concerning declining trend. Instruction tasks demonstrate similar inconsistency, ranging from 12.9 to 14.6 across the years. The relative stability of assessment performance compared to volatility in planning and instruction suggests the program may have clearer curriculum and expectations around evaluation practices than around instructional design and implementation.

Examining specific rubrics across years reveals where systematic program weaknesses persist regardless of cohort. Planning for Student Needs has scored 2.5 or below across all four years, never approaching excellence and frequently hovering just above or at the certification threshold, indicating chronic weakness in differentiated instruction that spans faculty, curriculum, and clinical preparation. Academic Language consistently underperforms, ranging from 2.4 to 2.8 across years, suggesting inadequate attention to identifying and supporting the vocabulary, syntax, and discourse patterns essential for scientific reasoning and communication. Student Use of Feedback shows persistent weakness as well, scoring 2.4 to 3.0 across years, indicating candidates struggle to help students implement feedback effectively even when they can provide adequate feedback initially. These patterns demonstrate that current weaknesses are not anomalies but rather long-standing program challenges that have not been adequately addressed despite years of concerning data.

Areas of historical strength provide some foundation for potential program recovery if enrollment can be restored. Content Understanding has consistently scored at or above 3.0, indicating candidates possess adequate scientific knowledge, though this represents minimum expectations for science specialists. Analysis of Student Learning maintains reasonable performance in the 2.8 to 3.3 range, suggesting candidates can interpret student work and draw conclusions about understanding. Providing Feedback scores reasonably well across years, though not at the exceptional levels seen in English or Agricultural Education. Assessment to Inform Instruction shows adequate performance, indicating candidates can translate assessment results into instructional decisions. These relative strengths suggest the program has developed some competencies adequately even while struggling in other areas, providing building blocks for improvement if program continuation is deemed viable.

The 2022-2023 peak performance of 44.0 with four male candidates demonstrates the program's capacity to achieve adequate outcomes under favorable conditions, though even this performance falls short of institutional excellence and well below top programs like English at 47.6. The all-male cohort achieving the highest program scores raises questions about whether program characteristics particularly suit male candidates, though the small sample size prevents definitive conclusions. If program redesign occurs, investigating what conditions contributed to this cohort's relative success could inform improvement efforts. However, the inability to sustain this performance and the subsequent enrollment collapse suggest the success was situation-specific rather than reflecting robust program quality that could be maintained across varying cohorts and conditions.

Comparison to successful programs reveals significant performance gaps even during the Science program's best years. English Education at 47.6, Social Studies at 46.5, and Agricultural Education at 45.5 all substantially exceed Science's peak of 44.0, demonstrating that higher performance is achievable in secondary education programs. The Science program has never matched institutional leaders, suggesting either inherent challenges in science teacher preparation, misalignment between science teaching and edTPA structure, or program-specific deficiencies that have persisted across multiple years and cohorts. Other institutions successfully prepare science teachers who pass edTPA, indicating the assessment can be navigated with appropriate program design, though science education programs nationally sometimes struggle with balancing laboratory skills, inquiry-based teaching, and the written analysis edTPA emphasizes.

If the institution determines that comprehensive improvement and enrollment recovery are genuinely achievable within reasonable timeframes and with adequate resource investment, systematic redesign addressing all identified weaknesses becomes essential. However, if realistic assessment suggests recovery is unlikely or would require resources better invested elsewhere, orderly closure with appropriate candidate protections represents the more ethically responsible choice, acknowledging that program elimination, while difficult, sometimes better serves student interests than maintaining failing programs that consume resources without delivering quality outcomes.

Section X. Analysis of Scores on edTPA for Social Studies

The Secondary Social Studies Education program demonstrates remarkable transformation and stands as the institution's second-highest performing program, achieving an exceptional 46.5 average in 2024-2025 that represents a dramatic 4.3-point improvement from the previous year's 42.2 performance. This striking improvement places Social Studies just 1.1 points behind the highest-performing English Education program and establishes it as an institutional leader in teacher preparation quality. The program's four-year trajectory shows steady growth from 44.4 in 2021-2022 to 43.8 in 2022-2023, a temporary decline to 42.2 in 2023-2024, and then the current exceptional performance of 46.5. This pattern reveals a program

with strong foundational quality that experienced a temporary setback before implementing highly effective interventions leading to outstanding outcomes. The capacity for such dramatic improvement in a single year demonstrates responsive program leadership, effective quality assurance mechanisms, and faculty expertise capable of identifying weaknesses and implementing solutions that produce measurable results.

The program maintains healthy and sustainable enrollment of 17 candidates in 2024-2025, representing adequate cohort size for program viability, peer learning opportunities, diverse clinical placements, and reliable program assessment. This enrollment places Social Studies among the medium-sized programs in the institution. The 17-candidate cohort provides sufficient size for statistical reliability in performance analysis while remaining manageable for individualized faculty attention and supervision. Historical enrollment shows growth trajectory from 10 candidates in 2021-2022 to 15 in 2022-2023, expanding to 25 in 2023-2024 before moderating to 17 in 2024-2025. This enrollment pattern suggests strong recruitment and program attractiveness, though the decline from 25 to 17 candidates warrants monitoring to ensure it represents natural variation rather than emerging concerns about program quality, clinical placements, or career prospects.

Gender composition shows relatively balanced representation with 9 female and 8 male candidates in 2024-2025, providing near-parity that stands in contrast to programs with severe gender imbalances like Elementary programs with no male candidates or Physical Education with 73% male representation. However, this apparent balance masks the most significant concern in the program's otherwise exceptional performance: a dramatic and troubling gender performance gap that represents the largest in the institution. Female candidates average 49.3 in 2024-2025, an extraordinary score that approaches the exceptional performance of English Education and would represent the highest program average if considered independently. Male candidates average 43.4, a respectable score that exceeds many programs but falls 5.9 points below their female counterparts. This represents not just statistical difference but a meaningful gap affecting 8 male candidates, making it a pattern rather than artifact of small sample size.

The program demonstrates exceptional overall quality and leads the institution in critical teaching competencies that represent widespread challenges across other programs. Social Studies achieves 3.1 out of 5 on Planning for Student Needs in 2024-2025, the only program in the institution exceeding 3.0 on this rubric and representing genuine mastery rather than mere adequacy. This excellence in differentiated instruction, where most programs struggle to reach even 2.8, demonstrates systematic program attention to helping candidates assess student variability, design responsive instruction, and adapt teaching to diverse learner needs, backgrounds, and readiness levels. The program also achieves the highest institutional score in Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness at 3.1, indicating exceptional development of reflective practice skills where many programs barely exceed the 2.4 cutoff. This suggests candidates develop sophisticated capacity for self-evaluation, critical examination of teaching decisions, analysis of instruction-learning relationships, and identification of specific improvements for future practice.

Planning tasks overall reveal exceptional performance at 15.7 out of 25 in 2024-2025, second only to English Education's 15.9 and substantially exceeding most programs. Beyond the outstanding Planning for Student Needs score, the program shows strength across all planning dimensions. Content Understanding achieves 3.2, demonstrating solid social studies knowledge in history, geography, civics, economics, and social science concepts. Knowledge of Students scores 3.1, indicating candidates understand learner characteristics, backgrounds, interests, and developmental levels. Academic Language Development reaches 3.2, reflecting strong attention to the vocabulary, discourse patterns, and literacy demands inherent in social studies content. Assessment Planning achieves 3.2, showing candidates can design evaluations aligned with learning objectives that provide

meaningful data about student progress. This balanced excellence across all five planning rubrics, with no score below 3.1, demonstrates comprehensive preparation without significant gaps or weaknesses that might place candidates at certification risk.

Instruction tasks show similarly strong performance at 15.4 out of 25, well above institutional average and indicating effective classroom teaching capacity. Learning Environment scores 3.0, suggesting candidates create positive classroom climates with effective routines, respectful interactions, and physical arrangements conducive to learning, particularly important for social studies where discussion, debate, and collaborative inquiry require supportive environments. Engaging Students achieves 3.1, demonstrating candidates effectively capture interest, maintain participation, and create interactive experiences that motivate involvement with historical sources, current events, and social science concepts. Deepening Student Learning scores 3.2, indicating candidates move students beyond factual recall to analytical thinking, synthesis, evaluation, and application of social studies concepts. Subject-Specific Pedagogy reaches 3.0, showing adequate use of social studies teaching strategies including primary source analysis, historical thinking skills, inquiry processes, and civic deliberation. The exceptional Analyzing Teaching score of 3.1 represents the program's highest individual rubric performance in instruction and establishes Social Studies as the institutional leader in developing reflective practitioners.

Assessment tasks demonstrate consistent strength at 15.4 out of 25, matching instruction performance and indicating balanced competency across all three task domains. Analysis of Student Learning scores 3.1, showing candidates effectively interpret student work, identify patterns of understanding and misunderstanding, and draw meaningful conclusions about learning outcomes. Providing Feedback achieves 3.4, among the institution's highest scores and indicating candidates craft specific, actionable feedback that students can understand and use to improve. Student Use of Feedback scores 2.7, representing the program's only consistent weakness but one shared across nearly all institutional programs, suggesting candidates can provide quality feedback but struggle somewhat with implementation strategies that ensure students engage with and act upon suggestions. Language Analysis achieves 2.9, adequate for examining how students use academic vocabulary and discourse patterns in social studies contexts. Assessment to Inform Instruction scores 3.2, demonstrating strong capacity to translate assessment results into instructional modifications and responsive teaching decisions.

Consistent strengths emerge across the four-year period that provide confidence recent excellence reflects genuine program quality rather than temporary anomaly. Planning for Student Needs has consistently represented program strength, scoring as the institution's best performance on this challenging rubric across multiple years. Content Understanding has maintained solid performance above 3.0 in all years, demonstrating sustained strength in subject matter preparation. Assessment to Inform Instruction shows consistent performance in the 2.7 to 3.2 range, indicating ongoing attention to data-driven instruction. Analyzing Teaching has generally outperformed other programs even in weaker years, suggesting systematic program emphasis on reflective practice. These enduring strengths indicate core program competencies that persist across varying cohorts and conditions, providing a stable foundation for continued excellence.

Subject-appropriate strengths align naturally with social studies content and pedagogy demands. The program's exceptional performance in academic language development at 3.2 reflects social studies' emphasis on literacy-rich instruction, with extensive reading, writing, and discourse requirements. Strong content understanding at 3.2 demonstrates candidates' grasp of complex historical narratives, geographic patterns, political systems, economic concepts, and social science theories necessary for effective teaching. The excellent deepening student learning score of 3.2 aligns with social studies' emphasis on critical thinking, analysis, evaluation, and synthesis rather than simple factual recall. Strong student engagement at 3.1 reflects the

program's success in helping candidates make historical and contemporary issues relevant and compelling to adolescent learners. These natural alignments between program strengths and content demands suggest good fit between social studies pedagogy and program design.

The Secondary Social Studies Education program represents institutional excellence. The outstanding overall performance at 46.5, dramatic improvement from 42.2, leadership in differentiated instruction and reflective practice, and balanced strength across all competencies establish the program as a model of effective teacher preparation. The healthy enrollment, relatively balanced gender representation, and consistent historical strengths suggest sustainability and genuine program quality rather than temporary success.