## PILOT STUDY RESULTS SPRING '13

## Explanation

Twenty-nine candidates participated in a national scoring pilot study during spring semester 2013. Results summaries are shown here. The complete study including a narrative and method section is available on request.

Table 1 shows hypothetical pass rates based on the national sample. A best guess is that 39 will be selected when Minnesota establishes cut scores during the summer of ' 14 . The potential cut scores shown in this and related tables represent one SEM above (42) and below (37) the median value selected by the national panel (39)

Table 1. Pass rates by area (minus world languages).

| Field | $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ | M | $\begin{gathered} \text { N Pass } \\ \underline{(42)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\% \text { Pass }}{(42)}$ | $\frac{\text { N Pass }}{(39)}$ | $\frac{\% \text { Pass }}{(39)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { N Pass } \\ \underline{(37)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% Pass } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elementary Literacy | 5 | 30.2 | 0 | ---- | 1 | 20.0 | 1 | 20.0 |
| Elementary Mathematics | 11 | 40.9 | 4 | 36.4 | 9 | 81.2 | 10 | 90.9 |
| Elementary | 16 | 35.2 | 4 | 25.0 | 10 | 62.5 | 11 | 68.7 |
| Early Childhood (CFS) | 3 | 40.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 |
| Secondary English Language Arts | 2 | 37.0 | 0 | ---- | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
| Physical Education | 2 | 38.5 | 0 | ---- | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
| Performing Arts | 1 | 37.0 | 0 | ---- | 0 | ---- | 1 | 50.0 |
| Social Studies | 2 | 35.0 | 0 | ---- | 1 | 50.0 | 1 | 50.0 |
| Science | 1 | 40.0 | 0 | ---- | 1 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 |
| Visual Arts | 2 | 50.5 | 1 | 50.0 | 2 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Secondary-K-12 | 10 | 39.9 | 1 | 10.0 | 6 | 60.0 | 8 | 80.0 |
| ALL SCSU | 29 | 38.5 | 7 | 24.1 | 19 | 65.5 | 21 | 72.4 |
| National Sample | ---- | 42.8 | ---- | 57.9 | ---- | 70.5 | ---- | 78.0 |

St. Cloud state's domains cores in spring 2013 matched the national rank order, but came in at lower values. These data are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Scores by domain (all SCSU).

|  | SCSU Sample <br> Spring '13 |  | National Sample <br> Spring '13 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area/Task | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ |
| Planning Instruction | 13.57 | 3.29 | 15.06 | 3.15 |
| Instructing | 13.47 | 2.54 | 14.35 | 2.77 |
| Assessing Instruction | 11.37 | 3.21 | 13.36 | 3.39 |

## INTERNAL SCORING <br> Fall '13

## Explanation

These data relate to scores on the edTPA collected during Fall of 2013 and scored internally. Elementary, early childhood and special education utilized the internal (3 level) scoring rubric, while secondary and K-12 scorers (University Supervisors) employed an existing "unit " (4-level (0-3)scoring rubric. The instruments are available upon request. Also, the full report with narrative is available upon request.

Table 1. Score by individual rubric: All Elementary, special education, and early childhood participants.

| $\underline{\text { Rubric }}$ | $\underline{\text { Task }}$ | $\underline{\text { Explanation }}{ }^{1}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ | $\underline{\underline{\text { Percent at }}} \mathbf{\underline { \text { Or Above 2 } }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Planning | Planning: Planning for Subject-Specific <br> Understandings | 32 | 2.22 | .71 | 84.4 |
| 2 | Planning | Planning: Planning to Support Varied <br> Student Learning Needs | 32 | 2.09 | .59 | 87.5 |
| 3 | Planning | Analyzing Teaching: Using Knowledge <br> of Students to Inform Teaching and <br> Learning | 32 | 2.00 | .57 | 84.4 |
| 4 | Planning | Academic Language: Identifying and <br> Supporting Language Demands | 31 | 2.16 | .69 | 83.9 |
| 5 | Planning | Planning: Planning Assessments to <br> Monitor and Support Student Learning | 31 | 1.87 | .62 | 74.2 |
| 6 | Instructing | Instruction: Learning Environment | 31 | 2.10 | .47 | 93.5 |
| 7 | Instructing | Instruction: Engaging Students in <br> Learning | 30 | 2.20 | .55 | 93.3 |
| 8 | Instructing | Instruction: Deepening Student Learning | 31 | 2.03 | .55 | 87.1 |
| 9 | Instructing | Instruction: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: <br> Using Representations | 31 | 2.06 | .63 | 83.9 |
| 10 | Instructing | Analyzing Teaching: Analyzing <br> Teaching Effectiveness | 30 | 1.90 | .48 | 83.9 |
| 11 | Assessing | Assessment: Analysis of Student <br> Learning | 29 | 2.10 | .62 | 86.2 |
| 12 | Assessing | Assessment: Providing Feedback to <br> Guide Learning | 30 | 1.87 | .57 | 76.7 |
| 13 | Assessing | Assessment: Student Use of Feedback | 29 | 2.00 | .65 | 79.3 |
| 14 | Assessing | Academic Language: Analyzing <br> Students' Language Use and Subject- <br> Specific Learning | 29 | 1.97 | .57 | 82.8 |
| 15 | Assessing | Analyzing Teaching: Using Assessment <br> to Inform Instruction | 30 | 1.97 | .67 | 76.7 |
|  | TOTAL | --- |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ The rubrics differ slightly by discipline; please check the Handbooks.
Table 2 shows domain scores by program. The full report, as noted above, is available upon request.

Table 2. Domain scores by program.

|  | All Candidates <br> $\mathrm{N} \sim 30$ |  | Early <br> Childhood <br> $\mathrm{N} \sim 6$ |  | Elementary <br> Literacy <br> $\mathrm{N} \sim 8$ |  | Elementary <br> Mathematics |  | Special <br> Education <br> $\mathrm{N}=9$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{\text { Domain }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ | $\underline{\text { Mean }}$ | $\underline{\text { SD }}$ |
| TOTAL (of 45) | 30.7 | 6.5 | 38.4 | 4.4 | 30.4 | 1.5 | 31.1 | 5.6 | 22.6 | 5.3 |
| Ability to Plan <br> Instruction (of 15) | 10.2 | 2.5 | 13.4 | 1.9 | 10.6 | 1.2 | 10.4 | 1.5 | 7.5 | 1.8 |
| Ability to Instruct/ <br> Deepening Student <br> Learning (of 15) | 10.2 | 2.1 | 12.2 | 1.9 | 10.0 | .0 | 10.8 | 2.4 | 8.4 | 1.8 |
| Ability to Assess <br> Instruction (of 15) | 10.0 | 2.6 | 13.2 | 1.7 | 9.8 | .5 | 9.9 | 2.3 | 6.8 | 1.9 |

Figure 1. Domain scores


Table 3.A. Score by Rubric and Program (secondary and K-12, Part 1).

|  |  | TOTAL Score (0-18) |  | Unit Rationale (0-3) |  | Unit Objectives (0-3) |  | Assessment (0-3) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD |
| All Students | 38 | 15.53 | 2.11 | 2.77 | . 424 | 2.65 | . 48 | 2.44 | . 50 |
| Social Studies | 18 | 14.88 | 2.33 | 2.69 | . 48 | 2.50 | . 52 | 2.31 | . 48 |
| Science | 3 | 15.67 | 2.08 | 2.67 | . 58 | 2.33 | . 58 | 3.00 | . 00 |
| Physical Education | 4 | 15.67 | 2.52 | 2.67 | . 58 | 3.00 | . 00 | 2.33 | . 58 |
| Communication/ <br> Arts/ Literature | 8 | 15.86 | 2.19 | 2.88 | . 35 | 2.75 | . 46 | 2.50 | . 53 |
| Teachers of English as a Second Language | 6 | 15.67 | 2.52 | 2.67 | . 52 | 2.83 | . 41 | 2.17 | . 41 |
| Mathematics Education | 3 | 16.67 | 1.53 | 3.00 | . 00 | 2.67 | . 58 | 3.00 | . 00 |
| World language | 3 | 17.0 | ---- | 3.00 | . 00 | 2.50 | . 71 | 3.00 | . 00 |
| Visual arts | 2 | 16.50 | . 71 | 3.00 | . 00 | 3.00 | . 00 | 2.00 | . 00 |

Table 3.B. Score by Rubric and Program (secondary and K-12, Part 2).

|  |  | Lesson Plans <br> $(0-3)$ |  | Resources and <br> References <br> $(0-3)$ |  | Unit <br> Assessment <br> $(0-3)$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{N}}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{S D}}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\text { SD }}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{S D}}}$ |
| All Students | 38 | 2.57 | .545 | 2.58 | .545 | 2.58 | .54 |
| Social Studies | 18 | 2.50 | .63 | 2.38 | .50 | 2.50 | .63 |
| Science | 3 | 2.33 | .58 | 2.33 | .58 | 3.00 | .00 |
| Physical <br> Education | 4 | 2.67 | .58 | 2.33 | .58 | 2.67 | .58 |
| Communication/ <br> Arts/ Literature | 8 | 2.62 | .52 | 2.57 | .53 | 2.75 | .46 |
| Teachers of <br> English as a <br> Second | 6 | 2.50 | .55 | 2.67 | .58 | 2.33 | .52 |
| Language | 3 | 2.67 | .58 | 2.67 | .58 | 2.67 | .58 |
| Mathematics <br> Education | 3 | 2.67 | .58 | 2.50 | .71 | 2.50 | .70 |
| World language | 2 | 3.00 | .00 | 3.00 | .00 | 2.50 | .71 |
| Visual arts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 4. Number and proportion passing by program

|  | N Passing <br> (Scores Greater <br> than 9.5) | 37 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | | Percent |
| :---: |
| (rassing |$|$| All Students | 15 | 93.8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Social Studies | 3 | 100.0 |
| Science | 3 | 100.0 |
| Physical Education | 7 | 100.0 |
| Communication/ Arts/ <br> Literature | 3 | 100.0 |
| Teachers of English as a <br> Second Language | 3 | 100.0 |
| Mathematics Education | 1 | 100.0 |
| World language | 2 | 100.0 |
| Visual arts |  |  |

## EXTERNAL RESULTS SPRING ‘ 14

## Explanation

The data for 82 candidates were available As of July 1, 2014. These data were pulled from the institutional Pearson site and analyzed. A full report is available upon request.

Table 1. Overall and domain scores (Spring, 2014).

| Area | $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ | $\frac{\text { Domain 1: }}{\text { Ability to Plan }}$ | $\frac{\text { Domain 2: }}{\frac{\text { Ability to }}{\text { Instruct }}}$ $\frac{(5-25)}{}$ | $\begin{gathered} \frac{\text { Domain 3: Ability to }}{\frac{\text { Assess Student }}{\text { Performance }}} \\ (5-25) \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{\text { Total Score }}{\underline{(15-75)}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underline{\text { State }} \\ \underline{\text { Average }} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Candidates (minus World Lang. [different scale]) | 78 | 14.50 | 14.14 | 13.01 | 41.65 |  |
| Elementary Literacy | $24^{1}$ | 12.62 | 13.65 | 12.18 | 38.36 | 41.6 |
| Elementary Mathematics | 22 | 15.34 | 15.52 | 13.36 | 44.07 | 44.0 |
| Commun Arts \& Lit | 3 | 16.00 | 14.67 | 14.67 | 45.33 | 45.8 |
| Social Studies | 5 | 14.20 | 11.50 | 11.10 | 36.80 | 44.1 |
| Mathematics | 6 | 16.17 | 14.33 | 15.50 | 46.00 | 44.8 |
| Science | 5 | 16.00 | 15.50 | 14.50 | 43.10 | 44.7 |
| Physical Education | 5 | 16.70 | 16.50 | 14.60 | 47.80 | 41.6 |
| Visual Arts | 3 | 16.67 | 14.67 | 13.00 | 44.33 | 44.9 |
| Music | 2 | 14.75 | 15.25 | 14.25 | 44.25 | Low N |
|  | -- | One fewer rubrics for WL (4-20) |  | One fewer rubrics for WL (4-20) | Two fewer rubrics for WL (13-65) | ----- |
| World Languages | 3 | 10.00 | 10.83 | 11.50 | 32.33 | 39.7 |

${ }^{1}$ Note that 25 candidates uploaded edTPAs by July 1, but one had limited data
The estimated pass rates based on a national study are provided in Table 2. The construction of this table is explained above in the discussion of the Spring 2013 pilot study.

Table 2. Estimated pass rates by area as of July 1 2014).

| Field ${ }^{1}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ | $\frac{\text { N Pass }}{\underline{(42)}}$ | $\frac{\% \text { Pass }}{\underline{(42)}}$ | $\frac{\text { N Pass }}{(39)}$ | $\frac{\% \text { Pass }}{\underline{(39)}}$ | $\frac{\text { N Pass }}{(37)}$ | $\frac{\% \text { Pass }}{(37)}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All SCSU | 78 | 52 | 67 | 56 | 72 | 75 | 96 |
| Elementary Literacy | 25 | 12 | 48 | 13 | 52 | 15 | 60 |
| Elementary Mathematics | 22 | 17 | 77 | 18 | 82 | 19 | 86 |
| Elementary | 47 | 29 | 62 | 31 | 66 | 34 | 72 |
| Secondary English Language Arts | 3 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 67 |
| Physical Education | 5 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 5 | 100 |
| Music | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 |
| Social Studies | 5 | 2 | 40 | 2 | 40 | 2 | 40 |
| Science | 5 | 3 | 60 | 4 | 80 | 5 | 80 |
| Visual Arts | 3 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 |
| Secondary-K-12 | 23 | 16 | 70 | 18 | 78 | 19 | 83 |

${ }^{1}$ No early childhood majors during spring semester; special education scored internally; no estimated cut score for World Language

Domain scores compared with Minnesota averages are shown below in Table 3 and Figure1.
Table 2. Scores by domain (all SCSU).

| Area/Task | $\frac{\text { Mean }{ }^{\mathbf{1}} \text { SCSU }}{\underline{(\mathbf{1 - 1 5})}}$ | $\frac{\text { Mean State }}{\underline{(\mathbf{1 - 1 5})}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Instruction | 14.5 | 15.2 |
| Instructing | 14.1 | 14.6 |
| Assessing Instruction | 13.7 | 13.7 |

${ }^{1}$ Variance estimates available upon request


