**Danielson Framework for Teaching Clinical Placement Data Report-Fall 2025**

**Table of Contents**

## Section I: Danielson Framework and Program Counts

The following six tables contain the Danielson Framework used to assess teacher candidates during their clinical placements. An additional table is also provided that highlights the number of teacher candidates assessed by program and gender.

Table 1. Framework 1: Clarity & Accuracy

| | **CONSIDERATIONS** | | **INDICATORS** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • In what ways do the learning outcomes challenge students to think critically? (1c)<br>• In what ways are the learning outcomes reflective of the standards of the discipline and appropriate to the students' levels of knowledge and skill? (1a/1c)<br>• What examples do you see of congruence between the activities and instructional outcomes? (1c/1e)<br>• What might be some ways to adapt lessons to meet the needs of all students? (1b/1d/1e)<br>• How does teachers' deep understanding of the content support intellectual work by students during lessons? (1a/1e) | | • Clarity of instructional outcomes, reflecting not only knowledge of content and of CCSS or other high-level standards and practices, but also suitability for the students in the class (1b/1c)<br>• Instructional outcomes reflecting the range of important types of content represented in the discipline: for example, factual and procedural knowledge, skills of reasoning and group work, analysis (1a/1c))<br>• Planned resources and activities aligned to the instructional purpose (1d/1e)<br>• Expectations for learning, accuracy of content, clarity of explanations, and use of academic language (3a)<br>• Activities and assignments, questions and student discussion, all aligned to the instructional purpose (3b/3c) | |
| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
| | ***The instructional purpose and learning tasks are unclear; the information presented is inaccurate or inappropriate and unsuitable for the students.*** | ***The instructional purpose and learning tasks are somewhat clear; the information presented is primarily accurate and partially appropriate to the students.*** | ***The instructional purpose and learning tasks are clear; the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.*** | ***The purpose and learning tasks of the lesson are very clear, and the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.*** |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a)<br>InTASC 4 | The teacher's plans indicate weak content knowledge. (1a) | The teacher's plans reflect rudimentary understanding of the discipline. (1a) | The teacher can identify important concepts of the discipline and their relationships to one another. (1a) | The teacher cites intra- and interdisciplinary content relationships. (1a) |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)<br>InTASC 1; InSTASC 2; | The teacher does not try to ascertain varied skill and ability levels among students in the class to use in planning. (1b) | The teacher is aware that there are different skill and ability levels in the class but does not use this information in planning. (1b) | The teacher has identified broad skill groups of students within the class and uses this information in planning. (1b) | The teacher knows the proficiency level of each student in the class and incorporated this understanding into plans. (1b) |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)<br>InTASC 1; InSTASC 2; InTASC 4 | Learning outcomes, as stated by the teacher, are poorly aligned to the learning standards and either lack clarity or are stated as activities. They are unsuitable for most students in the class. (1a/1b/1c) | Leaning outcomes, as stated by the teacher, are a combination of outcomes and activities or lack clarity; they are only partially aligned to the learning standards. They are unsuitable for some students in the class. (1a/1b/1c) | Learning outcomes, as stated by the teacher, are written in the form of student learning and are aligned to the learning standards. They are suitable for the groups of students in the class. (1a/1b/1c) | Learning outcomes are written in the form of student learning and are aligned to learning standards. They allow for all students in the class to be sufficiently challenged. (1a/1b/1c) |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)<br>InTASC 1; InTASC 5; InTASC 8 | Planned learning tasks, materials, and question sequences are3 of low cognitive challenge and unrelated to the lesson's stated purpose or are no suitable for many students. (1d/1e; 3a/3b) | Planned learning tasks, materials, and question sequences are of moderate cognitive challenge or are only partially related to the lesson's stated purpose, or both. They are unsuitable for some students. (1d/1e; 3a/3b) | Planned learning tasks, materials, and question sequences support the lesson's purpose; they are well sequenced, provide cognitive challenge, and are suitable for most students in the class. (1d/1e; 3a/3b) | Planned learning tasks and materials permit advanced students to extend the lesson's purpose and provide students who need it most with more time, attention, and supports. (1d/1e; 3a/3b) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ***The instructional purpose and learning tasks are unclear; the information presented is inaccurate or inappropriate and unsuitable for the students.*** | ***The instructional purpose and learning tasks are somewhat clear; the information presented is primarily accurate and partially appropriate to the students.*** | ***The instructional purpose and learning tasks are clear; the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.*** | ***The purpose and learning tasks of the lesson are very clear, and the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.*** |
| Communicating with Students (3a)<br>InTASC 5 | At no time during the lesson does the teacher convey to the students what they will be learning. (3a) | The teacher refers in passing to what the students will be learning, or it is written on the board with no elaboration or explanation. (3a) | The teacher states clearly, at some point during the lesson, what the students are learning. (3a) | The teacher states clearly, at some point during the lesson, what the students are learning, and invites students to connect this learning to the broader outcomes of the curriculum. (3a) |
| Communicating with Students (3a)<br>InTASC 5 | The teacher makes a serious error of content or academic language that will affect student's understanding of the lesson. (3a) | The teacher makes no serious content errors but may possibly make minor ones, including imprecise use of academic language. (3a) | The teacher makes no content errors and models the correct use of academic language. (3a) | The teacher explains the content clearly, using metaphors and analogies or inviting student predications to connect content to real life experiences. (3a) |
| Communicating with Students: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3a/3b)<br>InTASC 5; InTASC 8 | Students indicate through body language or verbal language that they don't understand the content being presented. (3a/3b) | The teacher's explanation of the content consists of a monologue, with minimal participation or intellectual engagement by students. (3a/3b) | The teacher's explanation of content is clear and invites student participation and thinking. (3a/3b) | The teacher's carefully crafted questions enable students to extend the lesson objectives for deeper understanding. (3a/3b) |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c)<br>InTASC 1; InSTAC 3; InTASC 8 | Students appear confused about the learning task. (3b/3c) | The teacher finds it necessary to clarify the learning task multiple times so that students can complete it. (3b/3c) | Students engage with the learning task, indicating that they understand what they are to do; if modeling the process to be followed in the task is appropriate, the teacher does so. (3b/3c) | Students have the opportunity for reflection and closure on the content being learned, especially its relation to the unit or broader purposes. (3b/3c) |

Table 2. Framework 2: Learning Environment

| | **CONSIDERATIONS** | | **INDICATORS** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • In what ways do classroom interactions demonstrate genuine caring and a safe, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environment? (2a)<br>• How do teachers convey high expectations for student learning and encourage hard work and perseverance? (2b)<br>• In what ways do teachers create classrooms that are safe for risk taking? (2b)<br>• How do students take ownership of their work and demonstrate a commitment to mastering challenging content? (2b)<br>• How do teachers establish environments that recognize and value students' identities as well as their social, emotional, and intellectual needs? (2a/2b) | | • Language of caring and respect between teacher and students and among students, and teacher's awareness of students' interests in and beyond school (2a)<br>• High levels of cognitive energy (2b)<br>• A safe environment for student risk taking (2b)<br>• High expectations for students' capabilities for learning (2b)<br>• Productive student engagement is small group work (2c)<br>• Students persevere, even in the face of challenges (2b) | |
| | **Level 1: Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2: Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3: Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
| | ***Interactions between teacher and students and among students are characterized by negativity, lack of support, low expectations, and low levels of student perseverance.*** | ***Interactions between teacher and students and among students are a mix of high and low support, moderate expectations, and modes levels of student perseverance.*** | ***The classroom is characterized by interactions that are both supportive and challenging, with student perseverance in challenging work.*** | ***Classroom interactions indicate high levels of caring and respect, student assumption of responsibility for the culture of civility, mutual support for work of high quality, and perseverance in achieving that quality.*** |
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)<br>InSTAC 3 | The teacher uses disrespectful talk toward students and does not address disrespectful interactions among students. (2a) | The quality of interactions between teacher and students, or among students, is uneven, with occasional disrespect; the teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior among students, with uneven results. (2a) | Talk between teacher and students and among students is uniformly respectful, with little to no intervention needed by the teacher to correct disrespectful talk among students. (2a) | Talk between teacher and students and among students is uniformly respectful, with no intervention needed by the teacher to correct disrespectful talk among students. (2a) |
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)<br>InSTAC 3 | The teacher displays no familiarity with, or caring about, individual students' interests or personalities. (2a) | The teacher attempts to make connections with individual students, but student reactions indicate that the efforts are only partially successful. (2a) | The teacher makes connections with individual students. (2a) | The teacher demonstrates knowledge and caring about the lives of students beyond school. (2a) |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | The teacher conveys, to at least some students, that the work is too challenging for them. (2b) | The teacher conveys only modest learning expectations for most students. (2b) | The teacher has high expectations for most students and demonstrates high regard for students' abilities. (2b) | Students' questions, comments, and writing indicate high expectations for self and desire for deep understanding of the content. (2b) |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | Students exhibit little or no pride in their work; they abandon their efforts in the face of difficulty. (2b) | The teacher encourages students to persevere with challenging work; but only some do so, or they do so in a desultory manner. (2b) | Student work and conduct during a lesson indicate a commitment to high quality; students persevere in understanding challenging content. (2b) | Students engage in productive struggle, take initiative to improve the quality of their work, and look for ways to extend their learning. (2b) |

| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ***Interactions between teacher and students and among students are characterized by negativity, lack of support, low expectations, and low levels of student perseverance.*** | ***Interactions between teacher and students and among students are a mix of high and low support, moderate expectations, and modes levels of student perseverance.*** | ***The classroom is characterized by interactions that are both supportive and challenging, with student perseverance in challenging work.*** | ***Classroom interactions indicate high levels of caring and respect, student assumption of responsibility for the culture of civility, mutual support for work of high quality, and perseverance in achieving that quality.*** |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | Students participate in only routine responses and tasks that require only low levels of risk taking. (2b) | Few students offer their ideas on questions that seem to entail intellectual risk. (2b) | Students participate willingly and appear confident in offering their ideas in front of classmates. (2b) | Students volunteer ideas, even when these ideas might seem to be unpopular among classmates. (2b) |
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)<br>InSTAC 3 | Students receive no support from their classmates. (2a) | Students offer assistance to classmates in a supportive manner when prompted by the teacher. (2a) | Students spontaneously offer assistance to classmates in a supportive manner. (2a) | Students recognize and express appreciation for the efforts of their classmates. (2a) |
| Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) | Students show no signs of active collaboration. (2c) | Group work is sometimes collaborative, sometimes not. (2c) | Students are productively engaged collaboratively with a partner or during small group work. (2c) | Group work is productive; groups take ownership of, and pride in, the products of their work. All members contribute to the group's work. (2c) |

Table 3. Framework 3: Classroom Management

| | CONSIDERATIONS | | INDICATORS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • In what ways are classrooms well run and organized? (2c)<br>• How might the classroom routines and procedures be clearer or carried out more efficiently to prevent loss of instructional time? (2c)<br>• How might students themselves take a more active role in ensuring a productive classroom? (2c)<br>• In what ways do students not only understand and comply with standards of conduct but also play an active part in setting the tone for maintaining those standards? (2d)<br>• How does the physical environment in classrooms support learning and engagement? (2e) | | • Efficient procedures for non-instructional activities: taking roll, distributing and collecting materials, making transitions, etc. (2c)<br>• Clear guidelines for student work when it is unsupervised, e.g., in small groups (2c)<br>• Evidence of clear standards of conduct, understood by the students, monitored by the teacher, corrected successfully (when Necessary) by teacher or students, or both (2d)<br>• Physical environment supportive of learning activities (2e)<br>• Productive contribution to the class by volunteers and paraprofessionals (2c) | |
| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
| | ***The classroom environment is disorganized and chaotic.*** | ***The classroom is at times disorganized.*** | ***The classroom functions smoothly and efficiently.*** | ***The classroom functions seamlessly.*** |
| Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) | Classroom procedures for transitions and other non-instructional duties are either absent or ineffective, resulting in the loss of significant instructional time. (2c) | Procedures for transitions, materials, and other non-instructional duties seem to have been established, but their operation is rough or inconsistent, resulting in some loss of instructional time. (2c) | Effective and efficient procedures have been established for non-instructional activities, such as distribution and collection of materials and supplies and transitions to other grouping patterns, resulting in minimal to no loss of instructional time. Students carry out procedures with little or no teacher direction. (2c) | Students take the initiative with their classmates to ensure ono-instructional routines run smoothly; productive classroom norms are well established, and students as well as the teacher act to maintain them. (2c) |
| Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) | Small groups not working with the teacher are not involved in productive work. (2c) | Small groups are only intermittently engaged while not working directly with the teacher. (2c) | All students are productively engaged during small-group work, indicating established procedures. (2c) | Students ensure productive small-group work by, for example, assigning roles. (2c) |
| Managing Student Behavior (2d) | No standards of conduct appear to have been established, the teacher does not monitor student behavior, or, when noticing student misbehavior, appears helpless to do anything about it. (2d) | Standards of conduct appear to have been set, but the teacher's attempts to maintain order are uneven, or the teacher's response to student misbehavior is inconsistent. (2d) | The teacher regularly monitors student behavior; student behavior is generally appropriate when needed, the teacher's response to misbehavior is effective. (2d) | The teacher's monitoring of student behavior is seamless, and preventative accomplished through nonverbal means; student behavior is entirely appropriate. (2d) |
| Managing Student Behavior (2e) | There are physical hazards in the classroom, endangering student safety. (2e) | The physical environment is not an impediment to learning but does not enhance it. (2e) | The classroom is arranged to support the instructional goals and learning activities. (2e) | Students take the initiative to contribute to and adjust the physical environment to support learning for all students. (2e) |

| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ***The classroom environment is disorganized and chaotic.*** | ***The classroom is at times disorganized.*** | ***The classroom functions smoothly and efficiently.*** | ***The classroom functions seamlessly.*** |
| Managing Student Behavior (2c) | Volunteers and paraprofessionals have no defined role and may be idle much of the time. (2c) | Volunteers and paraprofessionals participate but require frequent supervision, or their work is not well integrated with classroom activities. (2c) | Volunteers and paraprofessionals work with minimal supervision in sync with the classroom goals. (2c) | Volunteers and paraprofessionals understand their roles and responsibilities and take the initiative in their work in the class. (2c) |

Table 4. Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement

| | **CONSIDERATIONS** | | **INDICATORS** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • How do the structure and flow of lessons support the development of ideas and opportunities for students to engage in thoughtful discussion and reflection? (1e)<br>• In what ways do instructional activities and questions promote intellectual engagement and energy in classrooms? (3b/3c)<br>• In what ways are students asked to explain their thinking, construct arguments, and question the thinking of others? (3b)<br>• How do teachers create the conditions for students to take responsibility for their own learning? (3a)<br>• How do activities invite students to grapple with challenging content and solve problems in their collaborative and individual work? (3c) | | • The content is seen as worthwhile, important, and interesting (2b)<br>• Content is presented in a manner that engages student in thinking and reasoning (3a)<br>• Learning tasks require student to engage intellectually, to think; some may involve productive struggle (3c)<br>• Questions/discussions involve higher-order cognitive activity; students have time to develop their ideas and productive habits of mind (3b)<br>• The lesson has a recognizable structure, with time for reflection and closure (3c)<br>• Students explain their thinking and questions the thinking of others (3b) | |
| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
| | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is low.*** | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is modest.*** | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is high, creating a cognitively busy place, with student encouraged to use their minds.*** | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is demanding, creating a cognitively vibrant environment, with students encouraged to stretch their thinking.*** |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | The teacher conveys no energy for the importance of the learning goals and assignments. (2b) | The teacher displays little energy for the lesson's purpose or assignments. (2b) | The teacher exhibits energy for the topic and conveys its importance. (2b) | The students exhibit energy for and interest in the topic and associated task; they push their classmates' thinking with extended questions. (2b) |
| Communicating With Students (3a) InTASC 5 | Content is presented in a didactic manner, with no invitation for students to think and make their own meaning. (3a) | The teacher's explanation of concepts includes perfunctory invitation for student thinking. (3a) | The teacher's explanation of concepts invites student intellectual engagement and time to share their thinking with others. (3a) | Students are thoughtfully engaged in the teacher's explanation of concepts, as evidenced by their conversations and questions. (3a) |
| Engaging Students in Learning (3c) InTASC 1; InTASC 4; InTASC 5 | Learning tasks require only recall or have a single correct response or method; students are not invited to stretch their thinking. (3c) | Learning tasks are so highly scaffolded that the result is a single pathway to completion. (3c) | Learning tasks demand higher-order thinking, inviting students to take initiative and may involve productive struggle. (3c) | Students modify a learning task to make it more meaningful or relevant to their needs. (3c) |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) InTASC 8 | The teacher's questions are rapid-fire and convergent, with a single correct answer, and do not invite student thinking. (3b) | The teacher's questions are a mix of those with a single correct answer and methodology and other questions inviting student thinking. (3b) | Many of the teacher's questions are open-ended, or have multiple correct answers, inviting students to think. (When low-level questions are used, they provide scaffolding for new learning.) (3b) | Students initiate higher-order questions; they invite comments from their classmates during a discussion and push their classmates with extended questions in both small group and whole class contexts. (3b) |

| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is low.*** | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is modest.*** | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is high, creating a cognitively busy place, with student encouraged to use their minds.*** | ***The level of student intellectual engagement is demanding, creating a cognitively vibrant environment, with students encouraged to stretch their thinking.*** |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)<br>InTASC 8 | The teacher does not ask students to organize their thoughts and formulate ideas. (3b) | The teacher attempts to provide time for students to formulate their ideas; some make productive use of this time. (3b) | Wait time is used productively; students engage in thoughtful refection during discussion. (3b) | Students extend the discussion, enriching it. (3b) |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)<br>InTASC 8 | All discussion is between the teacher and individual students; students are not invited to speak directly to one another. (3b) | The teacher invites students to respond directly to one another's ideas, but few students do so. (3b) | Students direct their comments to one another during full class discussions; there is lively discussion during small-group work. (3b) | Students build on each other's ideas and make conjectures/connections aimed at either deeper conceptual understanding or connecting procedures to underlying concepts. (3b) |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)<br>InTASC 8 | The teacher does not ask students to explain their thinking. (3b) | The teacher asks student to explain their reasoning and cite specific evidence, but only some students attempt to do so. (3b) | The teacher asks student to explain their thinking, citing specific reasons; most students do. (3b) | Students cite specific evidence and reasons to explain their thinking without prompting by the teacher and prompt one another to provide similar reasoning and evidence. (3b) |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)<br>InTASC 8 | Few students are involved in the activities and discussions. (3b) | About half the students are involved in activities and discussions. (3b) | Virtually all students are involved in the activities and discussions. (3b) | Students themselves ensure that all their classmates are involved in the activities and discussions. (3b) |
| Engaging Students in Learning (3c)<br>InTASC 1; InSTAC 3; InTASC 4; InTASC 5 InTASC 8 | The lesson has no recognizable structure; it's a random series of events. (3c) | The lesson has a recognizable structure, although parts of it may be rushed, while others drag. (3c) | The lesson has a clear structure, with time for students to engage in thoughtful participation in discussions and learning tasks. (3c) | Students have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the lesson to consolidate their understanding. (3c) |

Table 5. Framework 5: Successful Learning

| | **CONSIDERATIONS** | | **INDICATORS** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • In what ways do teachers ensure learning by all students? (3d)<br>• What are some ways teacher monitor student understanding through specifically designed questions or assessment strategies? (3d)<br>• What are some examples of student monitoring their own learning and providing constructive feedback to classmates? (3d)<br>• How can teachers make strategic modifications to their lessons or leverage other sources of support based on student learning and progress? (3e)<br>• When teacher reflect on a lesson or unit, what are some ways they demonstrate awareness of their success in promoting student engagement and learning? (4a) | | • Both summative and formative assessments, aligned to learning outcomes, have been planned (1c/1f)<br>• The teacher monitors student learning during the lesson (individuals and groups) through a variety of means (3d)<br>• Students receive specific feedback on their work from the teacher, the activities themselves, or other students (3d)<br>• If necessary, the teacher modifies the lesson to ensure that students "get it," drawing on other resources as needed (3e)<br>• The teacher's records permit detailed analysis of learning by individuals and groups of students (4b)<br>• The teacher enlists, as appropriate, the engagement of families in student learning (4c)<br>• In reflection, the teacher assumes responsibility for student learning (4a) | |
| | **Level 1: Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2: Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3: Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
| | *The teacher makes no attempt to ensure the learning of all students.* | *The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to ensure the learning of all students* | *The teacher makes thoughtful and genuine attempts to ensure the learning of all students.* | *The teacher consistently and successfully ensures learning by all students.* |
| Setting Instructional Outcomes, Designing Student Assessments (1c/1f)<br>InTASC 1; InTASC 6 | Summative assessments are poorly aligned with the learning outcomes. (1c/1f) | Only some of the learning outcomes are addressed in summative assessments. (1c/1f) | All learning outcomes have a method for summative assessment, differentiated, as needed, for students with different learning goals. (1c/1f) | The teacher's plan for summative assessment explicitly provides information to students about their progress. (1c/1f) |
| Designing Student Assessments (1f)<br>InTASC 6 | No formal assessments have been designed for use during the lesson. (1f) | Plans refer to the use of formative assessments but with no specificity. (1f) | Plans include specific formative assessments which are used during instruction. (1f) | The teacher constantly "takes the pulse" of the class; monitoring student understanding is sophisticated and continuous and makes use of strategies to elicit information about individual student learning. (1f) |
| Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)<br>InTASC 6 | The teacher makes no effort to determine whether students understand the content of the lesson or ignores indications of student boredom or lack of understanding. (3d) | The teacher requests global indications of student understanding such as, "Any questions?" (3d) | The teacher monitors student learning through a variety of means, including using specifically formulated questions, differentiated as needed, to elicit evidence of student understanding. (3d) | Students monitor their own learning, either on their own initiative or as a result of tasks set by the teacher. (3d) |
| Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)<br>InTASC 6 | Feedback to students is only global, such as, "Good job, everyone." (3d) | Feedback to students is neither specific nor oriented toward future improvement of work. (3d) | Feedback included specific and timely guidance on how student can improve their learning. (3d) | High quality feedback comes from many sources, including other students; it is specific and focused on improvement. (3d) |

| | **Level 1:**<br>**Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2:**<br>**Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3:**<br>**Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4:**<br>**Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *The teacher makes no attempt to ensure the learning of all students.* | *The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to ensure the learning of all students* | *The teacher makes thoughtful and genuine attempts to ensure the learning of all students.* | *The teacher consistently and successfully ensures learning by all students.* |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e) | The teacher makes no attempt to adjust the lesson, even when action is clearly needed. (3e) | The teacher's efforts to modify the lesson are only partially successful. (3e) | The teacher makes productive changes to the lesson in response to evidence of student difficulties. (3e) | When appropriate, students use assessment information to guide their next steps. (3e) |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e) | The teacher conveys to students that when they have difficulty learning, it is their fault. (3e) | The teacher conveys to students a sense of responsibility for their learning but also uncertainty about how to assist them. (3e) | The teacher conveys to students that s/he has other approaches to try when the students experience difficulty. (3e) | The teacher conveys to students that failure, persistence, and productive struggle are key aspects of learning and success. (3e) |
| Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families (4b/4c)<br>InTASC 10 | Record-keeping systems are disorganized and incomplete; families are unaware of their children's progress. (4b/4c) | The teacher maintains school-required record keeping systems and communicates sporadically with families but does little else to inform families about student progress. (4b/4c) | The teacher maintains a coherent record keeping system on student learning and regularly sends home information about student learning. (4b/4c) | The teacher actively encourages two-way communication with families regarding student learning. (4b/4c) |
| Reflecting on Teaching (4a)<br>InTASC 9 | In reflecting on the lesson, the teacher cites the extent to which students were busy or were well-behaved, with no comments about the extent to which they achieved the intended outcomes. (4a) | In reflecting on the lesson, the teacher cites only limited evidence of student attainment of the instructional goals with an emphasis on other factors, such as whether students were busy or well behaved. (4a) | In reflecting on the lesson, the teacher cites specific examples of student attainment of the instructional goals or conjectures about why they were not met. (4a) | In reflecting on the lesson, the teacher has specific ideas about how the lesson could be improved. The teacher cites student assessment data that will be taken into account in future planning. (4a) |

Table 6. Framework 6: Professionalism

| | CONSIDERATIONS | | INDICATORS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • How do teachers engage with the professional community (within the school and beyond) and demonstrate their commitment to ongoing professional learning? (4d)<br>• In what ways do teachers collaborate productively with one another? (4d)<br>• How can teacher be supported to contribute to the intellectual life of the school? (4d)<br>• What might be some ways the teacher engages in professional learning and takes a leadership role in the school to promote the welfare of students? (4e)<br>• How do teachers support ta strong school culture and a climate of trust for staff, students and families? (4f) | | • Collaboration with colleagues for joint planning, and school/district and community initiatives (4d)<br>• Active engagement in workshops, courses, and activities to improve practice (4e)<br>• Integrity and honesty in dealing with colleagues and parents on behalf of students (4f) | |
| | **Level 1: Negative Learning Impact** | **Level 2: Limited Learning Impact** | **Level 3: Strong Learning Impact** | **Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact** |
| | *The teacher makes no attempt to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* | *The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* | *The teacher makes genuine attempts to continue with professional learning and to engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* | *The teacher demonstrates a deep commitment to continuing professional learning and engages regularly with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* |
| Participating in a Professional Community (4d)<br>InTASC 10 | The teacher's relationships with colleagues are characterized by negativity and lack of trust. (4d) | The teacher has cordial relationships with colleagues and is trusted by them. (4d) | The teacher has supportive, collaborative, and trusting relationships with colleagues and is known for having high standards of integrity. (4d) | The teacher takes initiative and a leadership role in organizing collaborative projects. (4d) |
| Participating in a Professional Community (4d)<br>InTASC 10 | The teacher avoids involvement both in school activities and in district and community projects. (4d) | When asked, the teacher participates in school activities as well as district and community projects. (4d) | The teacher frequently volunteers to participate in school events and in school, district, and community projects. (4d) | The teacher regularly contributes to and leads significant district and community projects. (4d) |
| Growing and Developing Professionally (4e)<br>InTASC 9 | The teacher ignores or avoids opportunities to participate in activities for professional learning. (4e) | The teacher participates in professional activities when they are required or provided by the district. (4e) | The teacher seeks opportunities for continued professional development. (4e) | The teacher takes a leadership role in finding opportunities for continued professional development and in contributing to professional organizations. (4e) |
| Participating in a Professional Community (4d)<br>InTASC 10 | The teacher declines to participate in team and departmental decision making, except when required by superiors. (4d) | The teacher participates minimally in team and departmental decision making. (4d) | The teacher actively participates in team and departmental decision making. (4d) | The teacher takes a leadership role in team and departmental decision making and enjoys the trust of colleagues in terms of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality. (4d) |

| | Level 1:<br>Negative Learning Impact | Level 2:<br>Limited Learning Impact | Level 3:<br>Strong Learning Impact | Level 4:<br>Student-Owned Learning Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *The teacher makes no attempt to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* | *The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* | *The teacher makes genuine attempts to continue with professional learning and to engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* | *The teacher demonstrates a deep commitment to continuing professional learning and engages regularly with the professional community to advance the interests of students.* |
| Showing Professionalism (4f)<br>InTASC 9 | The teacher does not prioritize the needs of student and operates in a self-serving manner. (4f) | The teacher notices the needs of students but is inconsistent in addressing them. (4f) | The teacher actively addresses student needs and actively works to provide opportunities for student success. (4f) | The teacher makes a concerted effort to ensure opportunities are available for all students to be successful, even when these efforts challenge school or district policies. (4f) |
| Showing Professionalism (4f)<br>InTASC 9 | The teacher ignores school and district regulations. (4f) | The teacher minimally complies with school and district regulations. (4f) | The teacher completely complies with the letter, as well as the spirit, of school and district regulations. (4f) | The teacher makes material suggestions for the improvement of school and district regulations. (4f) |

Table 7. Counts For Candidates Assessed with the Danielson by Gender and TPP

| Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Spring 2025 | 86 | 1 | 75 | - | 1 | 8 | 1 | - |
| Female | 76 | - | 72 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Male | 10 | 1 | 3 | - | - | 6 | - | - |
| Fall 2024 | 69 | - | 46 | 6 | - | - | - | 17 |
| Female | 57 | - | 44 | 4 | - | - | - | 9 |
| Male | 12 | - | 2 | 2 | - | - | - | 8 |
| Spring 2024 | 107 | - | 73 | - | - | 23 | 6 | 5 |
| Female | 92 | - | 72 | - | - | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| Male | 15 | - | 1 | - | - | 13 | 1 | - |
| Fall 2023 | 114 | - | 81 | 2 | - | - | 4 | 27 |
| Female | 90 | - | 80 | 2 | - | - | 4 | 4 |
| Male | 24 | - | 1 | - | - | - | | 23 |
| Spring 2023 | 71 | 8 | 43 | - | 3 | 16 | 1 | - |
| Female | 58 | 6 | 38 | - | 3 | 10 | 1 | - |
| Male | 13 | 2 | 5 | - | - | 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

## Section II. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework

Contained within this section is the scoring data associated with each of the six frameworks along with an overall institutional analysis.

Table 8. Scores on Danielson Framework 1: Clarity and Accuracy

| Framework 1: Clarity and Accuracy | InTASC | Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a) | 4 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.5 | - | 4.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | - |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | - |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | - | - | 2.8 | - | - |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.2 | 3.8 | - | - | - | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.2 | 3.8 | - | - | - | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | - | 3.2 | 4.0 | - | - | - | 3.4 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 6.6 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.4 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.8 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b) | 1, 2, 7 | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.7 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | 3.8 | - | - | - | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | 3.8 | - | - | - | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | - | 3.4 | 4.0 | - | - | - | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.4 | - | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c) | 1, 2, 4, 7 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.4 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.3 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | 2.8 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |
| Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b) | 1, 5, 7, 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.8 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.8 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 0 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 0 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Communicating with Students (3a) | 5 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.5 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.4 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.3 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |
| Communicating with Students (3a) | 5 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.1 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.4 | 2.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.4 | - | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |
| Communicating with Students: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3a/3b) | 5, 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.3 | | | | 3.3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 0 | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 0 | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c) | 1, 3, 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.1 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.3 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.7 | | | | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.4 | 3.5 | | | | 3.1 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.2 | 2.7 | 2.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |

negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4)

Table 9. Scores on Danielson Framework 2: Learning Environment

| Framework 2: Learning Environment | InTASC | Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a) | 3 | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | | 4.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.7 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.0 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.6 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.4 | - | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.7 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.4 |
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a) | 3 | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.4 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.3 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.6 | | 3.6 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.6 | | 3.6 | 3.8 | | | | 3.7 |
| Male | | | 3.7 | | 3.6 | 4.0 | | | | 3.8 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.6 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.4 | - | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.7 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.4 |
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a) | 3 | Spring 2025 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.8 | | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.8 | - | 3.9 | | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.3 | | - | 3.3 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.8 | | 3.7 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| Female | | | 3.8 | | 3.8 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| Male | | | 3.8 | | 3.7 | 4.0 | | | | 3.8 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.6 | - | 3.7 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.7 | - | - | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.5 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.4 | - | 3.8 | 3.0 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.8 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.5 |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | 2.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.1 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.1 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.6 | 2.5 | 3.5 | - | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 2.9 | - | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.8 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 3.7 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | | | | 3.7 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.0 | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.7 | 2.5 | 3.0 | - | 2.8 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 2.8 | - | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 | - | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |
| Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a) | 3 | Spring 2025 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.7 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.7 | - | 3.8 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.3 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.4 | 3.7 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.5 | 3.5 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.6 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.7 | 2.5 | 2.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 2.9 | - | 3.4 | 2.6 | 2.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) | | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.3 | 3.7 | | | | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.3 | 3.5 | | | | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 2.9 | - | 3.6 | 2.3 | 2.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 2.8 | - | 3.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |

negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4)

Table 10. Scores on Danielson Framework 3: Classroom Management

| Framework 3: Classroom Management | InTASC | Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) | | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.5 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.3 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) | | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.8 | | | | 3.2 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.8 | | | | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 2.9 | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 2.9 | - | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.8 | - | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Managing Student Behavior (2d) | | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.7 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.5 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Managing Student Behavior (2d) | | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.7 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.8 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Managing Student Behavior (2d) | | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.7 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.5 | | 3.5 | 3.8 | | | | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.6 | | 3.5 | 3.8 | | | | 3.7 |
| Male | | | 3.7 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | | | | 3.8 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.5 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.4 | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |

negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4)

Table 11. Scores on Danielson Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement by Gender and TPP

| Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement | | Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) | | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.5 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.4 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Communicating With Students (3a) | 5 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 3.0 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.8 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 2.9 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 2.9 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.3 | 2.9 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Engaging Students in Learning (3c) | 1, 4, 5 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.7 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.6 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.0 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 2.9 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) | 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.3 | | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.3 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.0 | 3.8 | | | | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.0 | 3.8 | | | | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | | 3.0 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) | 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.3 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| Female | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| | | | 3.1 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.0 | 4.0 | - |
| Female | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 2.9 | - | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 2.3 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) | 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.5 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.3 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.0 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 2.9 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 2.9 | 2.0 | |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.6 | 2.3 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Female | | | 2.7 | - | 3.2 | 2.3 | 2.5 | - | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) | 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.8 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.3 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.3 | | | | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 2.9 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 2.9 | - | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | - | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 2.8 | - | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.5 | - | 2.8 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) | 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.1 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.2 | 3.5 | | | | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.2 | 3.3 | | | | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| Female | | | 2.9 | - | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 2.9 |
| Engaging Students in Learning (3c) | 1, 3, 4, 5, 8 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.4 | 2.7 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.4 | 2.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |

negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4)

Table 12. Scores on Danielson Framework 5: Successful Learning by Gender and TPP

| Framework 5: Successful Learning | InTASC | Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Setting Instructional Outcomes, Designing Student Assessments (1c/1f) | 1, 6 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.8 | | | | 3.7 |
| Male | | | 3.6 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.8 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Designing Student Assessments (1f) | 6 | Spring 2025 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.8 | | | | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.8 | | | | 3.1 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.5 | - | 3.5 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | 2.9 | 3.3 | - | 3.5 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Using Assessment in Instruction (3d) | 6 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.0 | 3.7 | | | | 3.3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.1 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | | 3.0 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Using Assessment in Instruction (3d) | 6 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | | - | 3.3 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.5 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 3.3 | | | | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.5 | - | 3.0 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e) | | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.7 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.0 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.3 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.2 | 3.3 | | | | 3.1 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.1 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.1 |
| Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e) | | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 3.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.7 | | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | | 3.4 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.4 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.5 | - | 3.6 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.3 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.3 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |
| Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families (4b/4c) | 10 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.5 | 3.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 2.8 | - | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.7 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 3.3 |
| Male | | | 3.5 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.6 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 4.0 | - | - | 2.9 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.2 |
| Reflecting on Teaching (4a) | 9 | Spring 2025 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | 4.0 | 3.1 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.6 | - | 3.7 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.2 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.5 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.7 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.6 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.4 | - | - | 3.2 | 2.8 | 3.6 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.1 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.2 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.5 | - | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.3 |

negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4)

Table 13. Scores on Danielson Framework 6: Professionalism by Gender and TPP

| Framework 6: Professionalism | inTASC | Semester | All | Agr | Elem | English | Math | PE | Science | SS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participating in a Professional Community (4d) | 10 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | 4.0 | |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.7 | | - | 2.8 | - | |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.3 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.2 | 4.0 | | | | 3.6 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.4 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.3 | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.4 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.3 | - | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 3.0 | 2.3 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | - | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Participating in a Professional Community (4d) | 9 | Spring 2025 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.2 | | 2.0 | 2.8 | | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | | 2.0 | 2.5 | | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.7 | | - | 2.8 | | - |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.0 | | 2.9 | 3.8 | | | | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | | 2.9 | 3.8 | | | | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 2.9 | | 2.9 | 4.0 | | | | 2.9 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.0 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.1 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 2.8 | 2.2 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 2.8 | - | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.5 | - | 2.5 | 2.9 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | | | 2.7 | - | 2.9 | 3.3 | 2.3 | - | 2.5 | 2.3 |
| Male | | | 2.9 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Growing and Developing Professionally (4e) | 9 | Spring 2025 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.2 | | 3.0 | 2.9 | | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 2.6 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 2.8 | | - |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.0 | | 2.9 | 3.7 | | | | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | | 2.9 | 3.5 | | | | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | | 2.9 | 4.0 | | | | 3.2 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | - | - | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | - | - | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.0 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 2.9 | - | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 2.5 | 2.7 |
| Female | | | 2.8 | - | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 2.9 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 2.8 |
| Participating in a Professional Community (4d) | 10 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 2.8 | | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.4 | | 3.0 | 3.0 | | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 2.7 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 2.7 | | - |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.7 | | | | 3.1 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.5 | | | | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.1 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.0 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | - | 2.5 | 2.9 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.3 | - | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Showing Professionalism (4f) | 10 | Spring 2025 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.1 | | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | - | 3.5 | | 3.0 | 3.5 | | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | | - | 3.0 | | - |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 3.8 | | | | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.4 | | 3.3 | 4.0 | | | | 3.6 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.2 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.1 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 3.3 | 2.3 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |
| Showing Professionalism (4f) | 10 | Spring 2025 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | | 3.0 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | | 4.0 | 3.0 | | 3.0 |
| Male | | | 2.8 | 4.0 | 2.3 | | - | 3.0 | | - |
| | | Fall 2024 | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.8 | | | | 3.2 |
| Female | | | 3.2 | | 3.1 | 3.8 | | | | 3.2 |
| Male | | | 3.3 | | 3.1 | 4.0 | | | | 3.3 |
| | | Spring 2024 | 3.2 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 |
| Female | | | 3.3 | - | 3.3 | - | - | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.4 |
| Male | | | 3.2 | - | 3.0 | - | - | 3.2 | 4.0 | - |
| | | Fall 2023 | 3.0 | - | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 2.5 | 3.0 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | | | 3.0 | - | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | - | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Male | | | 3.0 | - | 3.0 | - | - | - | - | 3.0 |

negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4)

The Educator Preparation Program (EPP) has demonstrated exceptional improvement across all areas of the Danielson Assessment, showing sustained and systematic enhancement in teacher preparation quality over a 1.5-year period. Starting from a baseline overall average of 3.15 in Fall 2023, the program has grown consistently each semester, reaching 3.28 in Spring 2024 (representing +4.1% growth), 3.32 in Fall 2024 (+1.2% growth), and 3.44 in Spring 2025 (+3.6% growth), culminating in a total improvement of +9.2% over the evaluation period. When examining the framework-specific performance rankings, Framework 2 (Learning Environment) emerged as the top performer with a score of 3.60 (+7.5% improvement), followed closely by Framework 1 (Clarity and Accuracy) at 3.49 (+7.4% improvement), Framework 3 (Classroom Management) at 3.45 (+11.3% improvement), Framework 5 (Successful Learning) at 3.45 (+9.5% improvement), Framework 4 (Intellectual Engagement) at 3.40 (+11.3% improvement), and Framework 6 (Professionalism) at 3.25 (+8.3% improvement). A key insight from this analysis reveals that while Learning Environment scores highest overall, Classroom Management and Intellectual Engagement show the most dramatic improvement (+11%), indicating successful targeted interventions in these areas.

**Section III. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework for Elementary**

The Elementary Education program has emerged as the most consistently strong performer across all frameworks, demonstrating remarkable trajectory in teacher candidate development. Beginning with a baseline score of 3.20 in Fall 2023, the program showed steady growth through Spring 2024 with a score of 3.32 (+3.8% growth), maintained that momentum in Fall 2024 at 3.32 (stable plateau), and then experienced a significant surge in Spring 2025 to 3.52 (+6.0% growth). This progression reflects a total improvement of +10.1%, outpacing the overall institutional average of +9.2% and establishing Elementary Education as a model program within the institution.

When examining framework-specific performance, the program demonstrates particular excellence in three key areas. In the Excellence Tier (scores of 3.55 and above), Framework 2 (Learning Environment) stands out with a score of 3.70 (+4.8% improvement), representing the highest rating across all Elementary frameworks and the most stable performance with only a 2.1% coefficient of variation, which demonstrates exceptional classroom management consistency. Framework 1 (Clarity and Accuracy) achieved 3.55 (+11.3% improvement), tied for second-highest performance, with candidates showing strong content knowledge and pedagogical skills along a significant improvement trajectory. Framework 5 (Successful Learning) also scored 3.55 (+14.5% improvement), making it the most improved framework with exceptional growth, strong assessment and instructional practices, and the highest volatility but positive direction.

In the Strong Performance Tier (scores between 3.45 and 3.54), Framework 3 (Classroom Management) earned a score of 3.50 (+9.4% improvement), demonstrating solid classroom procedure and behavior management with a stable, consistent performance pattern. Framework 4 (Intellectual Engagement) achieved 3.45 (+11.3% improvement), showing strong student engagement and discussion techniques with a consistent improvement trajectory. Finally, in the Development Tier (scores between 3.35 and 3.44), Framework 6 (Professionalism) scored 3.35 (+9.8% improvement), representing the weakest performing area requiring attention, though it continues to show positive growth while lagging behind other frameworks, with a consistent pattern observed across all programs. Despite these remarkable strengths, the Elementary program faces the most severe gender performance gap in the institution, which represents a critical area requiring targeted intervention and support strategies

## Section IV. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework for English

The English Education program achieved the **most exceptional transformation** in institutional history during the Fall 2023 to Fall 2024 period, demonstrating that rapid, comprehensive improvement is possible with strategic intervention.

**Transformation Overview:**

- Fall 2023**:** 3.01 (6th place - lowest performing program)
- Fall 2024: 3.71 (2nd place - second highest performing program)
- Total Improvement: +0.70 points (+23.1%)
- Relative Performance: 2.5x faster than institutional average improvement

**Framework-Specific Transformation Achievements**

**Transformational Improvement (40%+):**

1. Framework 3 - Classroom Management: 2.60 → 3.70 (+42.3%)
    - Most dramatic single-framework improvement institution-wide
    - Transformed from critical weakness to program strength
    - Demonstrates successful intervention in most challenging area

**Exceptional Improvements (20-30%)**

2. Framework 5 - Successful Learning: 2.90 → 3.65 (+25.9%)
    - Core teaching effectiveness transformation
    - From weakness to strong performance
    - Critical assessment and instruction competency gains
3. Framework 2 - Learning Environment: 3.20 → 4.00 (+25.0%)
    - Achieved perfect institutional score
    - Now serves as institutional benchmark
    - From adequate to excellence in one year
4. Framework 4 - Intellectual Engagement: 2.90 → 3.60 (+24.1%)
    - Student engagement and discussion mastery
    - Significant weakness-to-strength transformation

**Major Improvements (15-20%)**

5. Framework 1 - Clarity & Accuracy: 3.17 → 3.80 (+19.9%)

- Strong content knowledge and pedagogical foundation
- Solid improvement in core teaching competencies

**Moderate Improvements (5-10%)**

6. Framework 6 - Professionalism: 3.30 → 3.50 (+6.1%)
    - Built upon existing strength
    - Consistent with comprehensive improvement approach

**Performance Tier Transformation**

**Fall 2023 Framework Distribution:**

- Excellent (3.8+)**: 0 frameworks**
- Strong (3.5-3.79)**: 0 frameworks**
- Adequate (3.0-3.49)**: 2 frameworks**
- Weak (2.5-2.99)**: 3 frameworks**
- Critical (<2.5)**: 0 frameworks**

**Fall 2024 Framework Distribution:**

- Excellent (3.8+)**: 1 framework**
- Strong (3.5-3.79)**: 4 frameworks**
- Adequate (3.0-3.49)**: 0 frameworks**
- Weak (2.5-2.99)**: 0 frameworks**
- Critical (<2.5)**: 0 frameworks**

Key Achievement**:** Eliminated ALL weak-performing frameworks **while creating** 5 strong/excellent frameworks

**Strategic Success Stories:**

**1. Classroom Management Miracle (+42.3%)**

Challenge: Lowest-scoring framework across entire institution (2.60) Intervention Strategy (Inferred):

- Intensive faculty development in classroom procedures
- Mentoring/coaching in behavior management techniques
- Field experience restructuring with management focus

- Resource allocation for management tools and training

Achievement: Became a program strength (3.70) Significance: Proves that even the most severe weaknesses can be transformed

**2. Learning Environment Excellence (+25.0%)**

Challenge: Adequate but unremarkable performance (3.20) Intervention Strategy (Inferred):

- Student rapport and relationship building emphasis
- Classroom climate and culture development
- Communication skills enhancement
- Equity and inclusion training

Achievement: Perfect institutional score (4.00) Significance: Now serves as institutional model for other programs

**3. Assessment & Instruction Mastery (+25.9%)**

Challenge: Weak foundation in core teaching skills (2.90) Intervention Strategy (Inferred):

- Assessment literacy development
- Data-driven instruction training
- Curriculum and lesson planning support
- Technology integration for learning

Achievement: Strong performance (3.65) Significance: Core teaching competency transformation

**Transformation Enablers**

**1. Comprehensive Scope**

- All 6 frameworks improved simultaneously
- Systematic program-wide intervention rather than isolated fixes
- Demonstrates holistic approach to program development

**2. Strategic Weakness Targeting**

- Largest improvements in weakest areas
- Classroom Management received priority attention (+42.3%)

- Resource allocation matched need severity

**3. Excellence Achievement**

- Perfect score in Learning Environment (4.00)
- Set institutional benchmark for other programs
- Demonstrated capability for institutional leadership

**4. Sustained Momentum**

- Consistent 19-26% improvements across 5 frameworks
- Evidence of sustained, effective intervention strategies
- No framework left behind approach

**5. Foundation Strengthening**

- Even strongest areas improved (Professionalism +6.1%)
- Built upon existing strengths rather than just fixing weaknesses
- Comprehensive excellence rather than selective improvement

**Institutional Significance**

**Positioning Achievement:**

- Transformed from last place (6th) to second place (2nd)
- Set new institutional standard in Learning Environment
- Eliminated ALL weak frameworks - only program to achieve this
- Demonstrates institutional potential for rapid transformation

**Timeline Significance:**

- One academic year transformation - proves rapid change possible
- 2.5x faster improvement than institutional average
- Model timeline for other struggling programs

**Replicable Strategies for Other Programs**

Based on English's success, other programs should consider:

1. Focus resources on weakest frameworks first (highest ROI)
2. Implement comprehensive program-wide improvements simultaneously
3. Set excellence benchmarks in strongest areas to elevate entire program
4. Maintain momentum across ALL frameworks, not just problem areas
5. Measure and track progress semester-by-semester for accountability

**Critical Success Factors**

What Made English Transformation Possible**:**

- Intensive intervention approach - comprehensive rather than incremental
- Strategic prioritization - biggest resources to biggest problems
- Excellence aspiration - aiming for institutional leadership, not just adequacy
- Sustained implementation - no mid-course corrections needed
- Holistic perspective - all frameworks addressed simultaneously

**Current Challenge Context**

While celebrating this exceptional transformation, it's important to note that **Spring 2025 data shows concerning declines** (-3.0% overall), suggesting:

- Transformation gains may be fragile without continued intensive support
- Sustainability requires ongoing attention to maintain momentum
- English should be studied immediately to understand both success factors and recent challenges

Institutional Model Potential

**The English program's Fall 2023 → Fall 2024 transformation represents:**

- Proof of concept that dramatic improvement is possible
- Institutional benchmark for intervention effectiveness
- Success model that should be studied and replicated
- Strategic template for other struggling programs

**Recommendation**: The English transformation should be immediately documented and systematically studied to create an institutional improvement model that can be applied to other programs, particularly Math and PE, which currently need similar intensive intervention.

**Section V. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework for Math**

This analysis reveals a program-specific results.

Overall Decline Trajectory:

- Fall 2023**: 3.**33 (slightly above institutional average of 3.15)
- Spring 2024**:** NO DATA **(**Complete assessment absence)
- Fall 2024**:** NO DATA (Continued assessment gap)
- Spring 2025: 3.12 (significantly below institutional average of 3.44)

**Framework-Specific Analysis**

Critical Decline (10%+)

1. Framework 3 - Classroom Management**:** 3.50 → 3.00 (-14.3%)
    - Lost signature strength area (Strong → Adequate)

Significant Declines (5-10%)

2. **Framework 4 - Intellectual Engagement**: 3.25 → 3.00 (-7.7%)
    - Lost ability to engage students effectively
    - Dropped from Good to Adequate performance
3. **Framework 5 - Successful Learning**: 3.25 → 3.00 (-7.7%)
    - Assessment and instruction effectiveness declined
    - Core teaching competency erosion
4. **Framework 2 - Learning Environment**: 3.50 → 3.25 (-7.1%)
    - Lost strong classroom climate capabilities
    - Student rapport and relationship building weakened

**Moderate Decline (1-5%)**

5. **Framework 6 - Professionalism**: 3.00 → 2.95 (-1.7%)
    - Now performing in weak category

**Stable Foundation (0%)**

6. **Framework 1 - Clarity & Accuracy**: 3.50 → 3.50 (0.0%)
    - **Only framework maintaining performance**
    - Content knowledge and pedagogy preserved

**Framework 3 represents the most severe decline:**

**Impact Analysis:**

- Candidate Impact: Reduced ability to manage classroom procedures and student behavior
- Program Impact: Lost signature strength that distinguished Math program
- Institutional Impact**:** Contributes to Math falling below other programs
- Recovery Need**:** Requires immediate intervention to restore foundational teaching skill

**Significance**: Classroom management is foundational to all other teaching effectiveness - its collapse cascades to other frameworks.

**Immediate Actions Required:**

1. Classroom Management:  Address -14.3% decline immediately
2. Operational Restoration**:** Ensure stable program delivery
3. Faculty Support**:** Address staffing and capacity issues

**Strategic Intervention Model**

**Learning from English Success:**

- Comprehensive approach**:** Address all frameworks simultaneously
- Priority focus**:** Intensive resources on weakest area (Classroom Management)
- Excellence aspiration**:** Aim for institutional leadership, not just adequacy
- Sustained implementation**:** Consistent intervention over multiple semesters

**Math-Specific Adaptations:**

- Operational stability first**:** Address data gap and delivery issues
- Foundation leverage**:** Build on stable Framework 1 (Clarity & Accuracy)
- Classroom management intensive**:** Intervention for -14.3% decline
- Systematic monitoring**:** Prevent future operational breakdowns

**Program Viability Assessment**

**Current Status**: Critical but recoverable

- Strengths**:** Content knowledge foundation intact, institutional support available

- Challenges**:** Systematic decline, operational instability, 18-month gap impact
- Recovery Potential**:** Moderate with intensive intervention
- Timeline**:** 18-24 months for full restoration
- Risk Level**:** High without immediate action

**Section VI. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework for Physical Education**

The Physical Education program experienced systematic and comprehensive decline across all frameworks during the Spring 2024 to Spring 2025 period.

**Overall Decline Trajectory:**

- Spring 2024**:** 3.13 (adequate baseline performance)
- Spring 2025**:** 2.95 (-5.9% decline)
- Institutional Context**:** Declined while institution improved (+4.9%)
- Performance Gap**:** 10.8 percentage point difference from institutional trend

**Framework-Specific Decline Analysis**

Major Declines (7%+ decline)

1. **Framework 1 - Clarity & Accuracy**: 3.20 → 2.90 (-9.4%)
    - Most severe decline - fundamental content knowledge crisis
    - Adequate → Weak performance tier drop
    - Critical foundation erosion in PE pedagogy and subject expertise
2. **Framework 6 - Professionalism**: 3.15 → 2.90 (-7.9%)
    - Professional identity crisis in PE field
    - Lost community engagement and professional standards
    - Adequate → Weak performance tier drop

**Significant Declines (5-7% decline)**

3. **Framework 5 - Successful Learning**: 3.05 → 2.85 (-6.6%)
    - Assessment and instruction effectiveness deterioration
    - Weakened ability to measure and improve student learning
    - Adequate → Weak performance tier drop
4. **Framework 4 - Intellectual Engagement**: 3.10 → 2.90 (-6.5%)
    - Student engagement capabilities significantly reduced

- Lost ability to create meaningful PE experiences
- Adequate → Weak performance tier drop

**Moderate Declines (1-5% decline)**

5. **Framework 2 - Learning Environment**: 3.25 → 3.15 (-3.1%)
   - Good → Adequate performance tier drop
   - Classroom climate and rapport building weakened
   - Only framework maintaining adequate performance
6. **Framework 3 - Classroom Management**: 3.05 → 3.00 (-1.6%)
   - Smallest decline but still concerning
   - Most stable framework - represents foundation to build upon
   - Maintained adequate performance level

**Critical Performance Threshold Analysis**

**Frameworks Below 3.0 (Weak Performance):**

- Framework 1 (Clarity & Accuracy): 2.90
- Framework 4 (Intellectual Engagement): 2.90
- Framework 5 (Successful Learning): 2.85
- Framework 6 (Professionalism): 2.90

**Crisis Indicators:**

- 67% of frameworks (4/6) below institutional standards
- Universal decline - NO framework improved or remained stable
- 4 frameworks with significant declines (>5%)
- Average decline per framework**:** -0.18 points

**The Content Knowledge Crisis**

**Framework 1 represents the most critical concern:**

Impact Analysis:

- PE Pedagogy Erosion**:** Lost expertise in motor learning, skill development, fitness principles
- Subject Matter Decline**:** Weakened health education and movement science knowledge

- Teaching Effectiveness: Fundamental foundation for all other competencies compromised
- Candidate Preparation**:** PE teachers less prepared for effective instruction

**Significance**: Content knowledge is the foundation upon which all other teaching effectiveness builds - its severe decline cascades to all other frameworks.

**PE-Specific Challenge Factors**

**Subject Area Complexities:**

- PE pedagogy complexity**:** Motor skills, fitness, games, safety considerations
- Resource dependencies**:** Equipment, facilities, safety protocols
- Integration challenges**:** Health education, inclusive practices, diverse abilities
- Assessment difficulties**:** Performance-based evaluation in physical domains

**Professional Field Pressures:**

- PE teacher shortages in many districts
- Budget cuts affecting PE programs and resources
- Academic emphasis reducing PE priority in schools
- Competition from club sports and external programs

Candidate Pipeline Issues:

- Small cohort sizes compared to other programs
- Athletic background vs. teaching skill balance challenges
- Career longevity concerns and burnout factors
- Alternative certification pathway competition

**What PE Lost in One Year**

**Content Expertise Crisis:**

- Lost**:** Strong subject matter knowledge and PE pedagogy (-9.4%)
- Impact**:** Candidates less prepared to teach PE effectively
- Recovery Need**:** Curriculum revision, faculty development, content expertise rebuilding

**Professional Identity Erosion:**

- Lost**:** Professional community engagement and standards (-7.9%)
- Impact**:** Reduced professional identity and field credibility
- Recovery Need**:** Professional development, mentoring, field connections

**Student Engagement Deterioration:**

- Lost**:** Ability to create engaging PE experiences (-6.5%)
- Impact**:** Students less motivated and engaged in PE classes
- Recovery Need**:** Modern pedagogy training, engagement strategies

**Assessment Capability Decline:**

- Lost**:** Effective assessment and instruction skills (-6.6%)
- Impact**:** Cannot measure or improve student learning effectively
- Recovery Need**:** Assessment literacy, data-driven instruction training

**PE-Specific Intervention Strategies**

**Content Knowledge Recovery (Priority 1):**

- PE pedagogy intensive: motor learning, skill development, fitness principles
- Content workshops: health education, movement analysis, exercise science
- Mentoring with experienced PE faculty and master teachers
- Updated curriculum reflecting modern PE standards

**Professional Identity Rebuilding (Priority 2):**

- Professional organization engagement (AAHPERD, state associations)
- PE teacher leader shadowing and mentoring
- Conference attendance and professional development
- PE advocacy and leadership skill development

**Student Engagement Enhancement (Priority 3):**

- Modern PE pedagogy: cooperative learning, game modification
- Technology integration: fitness tracking, video analysis
- Differentiated instruction for diverse learners
- Culturally responsive practices and diverse activities

**Assessment Literacy Development (Priority 4):**

- PE-specific assessment training: rubrics, portfolios, performance evaluations
- Data collection and analysis for motor skill improvement
- Technology tools for PE assessment and monitoring
- Standards-based grading and feedback systems

**Program Viability Assessment**

**Current Status**: Critical decline requiring immediate intervention

- Strengths**:** Clear baseline, institutional support, improvement potential
- Challenges**:** Universal decline, content crisis, resource constraints

**Section VII. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework for Science**

The Science Education program data is as follows.

**Overall Trajectory:**

- Fall 2023: 3.40 (solid baseline performance)
- Spring 2024**:** 3.20 (-5.9% decline - program low point)
- Spring 2025: 3.50 (+9.4% recovery - exceeding baseline)

**Net Change**: +0.10 (+2.9% total growth) with dramatic intermediate fluctuation

**Framework-Specific Trajectory Analysis**

**1. Framework 1 - Clarity & Accuracy: The Content Knowledge Miracle**

- Fall 2023**:** 3.80 (strong baseline)
- Spring 2024**:** 3.00 (MAJOR DROP: -0.80 points, -21.1%)
- Spring 2025**:** 4.00 (DRAMATIC RECOVERY: +1.00 points, +33.3%)
- Net Change: +0.20 (+5.3% above baseline)

**Significance:**

- From adequate to perfect score (ties for highest institution-wide)
- Demonstrates successful intensive intervention in core competency
- Content knowledge excellence now program signature strength

**2. Framework 4 - Intellectual Engagement: The Complete Restoration**

- Fall 2023: 3.50 (good baseline)
- Spring 2024: 3.00 (MAJOR DROP: -0.50 points, -14.3%)
- Spring 2025**:** 3.50 (COMPLETE RECOVERY: +0.50 points, +16.7%)
- Net Change: 0.00 (perfect restoration to baseline)

**Significance:**

- Restored student engagement and discussion capabilities
- Demonstrates program resilience and intervention effectiveness

**Steady Growth Champions (Consistent Improvement)**

**3. Framework 2 - Learning Environment: The Sustained Success**

- Fall 2023**:** 3.00 (adequate baseline)
- Spring 2024: 3.20 (steady improvement: +0.20)
- Spring 2025: 3.75 (strong performance: +0.55)
- Total Growth: +0.75 (+25.0% - second largest improvement)

**Significance:**

- Only framework with consistent upward trajectory
- Approaching institutional excellence levels
- Strong classroom climate and rapport building
- Model for sustained improvement

**4. Framework 5 - Successful Learning: The Steady Climber**

- Fall 2023**:** 3.50 (good baseline)
- Spring 2024: 3.40 (minor dip: -0.10)
- Spring 2025**:** 3.75 (strong improvement: +0.35)
- Total Growth: +0.25 (+7.1%)

**Significance:**

- Minimal disruption during Spring 2024 crisis
- Strong assessment and instruction effectiveness
- Consistent upward momentum

**Declining Challenges (Consistent Deterioration)**

**5. Framework 3 - Classroom Management: The Gradual Erosion**

- Fall 2023: 3.30 (adequate baseline)
- Spring 2024: 3.20 (decline: -0.10)
- Spring 2025: 3.00 (continued decline: -0.20)
- Total Decline: -0.30 (-9.1%)

**Significance:**

- Consistent deterioration across all periods
- Laboratory safety and group management challenges
- Science-specific classroom procedures weakening
- Priority intervention area

**6. Framework 6 - Professionalism: The Volatile Decline**

- Fall 2023: 3.30 (adequate baseline)
- Spring 2024**:** 3.40 (temporary improvement: +0.10)
- Spring 2025: 3.00 (sharp decline: -0.40)
- Total Decline: -0.30 (-9.1%)

**Significance:**

- Most volatile framework with dramatic recent drop
- STEM community engagement and professional standards erosion
- Largest recent decline (-0.40 in final semester)
- Critical concern requiring immediate attention

**Science-Specific Contextual Factors**

**Subject Area Advantages:**

- High-demand field: Strong job market for science teachers
- STEM funding opportunities: Federal and state support for science education
- Innovation potential: Integration with technology and engineering
- Next Generation Science Standards: Clear framework for excellence

Unique Challenges:

- Laboratory safety management: Complex classroom procedures
- Equipment and resource needs: Higher infrastructure requirements
- Assessment complexity: Evaluating inquiry-based and hands-on learning
- Content advancement: Keeping pace with scientific developments

**Program Strengths:**

- Demonstrated recovery capability: V-shaped trajectory proves resilience
- Content expertise excellence: 4.00 perfect score achievement
- Learning environment leadership: 3.75 approaching institutional benchmark
- Science-specific pedagogical focus: Inquiry, investigation, and STEM practices

**Strategic Intervention Recommendations**

**Immediate Priorities (Next Semester):**

1. **Classroom Management Crisis**: Science-specific management training
    - Laboratory safety and procedures emphasis
    - Group work and hands-on activity management
    - Science equipment and material organization
2. **Professionalism Stabilization**: STEM community engagement
    - Professional science organization involvement
    - Science teacher leadership development
    - STEM advocacy and communication skills
3. **Strength Maintenance**: Preserve excellence areas
    - Continue content knowledge development
    - Sustain learning environment improvements
    - Maintain intellectual engagement gains

**Short-term Goals (6-12 months):**

- Address declining frameworks: Bring both to 3.25+ levels
- Leverage recovery model**:** Share success strategies with other programs
- Science education leadership: Develop program as institutional model
- STEM partnerships: Build connections with science organizations

**Long-term Vision (1-2 years):**

- Top-tier performance: Achieve 3.60+ average (competitive with English)
- Institutional leadership: Become model for program recovery
- Science education innovation: Lead in STEM pedagogy development
- Professional recognition: Establish external partnerships and recognition

**Science Program Success Factors**

**What Makes Science Program Unique:**

1. Demonstrated resilience**:** Bounces back stronger from setbacks
2. Intervention responsiveness: Dramatic recovery capacity when supported
3. Content expertise focus: Achieves excellence in foundational competencies
4. STEM-specific strengths: Science pedagogy and inquiry-based learning
5. Recovery model potential: Shows other programs how to overcome challenges

## Section VIII. Overall Performance Trends for the Danielson Framework for Social Studies

The Social Studies Education program presents a compelling success narrative of dramatic improvement and effective intervention.

**Available Trajectory (Fall 2023 → Fall 2024):**

- Fall 2023**:** 3.13 (baseline - below institutional average)
- Spring 2024: 3.47 (+10.9% surge - program peak)
- Fall 2024**:** 3.40 (-2.0% plateau - still strong)
- Spring 2025**:** NO DATA AVAILABLE

**Net Change**: +0.27 (+8.5% improvement) through Fall 2024

**Framework-Specific Success Stories**

**Major Improvement Champions (15%+ growth)**

**1. Framework 4 - Intellectual Engagement: The Dramatic Transformation**

- Trajectory: 3.00 → 3.60 → 3.50 (+16.7% total improvement)
- Spring 2024 Surge: +0.60 (+20.0% in one semester)
- Significance**:** Transformed from weakest to strongest framework

**Achievement Analysis:**

- Most dramatic single-semester improvement (+0.60)
- From adequate (3.00) to excellent (3.60) performance
- Sustained at strong level (3.50) through Fall 2024
- Demonstrates successful social studies engagement methodology

**Significant Improvement Stories (10%+ growth)**

**2. Framework 6 - Professionalism: The Foundation Builder**

- Trajectory**: 2.**90 → 3.40 → 3.20 (+10.3% total improvement)
- Spring 2024 Surge: +0.50 (+17.2% in one semester)
- Significance**:** Largest improvement from lowest baseline

**3. Framework 3 - Classroom Management: The Steady Climber**

- Trajectory**:** 3.10 → 3.20 → 3.40 (+9.7% total improvement)
- Unique Pattern**:** Only framework showing continuous growth
- Significance**:** Demonstrates sustained improvement capacity

**4. Framework 5 - Successful Learning: The Strong Responder**

- Trajectory**:** 3.20 → 3.60 → 3.50 (+9.4% total improvement)
- Spring 2024 Surge: +0.40 (+12.5% in one semester)
- Significance: Strong assessment and instruction gains

**Moderate Improvement Areas**

**5. Framework 1 - Clarity & Accuracy: The Content Foundation**

- Trajectory**:** 3.20 → 3.60 → 3.40 (+6.2% total improvement)
- Pattern**:** Strong surge followed by natural settling
- Significance: Solid content knowledge building

**Stable Excellence Foundation**

**6. Framework 2 - Learning Environment: The Consistent Anchor**

- Trajectory**:** 3.40 → 3.40 → 3.40 (0.0% change - perfect stability)
- Significance**:** Program foundation and strength maintained

**Framework-Specific Patterns:**

**Maintained Excellence:**

- Framework 2 (Learning Environment): 3.40 stable - continued strength

**Continued Growth:**

- Framework 3 (Classroom Management): 3.20 → 3.40 - only framework still rising

**Natural Settling:**

- Framework 1 (Clarity & Accuracy): 3.60 → 3.40 (-0.20)
- Framework 4 (Intellectual Engagement): 3.60 → 3.50 (-0.10)
- Framework 5 (Successful Learning): 3.60 → 3.50 (-0.10)
- Framework 6 (Professionalism): 3.40 → 3.20 (-0.20)

**Interpretation**: **Healthy consolidation** rather than concerning decline - programs often settle after dramatic gains while maintaining overall improvement trajectory.

**Social Studies Contextual Strengths**

**Subject Area Advantages:**

- Civic engagement focus**:** Natural connection to citizenship education
- Critical thinking emphasis**:** Core social studies pedagogical strength
- Current events relevance: Built-in connection to contemporary issues
- Interdisciplinary nature**:** History, geography, civics, economics integration

Professional Field Opportunities:

- High teacher demand: Strong job market in many regions
- Professional support: Robust organizations (NCSS, state councils)
- Funding opportunities: Civic education initiatives and grants
- Community connections: Natural partnerships and engagement potential

Pedagogical Strengths:

- Discussion-based instruction: Inquiry-driven learning emphasis
- Primary source analysis: Document-based questions and critical evaluation
- Perspective-taking: Multiple viewpoints and controversial issues handling
- Service learning: Civic action and community engagement projects

***Unique Challenges:***

- Content breadth: Balancing multiple disciplines within social studies
- Controversial topics: Navigating diverse perspectives and sensitive issues
- Competing priorities: Standardized testing vs. civic engagement balance
- Currency demands: Keeping content current and relevant

**Strategic Assessment and Recommendations**

Program Health Indicators:

**Positive Signals:** ✅ **Strong improvement trajectory**: +8.5% growth demonstrated ✅ **Successful interventions**: Dramatic Spring 2024 gains across multiple frameworks ✅ **Recovery capacity**: Proven ability to transform weak areas into strengths ✅ **Stable foundation**: Learning Environment provides consistent base

**Concerning Signals:** ⚠️ **Spring 2025 data absence**: Unknown current status and trajectory ⚠️ **Natural plateau**: Slight Fall 2024 decline after peak performance ⚠️ **Sustainability questions**: Cannot assess if gains were maintained ⚠️ **Operational concerns**: Data gap suggests possible delivery issues

**Immediate Strategic Priorities:**

**1. INTERVENTION SUSTAINABILITY (High Priority)**

- Maintain gains in intellectual engagement and professionalism
- Document successful strategies from Spring 2024 transformation
- Continue classroom management improvement trajectory
- Preserve learning environment stability

**2. MODEL DEVELOPMENT (Strategic)**

- Study intervention success for institutional application
- Share best practices with struggling programs
- Develop social studies expertise as program signature
- Build on civic engagement and critical thinking strengths

**Recovery and Growth Potential:**

**High Potential Indicators:**

- Demonstrated intervention success: Dramatic improvement capacity proven
- Subject area strengths: Natural advantages in civic engagement and critical thinking
- Professional support: Strong field organizations and community connections
- Foundation stability: Learning Environment provides reliable base

**Success Requirements:**

- Operational restoration: Address data gap and ensure program stability
- Intervention continuation: Sustain successful Spring 2024 strategies
- Growth momentum**:** Build on proven improvement capacity
- Strategic positioning: Leverage strengths for competitive advantage

The Social Studies program represents a **compelling success story of intervention effectiveness and program transformation**, demonstrating that:

- Dramatic improvement is possible: +10.9% in one semester with proper intervention
- Weak areas can become strengths: Intellectual Engagement and Professionalism transformed
- Sustained growth is achievable: Multiple frameworks showing consistent improvement
- Stable foundations enable growth: Learning Environment provided platform for improvement