

### **Measure 3: Candidate Competency at Completion (Initial & Advanced)**

The EPP uses the following assessments to measure candidate competency at completion:

#### *Initial*

- Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI)
- edTPA Performance Assessment

#### *Advanced: MSED*

- MSED Literacy & Language Arts Internship Instrument
- MSED Special Education Internship Instrument

#### *Advanced: 092*

- Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT)

Note that The Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (STEI) is displayed in Table 1.

### 2024-2025 (edTPA)

Consistent with state college and career readiness content standards, and the InTASC Standards, edTPA assesses teaching behaviors that focus on student learning. edTPA includes two primary components: 1) Teaching-related performance tasks embedded in clinical practice that focus on planning, instruction, assessment, academic language, and analysis of teaching; and 2) a 3-to-5-day documented learning segment. The design of edTPA is based on theory and research that identifies constructs associated with effective teaching. SCALE's Review of Research on Teacher Education provides a research foundation for the role of assessment in teacher education, for the common edTPA architecture, and for each of the fifteen shared rubric constructs. In AY 2024-2025 the edTPA was locally scored using SCALE's local evaluation rubric as Connecticut no longer requires the edTPA for certification. For the SCALE local evaluation rubric the following performance ratings are given: Emerging Performance (1 point), Proficient Performance (2 points), and Advanced Performance (3 points). A score of 2 points or higher indicates a passing score.

**Table 12. Summary: Practice edTPA Rubric Score Distribution for Elementary, Secondary Programs, Health Education Programs Fall 2024**

**15 Rubric Handbook Summary**

	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mean by Task		
			P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	P	I	A
All 15-Rubric Handbooks	18	36.6	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.4	12.6	11.8	12.3
Secondary English-Language Arts	4	38.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.0	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.5	12.5	12.0	13.5
Secondary Mathematics	1	40.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	14.0	14.0	12.0
Secondary History/Social Studies	4	35.8	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.8	2.3	2.3	2.5	12.0	11.8	12.0
MAT Secondary English-Language Arts	2	26.5	1.5	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	7.5	9.0	10.0
MAT Secondary History/Social Studies	4	42.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	14.5	14.5	14.3
Health Education	3	33.0*	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	---	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	14.0	9.0*	10.0

*Note.* These items were-rated on a 3-point scale: 1 = Emerging Performance, 2 = Proficient Performance, and 3 = Advanced Performance; a passing score is 2.

**18 Rubric Summary**

	N	Total Score Mean	Planning					Instruction					Assessment					Mathematics			Mean by Task				
			P01	P02	P03	P04	P05	I06	I07	I08	I09	I10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	M16	M17	M18	P	I	A		
All 18-Rubric Handbooks	14	36.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4	14	36.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

### 13 Rubric Summary

	N	Total Score Mean	Planning				Instruction					Assessment				Mean by Task		
			P01	P02	P03	P04	I05	I06	I07	I08	I09	A10	A11	A12	A13	P	I	A
<b>Secondary Education Spanish (World Language)</b>	1	22.3	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.3	2.7	1.7	1.3	1.7	1.7	2.3	1.3	1.3	2.3	6.0	9.0	7.3

*Note.* These items were-rated on a 3-point scale: 1 = Emerging Performance, 2 = Proficient Performance, and 3 = Advanced Performance; a passing score is 2.

### Analysis of edTPA Portfolio Scores

*The edTPA Portfolio is designed to prepare our candidates for the workplace. All candidates are scored on 15 competencies which are aligned with the edTPA Rubrics, with the exception of Spanish (13 competencies aligned with edTPA) and Elementary Education which has an additional 3 competencies (total 18).*

### *Overall Performance*

The overall mean in this assessment for 15-Rubric Handbooks was 36, 22 for 13-Rubric Handbooks, and for 18-Rubric Handbooks it was 36.

### *Program-by-Program Analysis*

Elementary Education: Literacy with Mathematics Task 4 (18-Rubric)

---

N = 14 (Rubrics 5–18); N = 15 (Rubrics 1–4) Total Score Mean=36

All rubric means are 2.0 (Proficient) with a standard deviation of 0.0 across all 18 rubrics. All task area means — Planning, Instruction, Assessment, and Mathematics — are also scored 2.0. All candidates passed on every rubric.

## Secondary Education Programs — Combined (15-Rubric Handbook)

---

Overall N = 18 | Total Score Mean = 36.6 |

Across all 15-rubric programs combined, candidates averaged well above passing. All three task area means were above 2.0. However, results vary at the program level.

### *Undergraduate Programs*

Secondary English-Language Arts (N=4 | Mean: 38.5)

Assessment averaged 13.5 — the highest assessment task mean among undergraduate programs — with Rubric A12 reaching 3.0 (Advanced). Instruction and Planning were also proficient. One relative growth area: Rubric I06 (Learning Environment) averaged 2.0, the minimum passing threshold.

Secondary Mathematics (N=1 | Mean: 40.0)

Most rubrics scored 3.0 (Advanced), with Rubrics P03, I10, A11, A13, and A15 at 2.0. Note: This is a single candidate result; conclusions should be interpreted cautiously and tracked longitudinally.

Secondary History/Social Studies (N=4 | Mean: 35.8)

All rubric means are at 2.0 or above. Rubrics P02 (Knowledge of Students/Context) and A12 were slightly higher at 2.8. No rubric fell below passing.

Health Education (N=3 | Mean: 33.0\*)

Performing at or above passing on all available rubrics, with Planning averaging 14.0 — among the strongest planning task means in the dataset. \*Note: Rubric 6 (Learning Environment) data was missing from the source report; total score and Instruction mean reflect only available rubrics.

### *MAT Programs*

MAT Secondary History/Social Studies (N=4 | Mean: 42.3)

Nearly all rubric means are at or above 2.8, with multiple rubrics at 3.0 (Advanced) across Planning, Instruction, and Assessment. This cohort demonstrates strong, consistent advanced performance.

MAT Secondary English-Language Arts (N=2 | Mean: 26.5)

While Instruction (9.0) and Assessment (10.0) task means are passing, the Planning task mean is only 7.5 — driven by three rubric scores below passing:

- P01 – Planning for Content Understandings: 1.5
- P03 – Planning for Academic Language: 1.0
- P04 – Planning for Assessment: 1.0

With only two candidates, the sample is small and needs further monitoring across cohorts.

MAT Secondary Education Spanish — World Language (13-Rubric Handbook)

---

N = 1 | Total Score Mean = 22.3

This is a single candidate result, so generalizations are limited. The candidate passed overall, but several rubrics fell below the 2.0 passing threshold:

- P01 – Planning for Content Understandings: 1.3
- P04 – Planning for Language Development: 1.3
- I07 – Monitoring Student Learning: 1.3
- A11 – Analysis of Student Learning: 1.3
- A12 – Providing Feedback to Students: 1.3

Strongest areas were Rubric I05 (Learning Environment, 2.7) and Rubrics A10/A13 (both 2.3). The sample is small consisting of one candidate and therefore needs further monitoring across cohorts.

#### *Cross-Program Patterns and Trends*

- Elementary Education, undergraduate Secondary Education, and MAT Social Studies programs demonstrate consistent performances at proficient or higher scores.
- Instruction Task 2 remains the highest scored component across all initial programs with Planning the area for improvement, particularly for academic language (P03/P04) and assessment.
- MAT Secondary Education English and MAT Secondary Spanish were the lowest performing programs and need further monitoring as results might be due to small sample size.

Table 13. CAEP Advanced Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2025

CAEP Advanced MSSED Literacy and Language Arts Program							
Summer 2025 (n=6)							
Practicum Evaluation 2025							
Standard Elements Reading/Literacy Specialist	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary	N/A	Mean	Standard Deviation
2.2 Candidates design, select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based instructional approaches, using both informational and narrative texts, to meet the literacy needs of whole class and groups of students in the academic disciplines and other subject areas, and when learning to read, write, listen, speak, view, or visually represent.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
2.3 Candidates select, adapt, teach, and evaluate evidence-based, supplemental, and intervention approaches and programs; such instruction is explicit, intense, and provides adequate scaffolding to meet the literacy needs of individual and small groups of students, especially those who experience difficulty with reading and writing.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
4.1 Candidates demonstrate knowledge of foundational theories about diverse learners, equity, and culturally responsive instruction.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00

4.2 Candidates demonstrate understanding of themselves and others as cultural beings through their pedagogy and interactions with individuals both within and outside of the school community.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
5.1 Candidates, in consultation with families and colleagues, meet the developmental needs of all learners (e.g., English learners, those with difficulties learning to read, the gifted), taking into consideration physical, social, emotional, cultural, and intellectual factors.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
5.2 Candidates collaborate with school personnel and provide opportunities for student choice and engagement with a variety of print and digital materials to engage and motivate all learners.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
5.3 Candidates integrate digital technologies into their literacy instruction in appropriate, safe, and effective ways and assist colleagues in these efforts.	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	0.37
5.4 Candidates facilitate efforts to foster a positive climate that support the physical and social literacy-rich learning environment, including knowledge of routines, grouping structures, and social interactions.	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
6.1 Candidates demonstrate the ability to reflect on their professional practices, belong	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00

to professional organizations, and are critical consumers of research, policy, and practice.							
<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>% Below Standard</b>	<b>0.00%</b>						
<b>% Developing</b>	<b>0%</b>						
<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>98%</b>						
<b>% Exemplary</b>	<b>1.85%</b>						
<b>Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort</b>	<b>3.02</b>						
<b>MSED Literacy and Language Arts Program Practicum Evaluation (2025) 100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)</b>							

Note. All items were rated on a 4-point scale including 1 = *Below Standard*, 2 = *Developing* ability to meet the standard, 3 = *Proficient* at fully meeting the standard, and 4 = *Exemplary* performance by going beyond the expectations for the standard

Table 14. CAEP Advanced MSED Special Education Program Practicum Evaluation: Summer 2025

<b>MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment</b>							
<b>Rubric Element</b>	<b>Summer 2025 (n=13)</b>						
	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
CEC 2.1 Beginning special education professionals through collaboration with general educators and other colleagues create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning	0	0	13	0	0	3.0	0.00

environments to engage individuals with exceptionalities in meaningful learning activities and social interactions. CEC 2024: CEC 6.1.							
CEC 2.2 Beginning special education professionals use motivational and instructional interventions to teach individuals with exceptionalities how to adapt to different environments. CEC 2024: CEC 6.2.	0	0	11	2	0	3.15	0.36
CEC 2.3 Beginning special education professionals know how to intervene safely and appropriately with individuals with exceptionalities in crisis. CEC 2024: CEC 6.3.	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 3.2 Beginning special education professionals understand and use general and specialized content knowledge for teaching across curricular content areas to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities. CEC 2024: CEC 3.2.	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 3.3 Beginning special education professionals modify general and specialized curricula to make them accessible to individuals with exceptionalities. CEC 2024: CEC 3.2.	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00

<p>CEC 4.3 Beginning special education professionals in collaboration with colleagues and families use multiple types of assessment information in making decisions about individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>CEC 2024: CEC 4.1.</p>	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
<p>CEC 4.4 Beginning special education professionals engage individuals with exceptionalities to work toward quality learning and performance and provide feedback to guide them</p> <p>CEC 2024: CEC 4.0</p>	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
<p>CEC 5.0 Beginning special education professionals select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance learning of individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>CEC 2024: CEC 5.0</p>	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
<p>CEC 5.1 Beginning special education professionals consider individual abilities, interests, learning environments, and cultural and linguistic factors in the selection, development, and adaptation of learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.</p> <p>CEC 2024: CEC 5.1.</p>	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
<p>CEC 5.2 Beginning special education professionals use technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with exceptionalities.</p>	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00

CEC 2024: CEC 4.3							
CEC 5.5 Beginning special education professionals develop and implement a variety of education and transition plans for individuals with exceptionalities across a wide range of settings and different learning experiences in collaboration with individuals, families, and teams. CEC 2024: CEC 7.0	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 5.7 Beginning special education professionals teach cross-disciplinary knowledge and skills such as critical thinking and problem solving to individuals with exceptionalities. CEC 2024: CEC 5.0	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
CEC 7.1 Beginning special education professionals use the theory and elements of effective collaboration. CEC 2024: CEC 7.1.	0	0	12	1	0	3.08	0.27
CEC 7.2 Beginning special education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues. CEC 2024: CEC 7.2.	0	0	13	0	0	3.00	0.00
<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>% Below Standard</b>	<b>0%</b>						
<b>% Developing</b>	<b>0.0%</b>						

<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>98%</b>						
<b>% Exemplary</b>	<b>2%</b>						
<b>Overall Mean by Cohort</b>	<b>3.0</b>						
<b>MSED in Special Education Practicum Assessment (Summer 2025) 100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)</b>							

Note. All items were rated on a 4-point scale including 1 = *Below Standard*, 2 = *Developing* ability to meet the standard, 3 = *Proficient* at fully meeting the standard, and 4 = *Exemplary* performance by going beyond the expectations for the standard

Table 15. CAEP Advanced 092 Certification in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Practicum Evaluation: Spring 2025

<b>CAEP Advanced 092 Certification in Intermediate Administration and Supervision Program ED 665 Supervision of Teaching and Learning Assessment (University Supervisor) 2025</b>							
<b>Standard Elements NELP</b>	<b>Spring 2025 (n=6)</b>						
	<b>Below Standard</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
1.3 Promotion and continual and sustainable school improvement (Professional Skills).	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	0.37
2.1 Sustainment of a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	0.00

2.3 Development and supervision of the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff (Professional Skills)	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	0.50
4.1 Collaboration with faculty and community members (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	0.00
5.1 Ensuring that schools are accountable for every student's academic and social success (Professional Skills).	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	0.00
5.3 Safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity (Professional Knowledge).	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	0.00
<b>Frequencies</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>% Below Standard</b>	<b>0.00%</b>						
<b>% Developing</b>	<b>0.00%</b>						
<b>% Proficient</b>	<b>11%</b>						
<b>% Exemplary</b>	<b>89%</b>						
<b>Overall Mentor Mean by Cohort</b>	<b>3.89</b>						
<b>092 Certificate in Administration and Supervision (2025) 100% Passing (Developing, Proficient, and Exemplary)</b>							

*Note.* All items were rated on a 4-point scale including 1 = *Below Standard*, 2 = *Developing* ability to meet the standard, 3 = *Proficient* at fully meeting the standard, and 4 = *Exemplary* performance by going beyond the expectations for the standard

## Analysis (Strengths/Areas for Improvement) for the Advanced Programs based on the Practicum Scores

### 1. High Overall Pass Rate Across Advanced Programs

The MSed Literacy and Language Arts cohort and the Special Education cohorts and 092 Certificate in Administration and Supervision achieved a 100% pass rate for the 2025 practicum evaluation. No candidates were rated Below Standard or Developing, demonstrating the programs' effectiveness in preparing candidates for competent field-based practice.

### 2. Consistent Proficiency Across Core Standards

Across all assessed CAEP/CEC standard elements, most candidates were rated at the Proficient level. Specifically:

- Literacy & Language Arts (n=6): All 6 candidates scored Proficient or above on every single standard element, including evidence-based instructional design (2.2), intervention approaches (2.3), culturally responsive instruction (4.1, 4.2), collaborative learner support (5.1, 5.2), digital technology integration (5.3), learning environment facilitation (5.4), and professional practice (6.1).
- Special Education (n=13): All 13 candidates achieved Proficient or Exemplary on all CEC standard elements, spanning inclusive environment creation (CEC 2.1), behavioral interventions (CEC 2.2), crisis intervention (CEC 2.3), content knowledge application (CEC 3.2, 3.3), assessment use (CEC 4.3, 4.4), instructional strategy repertoire (CEC 5.0, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.7), and collaboration (CEC 7.1, 7.2).
- 092 Program (n=6): All 6 candidates achieved Proficient or Exemplary on all NELP standard elements with 89% scoring Exemplary.

### 3. Strong Foundation in Culturally Responsive and Equitable Practice

All programs show consistent candidate proficiency in standards related to equity, diversity, and culturally responsive instruction. Literacy candidates scored uniformly at 3.00 on Standards 4.1 (foundational theories about diverse learners and equity) and 4.2 (understanding of cultural identity in pedagogy). Special Education candidates likewise met or exceeded expectations on inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments (CEC 2.1). This indicates that both programs have successfully embedded equity-centered frameworks into their curriculum and field experiences. The 092 program candidates on NELP 5.3, safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity, achieved a perfect score of 4.00 with all six candidates rated Exemplary.

#### 4. Solid Grasp of Evidence-Based Instructional Practice

Candidates in both programs demonstrated proficiency in applying evidence-based instructional strategies. Literacy candidates met expectations in designing, selecting, and evaluating evidence-based instructional approaches for diverse texts and learner groups (Standard 2.2), as well as in supplemental and intervention instruction (Standard 2.3). Special Education candidates showed consistent mastery in selecting and adapting evidence-based strategies for individuals with exceptionalities (CEC 5.0, 5.1). This strength suggests the program's coursework and field placements are well-aligned with evidence-based practice expectations.

#### 5. Emergent Exemplary Performance in Targeted Areas

While most candidates scored at the Proficient level, a small number achieved the Exemplary rating, signaling genuine excellence in select competencies:

- Standard 5.3 (Digital Technology Integration — Literacy): 1 out of 6 candidates (16.7%) reached Exemplary, yielding a mean of 3.17 — the highest mean among all Literacy standards assessed.
- CEC 2.2 (Motivational and Instructional Interventions — Special Education): 2 out of 13 candidates (15.4%) earned Exemplary, with a mean of 3.15.
- CEC 7.1 (Theory and Elements of Effective Collaboration — Special Education): 1 candidate (7.7%) earned Exemplary, with a mean of 3.08.

These pockets of exemplary performance suggest that the programs are cultivating high-achieving candidates and that conditions exist for broader excellence in these competencies.

#### 6. Effective Preparation for Professional and Collaborative Roles

Literacy candidates consistently met expectations on Standard 6.1 (professional reflection, organizational membership, and critical research consumption), and Special Education candidates demonstrated strong collaborative skills (CEC 7.1, 7.2). This reflects both programs' emphasis on professional identity development and collegial practice, which are essential for advanced-level educators in specialist and leadership roles. The 092 program candidates on NELP 4.1 (collaboration with faculty and community) also achieved a perfect 4.00, affirming that candidates are entering leadership roles with strong partnership and stakeholder engagement skills. Combined with the school culture standard, this indicates a cohort well-prepared for the relational dimensions of school leadership.

#### 7. Growth Areas

Small cohort sizes across programs limit generalizability for program improvements. However, digital technology integration (ILA5.3) was the only Literacy standard with any performance variance — 5 Proficient, 1 Exemplary,  $SD = 0.37$ . While this is a

positive outlier, it also signals that this competency is an area of differential candidate readiness. As literacy instruction increasingly relies on digital platforms and multimodal text environments, ensuring all candidates can both use and model digital integration is critical.