

Danielson Framework for Teaching Clinical Placement Results Summary

Table of Contents

[Section I: Executive Summary for Danielson Framework for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section II. Survey Information](#)

[Section III. Danielson Framework 1: Clarity and Accuracy Results for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section IV: Danielson Framework 2: Learning Environment Results for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section V: Danielson Framework 3: Classroom Management Results for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section VI: Danielson Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement Results for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section VII: Danielson Framework 5: Successful Learning Results for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section VIII: Danielson Framework 6: Professionalism Results for Clinical Placements](#)

[Section IX: Danielson Framework: InTASC 1](#)

[Section X: Danielson Framework: InTASC 2](#)

[Section XI: Danielson Framework: InTASC 3](#)

[Section XII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 4](#)

[Section XIII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 5](#)

[Section XIV: Danielson Framework: InTASC 6](#)

[Section XV: Danielson Framework: InTASC 7](#)

[Section XVI: Danielson Framework: InTASC 8](#)

[Section XVII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 9](#)

[Section XVIII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 10](#)

Section I: Executive Summary for Danielson Framework for Clinical Placements

The Danielson Framework for Teaching Clinical Placement Results Summary provides an in-depth analysis of candidate performance across multiple semesters, focusing on six key clusters: clarity and accuracy, learning environment, classroom management, intellectual engagement, successful learning, and professionalism. The framework uses a four-point Likert scale to assess the impact of teaching on student learning, ranging from negative to student-owned learning impact.

Overall, performance in clarity and accuracy improved from Spring 2023 (3.24) to Spring 2024 (3.36), with female candidates consistently outperforming males, particularly in Spring 2023. Social Studies showed exceptional strength, while Science experienced a decline. In the learning environment, creating an environment of respect and rapport scored highest (3.34), while managing classroom procedures was the lowest (3.13). Elementary Education outperformed other disciplines, while English and Science needed improvement. Gender analysis showed higher scores for females in Spring semesters, with males scoring higher in Fall 2023.

Classroom management scores ranged from 2.5 to 3.7, with Elementary Education consistently strong, while English education showed the most room for improvement. Female candidates generally scored higher, especially in Elementary Education. Intellectual engagement showed a positive trend with a 2.2% improvement from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024, with Elementary candidates leading and Science having the greatest opportunity for growth. Female candidates generally outperformed males, except in "Engaging Students in Learning."

Successful learning saw a slight decrease in overall scores from Spring 2023 (3.26) to Spring 2024 (3.18), with Mathematics demonstrating the strongest performance and English showing the most opportunity for improvement. Gender differences narrowed over time, with males slightly outperforming females in recent semesters. Professionalism scores ranged from 2.90 to 3.15, with "Showing Professionalism" being the strongest component. Agriculture demonstrated the highest performance, while Science needed improvement. A positive temporal trend was observed, with Spring 2024 outperforming previous semesters.

Recommendations include targeted professional development focusing on questioning techniques for science candidates and support for English education candidates, cross-disciplinary sharing of successful practices from Elementary Education and Social Studies, addressing gender-specific performance gaps, and ensuring complete data collection for more robust future analyses.

Section II. Survey Information

The EPP uses the Danielson Framework for Teaching (Danielson) to assess candidates' skills in their clinical and residency placements. The framework has six clusters that comprise it which are: clarity and accuracy, learning environment, classroom management, intellectual engagement, successful learning, and professionalism. During each semester of a candidate's clinical or residency placement all six clusters are assessed at mid-term and once at the end. Each of the clusters has a four-point Likert scale that consists of negative learning impact (1), limited learning impact (2), strong learning impact (3), and student-owned learning impact (4). For candidates completing their first residency WVU looks for them to have a preponderance of scores ranging from limited impact learning (2) and above. For students in clinical placements and during the semester of their final residency the preponderance of scores should be at strong learning impact (3) and above. The scores shown in this report are reflective of what candidates earned on their final evaluations utilizing this rubric. Table 1 illustrates the number of candidates being assessed on the Danielson by gender and TPP. Tables 2 through 7 show the entire rubric for each framework. Tables 8 through 12 show which indicators on certain frameworks aligned with the InTASC Standards.

Table 1. Counts For Candidates Assessed with the Danielson by Gender and TPP

Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
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

Table 2. Framework 1: Clarity & Accuracy

	CONSIDERATIONS		INDICATORS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what ways do the learning outcomes challenge students to think critically? (1c) 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) What examples do you see of congruence between the activities and instructional outcomes? (1c/1e) What might be some ways to adapt lessons to meet the needs of all students? (1b/1d/1e) How does teachers' deep understanding of the content support intellectual work by students during lessons? (1a/1e) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) 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) Planned resources and activities aligned to the instructional purpose (1d/1e) Expectations for learning, accuracy of content, clarity of explanations, and use of academic language (3a) Activities and assignments, questions and student discussion, all aligned to the instructional purpose (3b/3c) 	
	Level 1: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The instructional purpose and learning tasks are unclear; the information presented is inaccurate or inappropriate and unsuitable for the students.</i>	<i>The instructional purpose and learning tasks are somewhat clear; the information presented is primarily accurate and partially appropriate to the students.</i>	<i>The instructional purpose and learning tasks are clear; the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.</i>	<i>The purpose and learning tasks of the lesson are very clear, and the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.</i>
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a) 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) 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) 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)	Learning 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) InTASC 1; InTASC 5; InTASC 8	Planned learning tasks, materials, and question sequences are of low cognitive challenge and unrelated to the lesson's stated purpose or are not 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: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The instructional purpose and learning tasks are unclear; the information presented is inaccurate or inappropriate and unsuitable for the students.</i>	<i>The instructional purpose and learning tasks are somewhat clear; the information presented is primarily accurate and partially appropriate to the students.</i>	<i>The instructional purpose and learning tasks are clear; the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.</i>	<i>The purpose and learning tasks of the lesson are very clear, and the information presented is accurate and suitable to the students.</i>
Communicating with Students (3a) 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) 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) 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) 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 3. Framework 2: Learning Environment

	CONSIDERATIONS		INDICATORS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what ways do classroom interactions demonstrate genuine caring and a safe, respectful, supportive, and challenging learning environment? (2a) How do teachers convey high expectations for student learning and encourage hard work and perseverance? (2b) In what ways do teachers create classrooms that are safe for risk taking? (2b) How do students take ownership of their work and demonstrate a commitment to mastering challenging content? (2b) How do teachers establish environments that recognize and value students' identities as well as their social, emotional, and intellectual needs? (2a/2b) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language of caring and respect between teacher and students and among students, and teacher's awareness of students' interests in and beyond school (2a) High levels of cognitive energy (2b) A safe environment for student risk taking (2b) High expectations for students' capabilities for learning (2b) Productive student engagement is small group work (2c) 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
	<i>Interactions between teacher and students and among students are characterized by negativity, lack of support, low expectations, and low levels of student perseverance.</i>	<i>Interactions between teacher and students and among students are a mix of high and low support, moderate expectations, and modes levels of student perseverance.</i>	<i>The classroom is characterized by interactions that are both supportive and challenging, with student perseverance in challenging work.</i>	<i>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.</i>
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a) 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) 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: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>Interactions between teacher and students and among students are characterized by negativity, lack of support, low expectations, and low levels of student perseverance.</i>	<i>Interactions between teacher and students and among students are a mix of high and low support, moderate expectations, and modes levels of student perseverance.</i>	<i>The classroom is characterized by interactions that are both supportive and challenging, with student perseverance in challenging work.</i>	<i>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.</i>
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) 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 4. Framework 3: Classroom Management

	CONSIDERATIONS		INDICATORS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what ways are classrooms well run and organized? (2c) How might the classroom routines and procedures be clearer or carried out more efficiently to prevent loss of instructional time? (2c) How might students themselves take a more active role in ensuring a productive classroom? (2c) 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) How does the physical environment in classrooms support learning and engagement? (2e) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficient procedures for non-instructional activities: taking roll, distributing and collecting materials, making transitions, etc. (2c) Clear guidelines for student work when it is unsupervised, e.g., in small groups (2c) 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) Physical environment supportive of learning activities (2e) Productive contribution to the class by volunteers and paraprofessionals (2c) 	
	Level 1: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The classroom environment is disorganized and chaotic.</i>	<i>The classroom is at times disorganized.</i>	<i>The classroom functions smoothly and efficiently.</i>	<i>The classroom functions seamlessly.</i>
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 on-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: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The classroom environment is disorganized and chaotic.</i>	<i>The classroom is at times disorganized.</i>	<i>The classroom functions smoothly and efficiently.</i>	<i>The classroom functions seamlessly.</i>
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 5. Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement

	CONSIDERATIONS		INDICATORS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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) In what ways do instructional activities and questions promote intellectual engagement and energy in classrooms? (3b/3c) In what ways are students asked to explain their thinking, construct arguments, and question the thinking of others? (3b) How do teachers create the conditions for students to take responsibility for their own learning? (3a) How do activities invite students to grapple with challenging content and solve problems in their collaborative and individual work? (3c) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The content is seen as worthwhile, important, and interesting (2b) Content is presented in a manner that engages student in thinking and reasoning (3a) Learning tasks require student to engage intellectually, to think; some may involve productive struggle (3c) Questions/discussions involve higher-order cognitive activity; students have time to develop their ideas and productive habits of mind (3b) The lesson has a recognizable structure, with time for reflection and closure (3c) Students explain their thinking and questions the thinking of others (3b) 	
	Level 1: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is low.</i>	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is modest.</i>	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is high, creating a cognitively busy place, with student encouraged to use their minds.</i>	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is demanding, creating a cognitively vibrant environment, with students encouraged to stretch their thinking.</i>
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: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is low.</i>	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is modest.</i>	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is high, creating a cognitively busy place, with student encouraged to use their minds.</i>	<i>The level of student intellectual engagement is demanding, creating a cognitively vibrant environment, with students encouraged to stretch their thinking.</i>
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) 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 reflection during discussion. (3b)	Students extend the discussion, enriching it. (3b)
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b) 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) 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) 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) 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 6. Framework 5: Successful Learning

	CONSIDERATIONS		INDICATORS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In what ways do teachers ensure learning by all students? (3d) What are some ways teacher monitor student understanding through specifically designed questions or assessment strategies? (3d) What are some examples of student monitoring their own learning and providing constructive feedback to classmates? (3d) How can teachers make strategic modifications to their lessons or leverage other sources of support based on student learning and progress? (3e) 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) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both summative and formative assessments, aligned to learning outcomes, have been planned (1c/1f) The teacher monitors student learning during the lesson (individuals and groups) through a variety of means (3d) Students receive specific feedback on their work from the teacher, the activities themselves, or other students (3d) If necessary, the teacher modifies the lesson to ensure that students “get it,” drawing on other resources as needed (3e) The teacher’s records permit detailed analysis of learning by individuals and groups of students (4b) The teacher enlists, as appropriate, the engagement of families in student learning (4c) 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
	<i>The teacher makes no attempt to ensure the learning of all students.</i>	<i>The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to ensure the learning of all students</i>	<i>The teacher makes thoughtful and genuine attempts to ensure the learning of all students.</i>	<i>The teacher consistently and successfully ensures learning by all students.</i>
Setting Instructional Outcomes, Designing Student Assessments (1c/1f) 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) 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) 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) 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: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The teacher makes no attempt to ensure the learning of all students.</i>	<i>The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to ensure the learning of all students</i>	<i>The teacher makes thoughtful and genuine attempts to ensure the learning of all students.</i>	<i>The teacher consistently and successfully ensures learning by all students.</i>
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) 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) 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 7. Framework 6: Professionalism

	CONSIDERATIONS		INDICATORS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do teachers engage with the professional community (within the school and beyond) and demonstrate their commitment to ongoing professional learning? (4d) In what ways do teachers collaborate productively with one another? (4d) How can teacher be supported to contribute to the intellectual life of the school? (4d) 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) How do teachers support ta strong school culture and a climate of trust for staff, students and families? (4f) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaboration with colleagues for joint planning, and school/district and community initiatives (4d) Active engagement in workshops, courses, and activities to improve practice (4e) 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
	<i>The teacher makes no attempt to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>	<i>The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>	<i>The teacher makes genuine attempts to continue with professional learning and to engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>	<i>The teacher demonstrates a deep commitment to continuing professional learning and engages regularly with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>
Participating in a Professional Community (4d) 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) 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) 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) 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: Negative Learning Impact	Level 2: Limited Learning Impact	Level 3: Strong Learning Impact	Level 4: Student-Owned Learning Impact
	<i>The teacher makes no attempt to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>	<i>The teacher makes sporadic or inconsistent attempts to continue with professional learning or engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>	<i>The teacher makes genuine attempts to continue with professional learning and to engage with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>	<i>The teacher demonstrates a deep commitment to continuing professional learning and engages regularly with the professional community to advance the interests of students.</i>
Showing Professionalism (4f) 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) 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 8. Framework 1: Clarity & Accuracy alignment with InTASC Standards

Indicators	InTASC
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a)	4
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)	1, 2, 7
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)	1, 2, 4, 7
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)	1, 5, 7, 8
Communicating with Students (3a)	5
Communicating with Students (3a)	5
Communicating with Students: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3a/3b)	5, 8
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c)	1, 3, 8

Table 9. Framework 2: Learning Environment alignment with InTASC Standards

Indicators	InTASC
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3

Table 10. Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement alignment with InTASC Standards

Indicators	InTASC
Communicating With Students (3a) InTASC 5	5
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 4, 5
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8

Table 11. Framework 5: Successful Learning alignment with InTASC Standards

Indicators	InTASC
Setting Instructional Outcomes, Designing Student Assessments (1c/1f)	1, 6
Designing Student Assessments (1f)	6
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	6
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	6
Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families (4b/4c)	10
Reflecting on Teaching (4a)	9

Table 12. Framework 6: Professionalism alignment with InTASC Standards

Indicators	InTASC
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	10
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	9
Growing and Developing Professionally (4e)	9
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	10
Showing Professionalism (4f)	10
Showing Professionalism (4f)	10

Section III. Danielson Framework 1: Clarity and Accuracy Results for Clinical Placements

The data on the Danielson Framework 1 (Clarity and Accuracy) reveals a gradual improvement in overall performance across the three semesters analyzed, with average scores rising from 3.24 in Spring 2023 to 3.25 in Fall 2023 and reaching 3.36 in Spring 2024.

A notable gender gap exists across all time periods, with female candidates consistently outperforming their male counterparts; this disparity was most pronounced in Spring 2023 (3.25 vs 2.10) but has narrowed in subsequent semesters.

Among subject areas, Social Studies demonstrated exceptional strength in Spring 2024 with an average of 3.45, while Science showed a concerning decline from 3.40 in Fall 2023 to 3.04 in Spring 2024, that is most likely due to the number of candidates assessed.

The framework components related to demonstrating knowledge of students and integrating that with content and pedagogy emerged as consistent strengths, while components involving questioning and discussion techniques remained the most challenging area despite showing recent improvement. Some disciplines exhibited distinctive patterns: Social Studies excelled particularly in resource knowledge and instructional design (scoring 3.8), while Science struggled most with student communication (scoring 2.7).

These findings suggest targeted professional development opportunities in questioning techniques, especially for Science instructors, while the approaches used by Social Studies faculty might serve as effective models for other disciplines. The continued positive trend in engagement strategies is encouraging, though more complete data collection would strengthen future analyses, particularly for subjects with missing information and to verify potential data anomalies such as the unusually high female Social Studies score (6.6) in Spring 2024. Table 13 illustrates scores on Danielson Framework 1: Clarity and Accuracy.

Table 13. 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 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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.1	3.2	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.2	3.2	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			1.8	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.2	0	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)	1, 2, 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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	-	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	-	-
Male			2.4	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)	1, 2, 4, 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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.6	3.4	-	3.6	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.6	3.5	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)	1, 5, 7, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-
Communicating with Students (3a)	5	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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.6	3.5	-	3.0	3.4	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.4	3.5	-	3.0	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.4	4.0	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-
Communicating with Students (3a)	5	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Communicating with Students: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3a/3b)	5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.3	3.2	-	2.8	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.4	3.2	-	2.8	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c)	1, 3, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	3.0	-	-

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

Section IV: Danielson Framework 2: Learning Environment Results for Clinical Placements

The analysis of Danielson Framework 2 reveals that Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a) consistently earns the highest scores (averaging 3.34), followed by Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b) at 3.22, while Managing Classroom Procedures (2c) shows the lowest overall performance at 3.13. Across semesters, Spring 2024 demonstrates the strongest results (3.39 average), reflecting significant improvement from Fall 2023, which had the lowest overall average (3.14). This positive trajectory is particularly evident in Managing Classroom Procedures, which improved by 0.40 points between Fall 2023 and Spring 2024.

When examining subject areas, Elementary Education consistently outperforms other disciplines with an impressive 3.55 average, while English (2.73) and Science (3.06) demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

Gender analysis shows female candidates generally scored higher in Spring semesters, while males showed significantly higher scores in Fall 2023, though sample size differences may influence this pattern. The most concerning data point appears in English education during Fall 2023, particularly in classroom management (2.3), while the highest individual score was recorded for Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport in Spring 2024 (3.6). Moving forward, the program might benefit from sharing successful practices from Elementary Education with other content areas, providing targeted support for English education candidates, and investigating the consistent dip in Fall semester performance compared to Spring terms.

Despite areas needing attention, the data indicates overall positive momentum in the Learning Environment domain with all categories showing improvement in the most recent semester. Table 14 shows scores achieved by candidates on Framework 2: Learning Environments by gender and TPP.

Table 14. 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 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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.9	3.5	-	3.4	3.4	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.8	3.5	-	3.4	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.5	4.0	3.2	-	-	3.4	-	-
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3	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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.4	3.8	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.3	3.8	-	3.6	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.5	3.5	3.6	-	-	3.3	-	-
Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b)		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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.4	3.4	-	3.2	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.5	3.4	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b)		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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.4	3.4	-	3.0	3.0	3.5	-
Female			3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.0	3.0	3.5	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Establishing a Culture for Learning (2b)		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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.1	3.5	-	2.6	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.2	3.6	-	2.6	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.5	-	2.8	2.9	3.5	-
Female			3.3	3.5	3.6	-	2.8	3.1	3.5	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.2	-	-	2.8	-	-
Managing Classroom Procedures (2c)		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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.3	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.5	3.2	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.3	-	-	3.0	-	-

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

Section V: Danielson Framework 3: Classroom Management Results for Clinical Placements

The analysis of the Danielson Framework 3 data on classroom management reveals several noteworthy patterns across semesters, subject areas, and gender demographics. Overall performance scores typically range between 2.5-3.7 on what appears to be a 4-point scale, with most scores clustering around 3.0-3.3, indicating generally solid classroom management skills among candidates.

Elementary Education consistently demonstrates strength across all management categories, while English education shows the most room for improvement, particularly during the Fall 2023 semester where scores dipped to 2.5-2.8.

A gender pattern emerges with female candidates typically scoring slightly higher than their male counterparts, especially in Elementary Education programs. Temporally, the data shows a slight overall decline from Spring 2023 to Fall 2023, followed by noticeable improvement from Fall 2023 to Spring 2024 across most categories and subjects.

When comparing specific management dimensions, "Managing Student Behavior" consistently receives higher ratings than "Managing Classroom Procedures," suggesting candidates may be more adept at behavioral management than procedural organization. Subject-specific strengths are evident, with PE instructors demonstrating particular effectiveness in behavior management, while Science and Social Studies maintain relatively stable mid-range scores across evaluated semesters.

This comprehensive view highlights both areas of success and opportunities for targeted professional development interventions, particularly in supporting English Education programs and sharing best practices from high-performing subject areas like Elementary Education and PE. Table 15 shows scores achieved by candidates on Framework 3: Classroom Management ts by gender and TPP.

Table 15. 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 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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.1	3.2	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.0	3.3	-	3.0	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	3.0	-	-
Managing Classroom Procedures (2c)		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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.4	3.2	-	2.8	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.4	3.2	-	2.8	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Managing Student Behavior (2d)		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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.0	3.2	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.0	3.2	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Managing Student Behavior (2d)		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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	3.5	-
Female			3.4	3.4	3.4	-	3.2	3.4	3.5	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Managing Student Behavior (2d)		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
		Spring 2023	3.5	3.7	3.3	-	3.3	3.1	4.0	-
Female			3.5	3.5	3.4	-	3.3	3.2	4.0	-
Male			3.3	4.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-

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

Section VI: Danielson Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement Results for Clinical Placements

The data analysis of the Danielson Framework 4 reveals a positive trend in intellectual engagement, with an overall improvement of 2.2% from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024. The highest performing component is "Establishing a Culture for Learning" with a score of 3.32, while "Engaging Students in Learning" shows the most room for growth at 3.10, despite positive improvement. The most substantial progress can be seen in "Questioning & Discussion Techniques," which demonstrated an impressive 10.3% improvement over the year-long period.

When examining subject areas, Elementary candidates consistently lead the way with the highest overall scores (3.37), followed by Social Studies and Math candidates who both perform above the average. Science candidates, with an average score of 3.07, appear to have the greatest opportunity for growth and may benefit from targeted professional development.

Gender analysis indicates that female candidates generally outperform their male counterparts in most components, with the most significant difference appearing in "Communicating with Students" (0.37 point gap). Interestingly, male candidates score higher in "Engaging Students in Learning," bucking the overall trend.

The semester-by-semester progression shows steady improvement, from 3.15 in Spring 2023 to 3.16 in Fall 2023, and reaching 3.22 by Spring 2024. This consistent upward trajectory suggests that EPP initiatives to enhance intellectual engagement are yielding positive results. To build on this momentum, the EPP should consider leveraging the strengths of Elementary candidates through peer observations, continuing successful professional development in questioning techniques, and implementing targeted support for Science candidates. Creating cross-gender and cross-subject mentoring opportunities could further help address performance gaps and share effective practices throughout the EPP. Table 16 shows scores achieved by candidates on Framework 4: Intellectual Engagement by gender and TPP.

Table 16. 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 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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.2	3.4	-	3.2	3.2	2.5	-
Female			3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.4	2.5	-
Male			3.1	3.0	3.2	-	-	3.1	-	-
Communicating With Students (3a)	5	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	2.8	3.5	-	3.2	3.0	3.5	-
Female			3.2	2.8	3.5	-	3.2	3.2	3.5	-
Male			3.1	3.0	3.4	-	-	2.9	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 4, 5	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.2	3.1	-	3.0	3.1	2.5	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.1	-	3.0	3.4	2.5	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	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
		Spring 2023	2.9	2.8	3.2	-	2.8	2.9	3.0	-
Female			3.0	3.0	3.2	-	2.8	3.2	3.0	-
Male			2.6	2.0	3.0	-	-	2.7	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	Spring 2024	3.3	-	3.3	-	-	3.0	3.2	3.4
Female			3.3	-	3.3	-	-	3.0	3.0	3.4
Male			3.1	-	4.0	-	-	3.0	4.0	-
		Fall 2023	3.0	-	3.0	2.3	3.5	-	3.3	3.0
Female			2.9	-	3.1	2.3	3.3	-	3.3	2.3
Male			3.1	-	3.0	-	-	-	-	3.1
		Spring 2023	3.0	2.8	3.3	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	2.8	3.4	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.0	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	Spring 2024	3.1	-	3.2	-	-	2.9	2.5	3.2
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
		Spring 2023	2.9	3.0	3.3	-	2.4	2.9	3.0	-
Female			3.0	3.3	3.3	-	2.4	3.1	3.0	-
Male			2.6	2.0	3.0	-	-	2.7	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	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
		Spring 2023	2.8	2.4	3.3	-	2.8	3.1	2.5	-
Female			2.9	2.5	3.3	-	2.8	3.3	2.5	-
Male			2.5	2.0	2.8	-	-	2.8	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	2.8	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			2.7	2.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.4	-	3.2	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section VII: Danielson Framework 5: Successful Learning Results for Clinical Placements

The Danielson Framework 5 data reveals several notable patterns across semesters, subject areas, and gender differences. Overall scores have slightly decreased from Spring 2023 (3.26) to Spring 2024 (3.18), though they've remained stable between Fall 2023 and Spring 2024.

Mathematics consistently demonstrates the strongest performance with an average score of 3.50, while English shows the most opportunity for improvement with the lowest average of 2.65. Elementary Education maintains strong performance (3.30), positioning it among the higher-performing subject areas.

An interesting trend emerges when examining gender differences: Spring 2023 showed a significant gap (0.32) with females scoring higher, but this difference has narrowed considerably in recent semesters, with males slightly outperforming females in both Fall 2023 and Spring 2024. Female performance has declined from 3.33 to 3.15, while male performance has improved from 3.01 to 3.16.

Component analysis reveals "Designing Student Assessments" as a relative strength across programs, with Social Studies showing improvement in this area from Fall 2023 to Spring 2024. Conversely, assessment-related components in Science candidates show persistent challenges, with "Assessment in Instruction" scoring particularly low (2.7) in Spring 2024. The strongest individual areas include SS and Math in Designing Assessments (both 3.6), while the areas needing most improvement include English in Setting Outcomes (2.5) and Science in Assessment Instruction (2.7). Table 17 shows scores achieved by candidates on Framework 5: Successful Learning by gender and TPP.

Table 17. 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 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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.2	3.3	-	3.4	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.4	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Designing Student Assessments (1f)	6	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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.5	-	3.6	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.5	3.5	-	3.6	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.2	-	-	2.9	-	-
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	6	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	2.8	3.2	-	3.2	3.0	3.0	-
Female			3.1	2.8	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Male			2.9	3.0	3.0	-	-	2.8	-	-
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	6	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.3	-	3.4	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.3	3.4	-	3.4	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e)		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
		Spring 2023	3.0	2.8	3.1	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.0	2.8	3.2	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness (3e)		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
		Spring 2023	3.5	3.2	3.6	-	3.6	3.2	4.0	-
Female			3.5	3.0	3.6	-	3.6	3.3	4.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.4	-	-	3.0	-	-
Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families (4b/4c)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.2	3.3	-	2.6	3.0	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.5	3.4	-	2.6	3.3	3.0	-
Male			2.5	2.5	2.5	-	-	2.6	-	-
Reflecting on Teaching (4a)	9	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

		Spring 2023	3.1	3.2	3.4	-	3.4	3.2	2.5	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.5	-	3.4	2.9	2.5	-
Male			3.2	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.5	-	-

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

Section VIII: Danielson Framework 6: Professionalism Results for Clinical Placements

The analysis of the Danielson Framework 6 data reveals several important trends in candidate professionalism. Overall scores range from 2.90 to 3.15 on a 4-point scale, with "Showing Professionalism" (4f) emerging as the strongest component. "Growing and Developing Professionally" (4e) scored lowest at 2.90 but showed the most improvement over time with a 0.20 point increase from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024.

Among subject areas, Agriculture demonstrated the highest performance (3.33), while Science (2.89) represents an area for potential improvement. The data shows a positive temporal trend, with Spring 2024 (3.17) outperforming both Fall 2023 (3.03) and Spring 2023 (3.08), suggesting that professional development efforts are yielding results.

A marginal difference between male (3.12) and female (3.08) performance was observed, though this gap appears minimal.

The consistent improvement across all professionalism components from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024 is particularly encouraging, with all three measured aspects showing positive growth. These findings suggest that while the overall professionalism framework demonstrates solid performance, targeted interventions in specific components and subject areas could further enhance candidate professional practices. The successful approaches in high-performing areas like Agriculture could potentially serve as models for departments needing additional support. Table 18 shows scores achieved by candidates on Framework 6: Professionalism by gender and TPP.

Table 18. 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 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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.4	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.5	3.5	-	3.0	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.3	3.2	-	2.8	2.8	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.3	-	2.8	2.9	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.5	2.8	-	-	2.7	-	-

Growing and Developing Professionally (4e)	9	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
		Spring 2023	2.8	3.2	3.1	-	2.6	2.8	2.5	-
Female			2.8	3.0	3.1	-	2.6	2.7	2.5	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	2.9	-	-
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.3	-	2.8	3.1	3.5	-
Female			3.2	3.5	3.3	-	2.8	3.1	3.5	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Showing Professionalism (4f)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.1	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Showing Professionalism (4f)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.2	3.3	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.0	3.3	-	3.0	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section IX: Danielson Framework: InTASC 1

The data for InTASC Standard 1 reveals several notable trends across the three academic semesters from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024. Overall performance has shown steady improvement, with the average score rising from 3.22 in Spring 2023 to 3.35 in Spring 2024, following a slight dip to 3.17 in Fall 2023.

A persistent gender gap exists across all components, with female students scoring an average of 0.14 points higher than their male counterparts (3.27 vs. 3.12).

Among program areas, Social Studies and Elementary Education consistently demonstrate the strongest performance, achieving the highest Spring 2024 scores at 3.47 and 3.42 respectively, while Science programs show the greatest opportunity for growth at 3.05.

Component analysis indicates that while teacher candidates excel at demonstrating knowledge of students, content, and pedagogy (all scoring 3.40 in Spring 2024), they face more challenges in the practical application of engaging students in learning (scoring 3.20 and 3.30). The most significant improvement occurred in "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques," which rose from 3.00 in Fall 2023 to 3.40 in Spring 2024.

These findings suggest that while a solid foundation exists in understanding learner development and differences, continued focus should be placed on translating this knowledge into effective student engagement strategies. Table 19 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 1 by Gender and TPP.

Table 19. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 1 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 1	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)	1, 2, 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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	-	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	-	-
Male			2.4	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)	1, 2, 4, 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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.6	3.4	-	3.6	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.6	3.5	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)	1, 5, 7, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-

Male			3.3	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c)	1, 3, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	3.0	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 4, 5	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.2	3.1	-	3.0	3.1	2.5	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.1	-	3.0	3.4	2.5	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.4	-	3.2	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section X: Danielson Framework: InTASC 2

Analysis of the InTASC Standard 2 data reveals several notable patterns across semesters, content areas, and gender groups. Overall scores across all metrics consistently range between 3.1-3.4 on a 4.0 scale, indicating generally solid performance in demonstrating knowledge of students. The stand-alone metric "Demonstrating Knowledge of Students" (1b) showed slight improvement from Spring 2023 (3.3) to Fall 2023 (3.4) and maintained that level through Spring 2024, suggesting stability in this competency. In contrast, the combined metric encompassing knowledge of content, students, and outcomes (1a/1b/1c) displayed more volatility, dropping from 3.4 in Spring 2023 to 3.1 in Fall 2023 before recovering to 3.4 in Spring 2024. This fluctuation warrants further investigation to identify contributing factors.

Content area performance varied significantly, with Social Studies and Elementary Education consistently demonstrating strength across multiple semesters, scoring as high as 3.6 and 3.5 respectively in Spring 2024. English emerged as an area for potential growth, scoring the lowest (2.8) on the combined metric in Fall 2023, while Science showed inconsistent performance between metrics.

Gender analysis revealed that female students generally outperformed male students by approximately 0.2-0.3 points across both metrics, though notable exceptions existed in specific content areas. Most dramatically, male Science students scored significantly higher (+1.0) than females in Spring 2024, while female Elementary Education students consistently outperformed males.

The data highlights both standout achievements, such as male Science students scoring a perfect 4.0 on Knowledge of Students in Spring 2024, and areas needing attention, particularly the 2.8 score for female Social Studies students in Fall 2023. These insights suggest opportunities for cross-disciplinary sharing of effective practices from high-performing areas like Social Studies and Elementary Education, targeted support for English instruction, and consideration of gender-specific pedagogical approaches to address performance disparities in certain content areas. Table 20 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 2 by Gender and TPP.

Table 20. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 2 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 2	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)	1, 2, 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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	-	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	-	-
Male			2.4	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)	1, 2, 4, 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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.6	3.4	-	3.6	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.6	3.5	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-

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

Section XI: Danielson Framework: InTASC 3

The analysis of InTASC Standard 3 data reveals several notable trends across semesters, categories, and demographics. Overall performance has improved from Fall 2023 (3.20) to Spring 2024 (3.40), with Spring 2023 falling in between at 3.28. "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2)" emerged as the highest-performing category with an average score of 3.47, while "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (3)" recorded the lowest average at 3.17.

Gender differences were most pronounced in Fall 2023, where males scored 0.60 points higher than females in two "Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport" categories, though Spring 2024 data shows more balanced performance between genders, particularly in "Engaging Students in Learning" and "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques" where no gender differences were observed.

Among subject areas, Elementary Education maintained consistently high performance (3.48-3.50) across all semesters, while Science demonstrated concerning fluctuations, declining from 3.28 in Fall 2023 to 3.00 in Spring 2024. Social Studies showed improvement from Fall 2023 (3.22) to Spring 2024 (3.44), while Mathematics data, though limited, indicated improvement from Fall 2023 (3.00) to Spring 2023 (3.24).

These findings suggest overall positive development in most areas related to InTASC Standard 3. Table 21 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 3 by Gender and TPP.

Table 21. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 3 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 3	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c)	1, 3, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	3.0	-	-
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3	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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.9	3.5	-	3.4	3.4	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.8	3.5	-	3.4	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.5	4.0	3.2	-	-	3.4	-	-
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3	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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.4	3.8	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.3	3.8	-	3.6	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.5	3.5	3.6	-	-	3.3	-	-
Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport (2a)	3	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.5	-	2.8	2.9	3.5	-
Female			3.3	3.5	3.6	-	2.8	3.1	3.5	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.2	-	-	2.8	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.4	-	3.2	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section XII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 4

The InTASC Standard 4 data reveals several noteworthy patterns across semesters, content areas, and gender. For the "Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy" metric, scores generally ranged from 3.0-3.8, with Fall 2023 achieving the highest overall average of 3.4.

Science consistently performed well in this area, while Social Studies showed improvement from 3.2 to 3.6 over time. When examining the combined metric for content knowledge, student knowledge, and instructional outcomes, overall scores trended slightly higher, with Spring 2023 and Spring 2024 both averaging 3.4, and Elementary Education maintaining consistent performance between 3.2-3.5. The "Engaging Students in Learning" metrics revealed slightly lower scores overall compared to content knowledge measures, with Science improving from 2.5 to 3.0 over time, while male PE students demonstrated exceptional engagement (4.0) in Spring 2024.

Gender analysis indicates that female students typically score at or above overall averages across most metrics, while male students show greater score variability, including a notably low content knowledge score (1.8) in Spring 2023 but strong performance in Elementary Education (4.0) in Spring 2024.

Content area analysis highlights Science's strength in content knowledge despite declining engagement scores, Elementary Education's consistent performance across all metrics, Social Studies' improving trend, and PE's strong student engagement. These patterns suggest opportunities for cross-program collaboration, particularly sharing best practices from Elementary Education and investigating factors behind Science's engagement decline and Social Studies' improvement trends. Table 22 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 4 by Gender and TPP.

Table 22. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 4 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 4	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (1a)	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.1	3.2	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.2	3.2	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			1.8	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.2	0	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)	1, 2, 4, 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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.6	3.4	-	3.6	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.6	3.5	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 4, 5	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.2	3.1	-	3.0	3.1	2.5	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.1	-	3.0	3.4	2.5	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.4	-	3.2	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section XIII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 5

The InTASC Standard 5 data reveals consistent performance across multiple teaching competencies related to application of content. For the comprehensive metric combining knowledge of resources, instruction design, and communication techniques, overall scores maintained around 3.2-3.4 across semesters, with Social Studies showing notable improvement to 3.8 in Spring 2024. The "Communicating with Students" metrics demonstrate relatively stable performance averaging 3.3-3.4 across all programs, though Science shows some concerning trends with scores declining from 3.0 to 2.7 in recent evaluations, with male Science students scoring particularly low (2.0) in Spring 2024.

Elementary Education stands out positively, with male Elementary students achieving perfect 4.0 scores in communication during both Fall 2023 and Spring 2024. When examining questioning and discussion techniques, scores hover consistently around 3.1-3.2 across all programs, with Mathematics showing improvement from 2.8 to 3.5. The engagement metrics show incremental improvement over time, moving from 3.0 to 3.2 for the simpler metric and maintaining at 3.2-3.3 for the comprehensive engagement evaluation.

Gender analysis shows generally comparable performance between males and females, with some exceptions: male Elementary Education students excel in communication while male Science students struggle with engagement. Content area comparison highlights Social Studies' strengthening performance, PE's consistent communication skills, and some concerning engagement trends in Science that may require intervention.

The data suggests strong overall competency in Standard 5. Table 23 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 5 by Gender and TPP.

Table 23. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 5 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 5	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)	1, 5, 7, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-
Communicating with Students (3a)	5	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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.6	3.5	-	3.0	3.4	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.4	3.5	-	3.0	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.4	4.0	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-
Communicating with Students (3a)	5	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Communicating with Students: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3a/3b)	5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.3	3.2	-	2.8	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.4	3.2	-	2.8	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 4, 5	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.2	3.1	-	3.0	3.1	2.5	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.1	-	3.0	3.4	2.5	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.4	-	3.2	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section XIV: Danielson Framework: InTASC 6

The data associated with InTASC Standard 6 reveals significant insights about assessment practices across educational programs. Overall, there's a clear upward trend in performance across all competency areas from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024, with "Designing Student Assessments" emerging as the highest-performing area with an average of 3.3/4.0.

Gender analysis shows interesting patterns, with females generally outperforming males in Spring 2023, males slightly ahead in Fall 2023, and mixed results in Spring 2024 where females excelled in "Designing Assessments" while males showed stronger results in "Setting Outcomes."

Subject area examination highlights Elementary Education as consistently strong across all categories, while the Science program demonstrates consistent challenges with scores ranging from 2.7-3.0 across all assessment components. Social Studies shows notable strength in assessment design (3.6) but needs improvement in using assessment during instruction. The PE program displays inconsistent performance across different assessment categories.

These findings suggest several opportunities for improvement, including targeted professional development for the Science program, enhanced focus on "Using Assessment in Instruction" across all programs, addressing gender performance fluctuations, and sharing effective practices from high-performing programs like Elementary Education. The positive overall trend indicates that programmatic improvements are having beneficial effects, though specific areas still require attention to ensure all candidates develop strong assessment competencies aligned with InTASC Standard 6. Table 24 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 6 by Gender and TPP.

Table 24. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 6 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 6	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Setting Instructional Outcomes, Designing Student Assessments (1c/1f)	1, 6	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.2	3.3	-	3.4	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.4	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Designing Student Assessments (1f)	6	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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.5	-	3.6	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.5	3.5	-	3.6	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.2	-	-	2.9	-	-
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	6	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	2.8	3.2	-	3.2	3.0	3.0	-
Female			3.1	2.8	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Male			2.9	3.0	3.0	-	-	2.8	-	-
Using Assessment in Instruction (3d)	6	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.3	-	3.4	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.3	3.4	-	3.4	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-

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

Section XV: Danielson Framework: InTASC 7

The data related to InTASC Standard 7 reveals several important trends across three assessment areas over three semesters from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024. Overall scores show either stability or improvement, with Knowledge of Students increasing slightly from 3.3 to 3.4, Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy remaining stable at 3.4, and Knowledge of Resources and Instruction showing the most improvement, rising from 3.2 to 3.4.

Gender performance analysis indicates that female students consistently outperform male students in most assessment areas, though this gap has generally narrowed over time, with the most significant difference observed in Spring 2023 for Knowledge of Students (0.9 point gap).

Subject-specific performance varies considerably, with Social Studies emerging as the strongest performer in Spring 2024 across all assessment areas (3.6-3.8), while Math and English showed strong results in Fall 2023. Science consistently scored lower (3.0-3.2) across multiple semesters, suggesting an area for targeted improvement.

The consistency of patterns across all three assessment areas indicates alignment in the implementation of different aspects of InTASC Standard 7, while the generally positive trajectory suggests that effective teaching practices are being maintained or enhanced over time. Table 25 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 7 by Gender and TPP.

Table 25. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 7 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 7	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Demonstrating Knowledge of Students (1b)	1, 2, 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
		Spring 2023	3.3	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	-	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	-	-
Male			2.4	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy, Demonstrating Knowledge of Students, Setting Instructional Outcomes (1a/1b/1c)	1, 2, 4, 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
		Spring 2023	3.4	3.6	3.4	-	3.6	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.4	3.6	3.5	-	3.6	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	3.0	-	-	2.9	-	-
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)	1, 5, 7, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-

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

Section XVI: Danielson Framework: InTASC 8

The data associated with InTASC Standard 8 reveals several notable trends across different subject areas, time periods, and demographics. Overall performance shows a positive trajectory from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024, with the average score increasing from 3.02 to 3.24 across all metrics. The strongest performance areas in Spring 2024 are "Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources" and "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques + Engaging Students in Learning," both scoring 3.4. Consistently across semesters, "Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques" as an isolated skill remains the weakest area, particularly in Science programs.

When examining subject areas, Social Studies demonstrates the strongest overall performance with a 3.27 average and exceptional scores in "Demonstrating Knowledge" (3.8). Elementary Education maintains consistent strength across all metrics with a 3.31 average. Science programs show the most room for improvement with a 2.90 average, struggling particularly with questioning and discussion techniques. Physical Education excels specifically in "Engaging Students in Learning" (3.4) and "Using Questioning & Discussion + Engaging" (3.5).

Gender analysis reveals that female candidates have steadily improved from Spring 2023 (3.12) to Spring 2024 (3.26) and generally outperform male candidates in most Standard 8 metrics. However, male performance has shown significant growth from Spring 2023 (2.88) to Spring 2024 (3.13), narrowing the performance gap. Interestingly, during Fall 2023, male candidates slightly outperformed female candidates (3.14 vs. 2.99), representing an anomaly in the overall pattern.

Looking at longitudinal patterns, "Using Questioning & Discussion + Engaging Students" shows the most substantial improvement (from 3.20 to 3.40), while "Engaging Students in Learning" has also improved from 3.10 to 3.30. Other areas like "Demonstrating Knowledge" and "Communicating with Students" remain relatively stable. These findings suggest that focused interventions in Science programs, studying successful practices in Social Studies, continued monitoring of gender differences, building on integration strengths, and maintaining regular assessment would be beneficial strategies moving forward for continued improvement in InTASC Standard 8 performance. Table 26 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 8 by Gender and TPP.

Table 26. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 8 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 8	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, Designing Coherent Instruction, Communicating with Students, Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (1d/1e; 3a/3b)	1, 5, 7, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.3	-	-
Communicating with Students: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3a/3b)	5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.3	3.2	-	2.8	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.4	3.2	-	2.8	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques, Engaging Students in Learning (3b/3c)	1, 3, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.3	3.2	3.5	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	3.0	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	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
		Spring 2023	2.9	2.8	3.2	-	2.8	2.9	3.0	-
Female			3.0	3.0	3.2	-	2.8	3.2	3.0	-
Male			2.6	2.0	3.0	-	-	2.7	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	Spring 2024	3.3	-	3.3	-	-	3.0	3.2	3.4
Female			3.3	-	3.3	-	-	3.0	3.0	3.4
Male			3.1	-	4.0	-	-	3.0	4.0	-
		Fall 2023	3.0	-	3.0	2.3	3.5	-	3.3	3.0
Female			2.9	-	3.1	2.3	3.3	-	3.3	2.3
Male			3.1	-	3.0	-	-	-	-	3.1
		Spring 2023	3.0	2.8	3.3	-	3.0	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.1	2.8	3.4	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Male			3.1	3.0	3.2	-	-	3.0	-	-

Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	Spring 2024	3.1	-	3.2	-	-	2.9	2.5	3.2
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
		Spring 2023	2.9	3.0	3.3	-	2.4	2.9	3.0	-
Female			3.0	3.3	3.3	-	2.4	3.1	3.0	-
Male			2.6	2.0	3.0	-	-	2.7	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	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
		Spring 2023	2.8	2.4	3.3	-	2.8	3.1	2.5	-
Female			2.9	2.5	3.3	-	2.8	3.3	2.5	-
Male			2.5	2.0	2.8	-	-	2.8	-	-
Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (3b)	8	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	2.8	3.3	-	3.2	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.4	3.0	-
Male			2.7	2.0	3.0	-	-	3.0	-	-
Engaging Students in Learning (3c)	1, 3, 4, 5, 8	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.0	3.3	-	3.2	3.3	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.0	3.4	-	3.2	3.5	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-

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

Section XVII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 9

The data for InTASC Standard 9 reveals several notable trends across three semesters from Spring 2023 to Spring 2024. Overall scores for Reflecting on Teaching (4a) show steady improvement, rising from 3.1 to 3.3, with Elementary Education consistently performing well and Social Studies achieving the highest score (3.6) in Spring 2024. Meanwhile, Participating in a Professional Community (4d) scores fluctuated, starting at 3.0, dropping to 2.8, then returning to 3.0, with Science showing a concerning downward trend from 3.0 to 2.3. Growing and Developing Professionally

(4e) scores demonstrated modest improvement from 2.8 to 3.0 over the three semesters, with Science showing significant improvement from 2.5 to 3.2.

Gender differences are apparent across components, with males generally scoring higher in Science (notably a 4.0 vs. 2.8 in Reflecting on Teaching for Spring 2024) while females tend to perform better in Elementary Education.

Subject area strengths include Social Studies and Elementary Education, while Science and Math represent areas requiring additional support, particularly in professional community participation.

The overall trajectory is positive, suggesting that recent initiatives may be having a beneficial impact, though incomplete data across some disciplines (Agriculture only in Spring 2023, English only in Fall 2023) limits comprehensive analysis. These findings suggest that targeted professional development focusing on building community engagement skills could further strengthen outcomes for InTASC Standard 9 performance. Table 27 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 9 by Gender and TPP.

Table 27. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 9 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 9	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Reflecting on Teaching (4a)	9	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.2	3.4	-	3.4	3.2	2.5	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.5	-	3.4	2.9	2.5	-
Male			3.2	3.0	3.0	-	-	3.5	-	-
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.3	3.2	-	2.8	2.8	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.3	3.3	-	2.8	2.9	3.0	-
Male			3.0	3.5	2.8	-	-	2.7	-	-
Growing and Developing Professionally (4e)	9	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
		Spring 2023	2.8	3.2	3.1	-	2.6	2.8	2.5	-
Female			2.8	3.0	3.1	-	2.6	2.7	2.5	-
Male			3.1	3.5	2.8	-	-	2.9	-	-

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

Section XVIII: Danielson Framework: InTASC 10

The analysis of InTASC Standard 10 data reveals several important trends across different categories, programs, and time periods. "Participating in a Professional Community" emerged as the highest-performing category with an average score of 3.24, while "Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families" showed the lowest average at 3.08, though all categories maintained scores above 3.0, indicating generally proficient performance across the board.

Among academic programs, Agriculture demonstrated the strongest results with a 3.34 average, followed closely by English (3.30) and Elementary Education (3.24). Science and Math programs showed the most room for improvement, scoring 3.03 and 3.06 respectively.

Gender comparison indicates that male students generally outperformed female students in "Participating in a Professional Community" and "Showing Professionalism," while female students showed stronger results in "Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families," with the most pronounced gender gap (0.18 difference) occurring in this latter category.

Temporally, performance improved from Fall 2023 (3.11) to Spring 2024 (3.20), with Spring 2023 (3.16) showing higher scores than the following fall semester, potentially suggesting seasonal patterns in performance. The highest individual score (4.0) was achieved by male Elementary Education students in Spring 2024 for Records & Communication, while the lowest (2.3) was recorded by female Social Studies students in Fall 2023 for Professional Community. English emerged as the most consistent program with minimal score variation (standard deviation of 0.00), while Math and Science showed the greatest variability (0.27).

These findings suggest opportunities for targeted improvement strategies. Table 28 illustrates scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 10 by Gender and TPP.

Table 28. Scores on Danielson Rubric Indicators aligned with InTASC 10 by Gender and TPP.

InTASC 10	InTASC	Semester	All	Agr	Elem	English	Math	PE	Science	SS
Maintaining Accurate Records, Communicating with Families (4b/4c)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.0	3.2	3.3	-	2.6	3.0	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.5	3.4	-	2.6	3.3	3.0	-
Male			2.5	2.5	2.5	-	-	2.6	-	-
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.4	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-

Female			3.3	3.5	3.5	-	3.0	3.4	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Participating in a Professional Community (4d)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.5	3.3	-	2.8	3.1	3.5	-
Female			3.2	3.5	3.3	-	2.8	3.1	3.5	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Showing Professionalism (4f)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.2	3.3	3.3	-	3.2	3.1	3.0	-
Female			3.2	3.3	3.4	-	3.2	3.1	3.0	-
Male			3.2	3.5	3.0	-	-	3.1	-	-
Showing Professionalism (4f)	10	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
		Spring 2023	3.1	3.2	3.3	-	3.0	3.2	3.0	-
Female			3.1	3.0	3.3	-	3.0	3.3	3.0	-
Male			3.3	3.5	3.2	-	-	3.1	-	-

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