edTPA Summary and Progress Report

Comparison Over Time, through 2023-2024 academic year

Maryland is in the last year of the phase in plan to require edTPA for all traditionally trained interns. By Summer 2025 (Specifically July 1, 2025) all candidates working toward certification within a college or university will be required to complete either the edTPA or PPAT, in addition to Praxis tests in specific content areas. The senate bill that was passed in Spring 2024 called for a change in who was required to complete edTPA, and that includes provisionally licensed teachers that are working toward certification and are unaffiliated with a IHE, as well as teacher candidates that are part of an alternative certification program (also, typically not affiliated with an IHE). This allows each district to adopt their own policies surrounding certification requirements in terms of Assessment (Praxis, edTPA, PPAT).

Table 1. Comparison of total score and rubric means, by content area, over time.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2020-2021** | **2021-2022** | **2022-2023** | **2023-2024** |
| **Portfolio Content Area** | **n** | **Mean Score** | **Rubric Mean** | **n** | **Mean Score** | **Rubric Mean** | **n** | **Mean Score** | **Rubric Mean** | **n** | **Mean Score** | **Rubric Mean** |
| Overall average | 115 | 41.14 | 2.67 | 176 | 42.05 | 2.77 | 108 | 41.11 | 2.74 | 102 | 41.47 | 2.77 |
| Not scored (condition codes) | 4 |  |  | - |  |  | 3 |  |  | 2\*\* |  |  |
| **13 Rubric Handbook** (34 is suggested “cut score”) |
| World Languages  | 1 | 19 | 1.5 | 6 | 33.17 | 2.55 | 1 | 26 | 2.0 | 1 | 37.00 | 2.85 |
| **15 Rubric Handbooks** (37 is suggested “cut score”) |
| Business Education | 1 | 37 | 2.5 | - | - | - | 1 | 45 | 3.0 | 6 | 46.80 | 3.12 |
| Early Childhood Education | 8 | 40 | 2.7 | 14 | 39.9 | 2.7 | 19 | 40.63 | 2.71 | 11 | 39.18 | 2.61 |
| Elementary Literacy | 4 | 41.8 | 2.8 | 7 | 41.4 | 2.8 | 11 | 43.7 | 2.91 | 6 | 43.00 | 2.86 |
| Elementary Math | 2 | 42 | 2.8 | 7 | 43.1 | 2.9 | 9 | 41.33 | 2.75 | 14 | 44.50 | 2.97 |
| English as an Additional Language | 5 | 44.8 | 3.0 | 16 | 44.4 | 2.9 | 7 | 46.29 | 3.08 | 9 | 45.13 | 3.01 |
| Performing Arts | 3 | 43.7 | 2.9 | 4 | 39.3 | 2.6 | 2 | 47 | 3.13 | 1 | 46.00 | 3.07 |
| Secondary English | 8 | 44 | 2.9 | 15 | 44.9 | 2.9 | 6 | 42.33 | 2.82 | 4 | 41.75 | 2.78 |
| Secondary Math | 4 | 41.3 | 2.8 | 4 | 37.5 | 2.5 | 1 | 36 | 2.4 | 3 | 33.50 | 2.24 |
| Secondary Science | 10 | 37.1 | 2.5 | 4 | 40 | 2.7 | 5 | 42.6 | 2.84 | 3 | 44.33 | 2.95 |
| Secondary Social Studies | 8 | 40.4 | 2.7 | 11 | 46.4 | 3.1 | 3 | 42.67 | 2.84 | 4 | 44.75 | 2.99 |
| Special Education | 46 | 39.2 | 2.6 | 61 | 39.6 | 2.6 | 40 | 39.05 | 2.6 | 35 | 38.86 | 2.59 |
| Technology and Engineering Ed. (includes computer science) | 2 | 47 | 3.2 | 1 | 31 | 2.1 | 1 | 45 | 3.0 | - | - | - |
| Visual Arts | 4 | 45 | 3 | 6 | 48.6 | 3.2 | 2 | 43.5 | 2.9 | 4 | 46.00 | 3.07 |
| **18 Rubric Handbooks** (44 is suggested “cut score”) |
| Elementary Educ. (Lit. w Math Task 4)  | 5 | 40.4 | 2.3 | 9 | 45.7 | 2.5 | - | - | - | -\* | - | - |
| Elementary Educ. (Math w Lit. Task 4) | 15 | 47.4 | 2.6 | 6 | 49 | 2.7 | - | - | - | -\* | - | - |

\* NDMU no longer uses the 4-task handbooks, as this is not a requirement for the state of Maryland.

\*\*At the time of the creation of this report (6/3/24), 12 students have yet to submit their edTPA portfolio (including 8 who are part of the Elevates Grant, and will submit by July 11th). Also, the two students who require retakes because of condition codes will have scores back over the summer. Lastly, one student missed the 5/1 scoring window, so scores will be back 8/1. The next window closes on 7/11, with scores returning 8/1. This will give us 11 more scores to analyze as part of this data set.

Table 2. Percentage of candidates meeting the suggested cut score over time

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Portfolio Content Area** | **2020-2021** | **2021-2022** | **2022-2023** | **2023-2024** |
|  | **n** | **% met** | **n** | **% met** | **n** | **% met**  | **n** | **% met** |
| Overall average | 115 | 74% | 176 | 77% | 108 | 80% | 102 | 85% |
| **13 Rubric Handbook (34 out of 65 cut Score)** |
| World Languages | 1 | 0% | 6 | 50% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% |
| **15 Rubric Handbooks (37 out of 75 cut score)** |
| Business Education | 1 | 0% | - | - | 1 | 100% | 6 | 100% |
| Early Childhood Education | 8 | 88% | 14 | 86% | 19 | 79% | 11 | 64% |
| Elementary Literacy | 4 | 100% | 7 | 86% | 11 | 100% | 6 | 83% |
| Elementary Math | 2 | 100% | 7 | 86% | 9 | 89% | 14 | 100% |
| English as an Additional Language | 4 | 75% | 16 | 88% | 7 | 100% | 9 | 88% |
| Performing Arts | 3 | 64% | 4 | 75% | 2 | 100% | 1 | 100% |
| Secondary English | 8 | 88% | 15 | 87% | 6 | 83% | 4 | 75% |
| Secondary Math | 3 | 100% | 4 | 75% | 1 | 0% | 3 | 50% |
| Secondary Science | 9 | 67% | 4 | 75% | 5 | 80% | 3 | 100% |
| Secondary Social Studies | 8 | 100% | 11 | 100% | 3 | 100% | 4 | 100% |
| Special Education | 46 | 74% | 61 | 66% | 40 | 68% | 35 | 83% |
| Tech and Eng. Ed., include comp. sci. | 2 | 100% | 1 | 0% | 1 | 100% | - | - |
| Visual Arts | 3 | 100% | 6 | 100% | 2 | 100% | 4 | 100% |
| **18 Rubrics - 4 Task Handbook (44 out of 90 cut score)** |
| Elementary Educ. (Literacy with Math Task 4) | 4 | 0% | 9 | 55% | - | - | - | - |
| Elementary Educ. (Math with Lit Task 4) | 13 | 97% | 6 | 83% | - | - | - | - |

By August 1st, we will have 15 additional scores to add for reporting purposes. There are eight students who are part of the Elevates grant that will submit their work by July 11th. Jodi King is teaching a separate section of edTPA for the Special Education candidates (n=4), and there are four TESOL students in Angela Snyder’s class that took an incomplete in the course that was planned from the beginning. Lisa and Angela will continue to follow up with all candidates to ensure their portfolios are submitted and fully scored. It should be noted that there is also one student, a Business Education candidate, who was not in the edTPA course for an unknown reason, who submitted his portfolio on his own, and received condition codes in all three Tasks. Angela will meet with him the week of 6/3/2024 to try to advise him on a retake of all tasks.

Similar to last year, we have increased our overall Percent Met Passing Criteria, from 80% meeting the suggested cut scores in the 22-23 academic year to 85% meeting the suggested cut scores this academic. Additionally, we have increased our Percent Met Passing Criteria in several areas, including World Languages, Elementary Math, Secondary Math, Secondary Science, and Special Education. However, several other areas decreased their overall percent of students who met the passing criteria, including Early Childhood, Elementary Literacy, TESOL, and Secondary English. As some of these areas have a very low n, this analysis should be viewed with caution.

Some additional things have remained the same: the overall total of students who meet the suggested passing score in Maryland has continued to increase each year, which we attribute to increased content specific support within the two sections of the edTPA class. Additionally, both sections of the class have had a co-teacher who have made significant contributions to the class. We also have been continuing to work with faculty to layer in edTPA language and materials into methods and other courses.

For our largest program, Special Education, over the last three years we have continued to see growth in the percentage of students who meet the suggested score set by Maryland (37). This program is in the process of undergoing many changes, including changes in key assignments and rubrics, as well as personnel who are teaching the courses. The overall number of students using this handbook has declined over the last three years as well, which could be the reason for the change (increase) in percentage of those meeting the cut score. This program’s overall total score and rubric average have remained largely unchanged, though we have been able to increase the number of students passing this assessment. As Maryland moves into its last year of the phase in process, we will have to determine what the consequences of not meeting the minimum cut score will be, as universities around the state have adopted different policies.

When looking at overall scores, the average total score has been fairly consistent, with small shifts up or down by less than a point over time. Rubric scores have also remained fairly consistent. Rubrics were our candidates are showing strength (within .1 of the goal of a 3 on each rubric) include Rubric 4, 6, and 12. Rubric 4 concerns supporting academic language demands during planning; rubric 6 deals with creating a positive learning environment; and rubric 12 is about providing feedback to improve learners’ growth. All three of these rubrics are areas we have focused heavily on within the last several years, specifically offering additional supports for academic language, and discussing techniques around providing positive and effective feedback for learners. Rubrics were our candidates have room for growth (scoring less than 2.75 on average) include rubrics 3, 5, 10, 11, 13 and 14. Rubrics 3 and 5 are part of Task 1 – Planning: rubric 3 is about candidates using knowledge of their learners to plan instruction to meet diverse needs; rubric 5 is about planning assessment to meet those diverse learners needs. Rubric 10 is part of Task 2 - Instruction, and is about analyzing teaching effectiveness, where candidates reflect on their instruction after it has been delivered and make changes based on engagement, behavior, and other classroom needs. Rubrics 11, 13, and 14 are part of Task 3 – Assessment; rubric 11 is about analyzing student learning, where candidates have to provide whole class item analysis of their chosen assessment and then also analyze three students (typically one below grade level, one at grade level, and one above grade level). Despite covering this in the edTPA course, this is still an area of need. Rubric 13 is all about our candidates ensuring that their students understand and can use the feedback provided to them, so while our candidates in general are now providing positive, effective feedback, they are less able to articulate how their students use that feedback to improve their learning. Lastly, rubric 14 is about candidates analyzing students’ use of academic language demands. Like the feedback rubric, our candidates are now planning better for academic language demands, but they are less able to articulate student *use* of that academic language during instruction and assessment. The edTPA co-Coordinators will work with the Initial Certification Committee to plan professional development for our faculty on these rubric areas and also continue to infuse these areas into our coursework during the edTPA 400/600 classes.

Once all scores for the 2023-2024 aademic year have been received (August 1, 2024), the two edTPA course faculty (and co-edTPA Coordinators) will compare each content specific area to Maryland and National scores for candidates. While Task 3 nationally has always been the task that is scored the lowest, we need to be able to compare our candidates by content area and by rubric to national and Maryland scores to determine further professional development needs. This comparison will allow us to make deeper and more meaningful changes to courses during a candidates’ training, and also to the edTPA course that candidates take during internship. The two edTPA Coordinators also plan to train University Supervisors in content specific handbooks, and will continue to offer training for faculty and associate faculty for their own individual courses.

One of the edTPA Coordinators, Angela Snyder, would like to move away from edTPA, as both an instructor of the course each semester as well as an edTPA Coordinator. Her work at NDMU has evolved over her 15 years here, and she now works almost exclusively with doctoral students, except for the one edTPA class each semester. Through discussion with Lisa Pallett (co-Coordinator) and Angelo Letizia (Initial Certification Department Chair) and the Dean (Kathy Doherty), we have decided to work starting this summer, in training additional faculty/adjunct faculty in edTPA, so that others can take over the class. Ideally, we will have subject/content specific sections of the edTPA 400/600 course for our bigger programs (one section each for Special Ed, TESOL, Early Childhood, and Elementary Education), while the handbooks that have fewer students will continue to be grouped together (Secondary content areas and Business Ed in one section, plus Visual and Performing Arts, World Languages, and Technology and Engineering Education in another section). The purpose of grouping by content is largely based on the research Lisa and Angela conducted (from surveys and interviews) that candidates need more targeted support, as the handbooks are very specific and different by content. This is especially true for Special Education, TESOL, and Early Childhood, as the requirements and expectations for candidates are different from the other content areas. Additionally, it will allow class sizes to be smaller; as despite having a co-teacher for each section, smaller class sizes where candidates are grouped by content area (where possible) could really allow for deeper development of candidate skills in all three areas measures – Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. Lisa will be on sabbatical in Fall 2024, and when she returns, we hope to start putting some of this in place.