

# **West Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment (WVTPA) Results: BA in Elementary Education, BA in Early Childhood Education, BA in Secondary Education, MA in Special Education, and Master of Arts in Teaching**

## **Data Analysis**

The West Virginia Teacher Performance Assessment (WVTPA) serves as a culminating performance-based assessment completed during Residency II and provides evidence of candidates' ability to plan instruction, implement effective teaching practices, assess student learning, and reflect on professional practice. During the 2024–2025 academic year, a total of 140 candidates across Marshall University's teacher education programs completed the WVTPA, including candidates in Elementary Education (n=70), Special Education (n=11), Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) (n=13), Early Childhood Education (n=3), and Secondary Education content areas (n=43). Overall results indicate that candidates demonstrated consistent proficiency across the seven WVTPA tasks, with most rubric elements averaging between approximately 2.5 and 3.1 on the four-point scoring scale. These results suggest that candidates generally demonstrated developing to proficient levels of performance in planning, instruction, assessment, and reflective practice during their culminating clinical experience.

Within Task 1: Contextual Factors, candidates demonstrated the ability to analyze and interpret contextual influences on instruction. Across all majors, candidates scored highest in Implications of Community, School, and Family Factors (m=3.03), indicating that candidates were generally able to describe how broader environmental factors influence instruction and learning. Scores for Implications of Classroom Factors (m=2.83) and Implications of Individual Student Factors (m=2.85) were slightly lower but remained within a similar range, suggesting that candidates were able to identify classroom and individual student considerations when planning instruction, though further development in translating these factors into targeted instructional decisions may be beneficial. Results from Task 2: Standards and Goals indicate that candidates demonstrated an understanding of aligning instruction to academic standards and learning outcomes. Candidates performed strongest in Alignment of Standards and Learning Goals (m=2.96), suggesting that most candidates were able to establish clear connections between instructional goals and relevant standards. Scores for Learning Goals (m=2.80) and Anticipated Student Challenges (m=2.54) were somewhat lower, indicating that while candidates generally articulated appropriate learning objectives, additional emphasis on anticipating student misconceptions and learning barriers may further strengthen instructional planning.

Within Task 3: Assessment Plan, candidates demonstrated the ability to design assessments aligned with learning goals. Candidates scored highest on Alignment with Learning Goals (m=2.97), indicating that assessments were generally consistent with stated instructional outcomes. Scores for Assessment Criteria and Technical Soundness (m=2.56) and Balance of Assessments (m=2.58) were slightly lower, suggesting that candidates may benefit from continued development in designing technically sound assessment tools and incorporating a balanced combination of formative and summative assessment strategies. Results from Task 4: Design for Instruction reflect candidates' ability to develop instructional strategies and resources aligned with learning goals. Scores across this task ranged from Factors in Planning (m=2.80) to Learning Resources and Technology (m=2.68) and Instructional Strategies (m=2.76), indicating that candidates generally demonstrated competence in planning instruction and selecting appropriate strategies. The lowest score within this task occurred in Differentiated Instruction (m=2.54), suggesting that while candidates recognize the importance of adapting instruction to diverse learners, further emphasis on differentiation strategies may enhance candidates' ability to respond to varied student needs.

In Task 5: Implementation and Reflection on Daily Instruction, candidates demonstrated strengths related to classroom organization and instructional delivery. The highest score within this task was observed in Classroom Set-up and Organization (m=2.98), indicating that candidates generally established effective classroom environments. Candidates also demonstrated competence in Flexibility (m=2.81) and Questioning Strategies (m=2.75), reflecting the ability to adapt instruction and engage students during the learning process. Scores for Classroom and Behavior Management (m=2.71) and Student Engagement (m=2.76) further indicate that candidates were able to maintain productive learning environments during their clinical experiences.

The strongest performance across the WVTPA occurred within Task 6: Impact on Student Learning, where candidates demonstrated the ability to analyze student performance and interpret assessment data. Candidates achieved the highest average score on Clarity and Representation of Evidence (m=3.15), suggesting that candidates were generally able to present student learning data clearly and accurately. Scores for Interpretation of Data (m=2.94) and Evidence of Impact (m=2.74) further indicate that candidates were able to analyze student learning results and describe how instruction influenced student outcomes. Finally, results from Task 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation indicate that candidates demonstrated the ability to reflect on their instructional practice and identify areas for professional growth. Across all majors, candidates achieved consistent scores in Insights on Teaching and Learning (m=2.79), Professional Collaborative Practice (m=2.79), Implications for Future Teaching (m=2.79), and Professional Growth (m=2.86). These results suggest that candidates were generally able to evaluate their instructional decisions and identify strategies for continued professional development.

Overall, WVTPA results for the 2024–2025 academic year indicate that candidates across Marshall University’s teacher education programs demonstrated consistent proficiency across planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection, with the strongest performance observed in the analysis of student learning data and classroom implementation. Areas with slightly lower mean scores, particularly related to anticipating student challenges, assessment design, and differentiated instruction, represent opportunities for continued program improvement as candidates develop deeper expertise in instructional planning and assessment literacy.

Figure 1: WVTPA Evaluations by Degree Program

	<b>Elementary</b>	<b>Early Childhood</b>	<b>Special Education</b>	<b>MAT</b>
	n=70	n=3	n=11	n=13
1A Implications of Community, School, & Family Factors	2.67	2.79	3.36	3.46
1B Implications of the Classroom Factors	2.67	2.73	2.82	2.85
1C Implications of Individual Student Factors	2.67	2.79	3.27	2.69
2A Alignment of Standards and Learning Goals	2.67	2.94	3.00	3.08
2B Learning Goals	2.33	2.87	2.36	2.77
2C Anticipated Student Challenges	2.33	2.47	2.45	2.62
3A Alignment with Learning Goals	2.67	2.91	2.36	3.00
3B Assessment Criteria/ Technical Soundness	2.33	2.41	2.55	2.85
3C Balance of Assessments	2.67	2.51	2.36	2.69
4A Factors in Planning	2.33	2.69	2.73	2.92
4B Consultation	2.67	2.56	2.55	2.54
4C Instructional Strategies	2.33	2.69	2.45	3.00
4D Rationale for Instructional Strategies	2.33	2.63	2.45	2.85
4E Learning Resources/ Technology	2.33	2.63	2.64	2.77
4F Differentiated Instruction	2.67	2.50	2.55	2.31
5A: Classroom Set-up and Organization	3.00	2.79	2.82	3.08
5B: Classroom and Behavior Management	2.33	2.67	2.82	2.54
5C: Flexibility	2.33	2.67	2.82	2.85
5D: Questioning Strategies	3.00	2.77	2.45	3.00

5E: Student Engagement	3.33	3.03	2.36	2.77
6A: Clarity and Representation of Evidence	2.33	2.87	2.36	3.54
6B: Interpretation of Data	2.67	2.69	2.64	3.15
6C: Evidence of Impact	2.67	2.80	2.27	2.85
7A: Insights on Teaching and Learning	2.33	2.73	2.27	3.00
7B: Professional Collaborative Practice	2.33	2.76	2.82	2.69
7C: Implications for Future Teaching	2.00	2.84	2.64	3.00
7D: Professional Growth	2.33	2.79	2.73	2.92

Figure 2: WVTPA Evaluations by Secondary Education

	Secondary (All)	Art	English	Biology	Chemistry	Music	Math	Social Studies	Wellness
	n=43	n=4	n=15	n=2	n=1	n=3	n=1	n=15	n=2
1A Implications of Community, School, & Family Factors	3.23	2.75	2.73	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.47	3.50
1B Implications of the Classroom Factors	3.00	2.75	2.53	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.13	3.00
1C Implications of Individual Student Factors	2.91	2.75	2.33	2.50	3.00	2.67	2.00	3.27	3.00
2A Alignment of Standards and Learning Goals	2.98	3.00	2.60	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	3.00
2B Learning Goals	2.84	2.25	2.47	2.50	4.00	2.67	3.00	2.93	3.00
2C Anticipated Student Challenges	2.67	2.75	2.20	2.50	3.00	2.67	2.00	2.80	2.50
3A Alignment with Learning Goals	3.23	2.75	2.87	3.50	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.27	3.50
3B Assessment Criteria/ Technical Soundness	2.72	2.75	2.40	3.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	2.73	2.50
3C Balance of Assessments	2.70	2.75	2.40	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.00	2.60	2.50

	Secondary (All)	Art	English	Biology	Chemistry	Music	Math	Social Studies	Wellness
4A Factors in Planning	3.00	2.75	2.47	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.07	3.50
4B Consultation	2.77	2.50	2.60	3.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	2.67	3.00
4C Instructional Strategies	2.93	3.25	2.53	3.00	4.00	2.33	2.00	2.93	3.00
4D Rationale for Instructional Strategies	2.67	3.00	2.27	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.67	3.00
4E Learning Resources/ Technology	2.77	2.75	2.33	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.73	3.00
4F Differentiated Instruction	2.67	2.75	2.47	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.00	2.47	2.50
5A: Classroom Set-up and Organization	3.30	3.25	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.20	3.00
5B: Classroom and Behavior Management	2.84	2.50	2.60	3.00	3.00	2.33	3.00	2.73	3.50
5C: Flexibility	3.05	3.00	2.60	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.07	3.50
5D: Questioning Strategies	2.88	2.50	2.60	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.87	3.00
5E: Student Engagement	2.79	2.50	2.53	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.67	3.00
6A: Clarity and Representation of Evidence	3.49	3.25	3.33	4.00	4.00	2.33	3.00	3.47	3.50
6B: Interpretation of Data	3.07	3.25	2.67	4.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.93	3.50
6C: Evidence of Impact	2.93	3.00	2.53	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.93	3.00
7A: Insights on Teaching and Learning	2.86	3.00	2.47	3.00	3.00	2.67	3.00	2.80	3.00
7B: Professional Collaborative Practice	2.93	2.50	2.60	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.93	3.00
7C: Implications for Future Teaching	2.88	3.00	2.53	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.80	2.50
7D: Professional Growth	2.95	3.00	2.60	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.87	3.00

Figure 3: WVTPA Evaluations by All Majors

	<b>Mean</b>
	All Majors (n=140)
1A Implications of Community, School, & Family Factors	3.03
1B Implications of the Classroom Factors	2.83
1C Implications of Individual Student Factors	2.85
2A Alignment of Standards and Learning Goals	2.96
2B Learning Goals	2.80
2C Anticipated Student Challenges	2.54
3A Alignment with Learning Goals	2.97
3B Assessment Criteria/ Technical Soundness	2.56
3C Balance of Assessments	2.58
4A Factors in Planning	2.80
4B Consultation	2.62
4C Instructional Strategies	2.76
4D Rationale for Instructional Strategies	2.64
4E Learning Resources/ Technology	2.68
4F Differentiated Instruction	2.54
5A: Classroom Set-up and Organization	2.98
5B: Classroom and Behavior Management	2.71
5C: Flexibility	2.81
5D: Questioning Strategies	2.75
5E: Student Engagement	2.76
6A: Clarity and Representation of Evidence	3.15
6B: Interpretation of Data	2.94
6C: Evidence of Impact	2.74
7A: Insights on Teaching and Learning	2.79
7B: Professional Collaborative Practice	2.79
7C: Implications for Future Teaching	2.79
7D: Professional Growth	2.86