

Across four semesters (Fall 23, Spring 24, Fall 24, Spring 25), data from lesson observations was analyzed to determine trends in areas of strength and areas for growth. Overall, data demonstrate consistency across programs, with clear strengths in classroom environment, standards alignment, and planning. Candidates show measurable growth as they progress through the program, with the strongest performance occurring during Student Teaching. However, instructional rigor (specifically questioning, academic feedback, and promotion of higher-order thinking) remains the most consistent area for improvement across all semesters and levels. Further analysis of the charts included in Evidence is below:

Overall Trend Across Four Semesters:

Overall Final Scores (Averages by Level)

| Semester | Junior Avg | Senior Avg | Student Teaching Avg |
|-----------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Fall 23 | 2.85 | 3.38 | 2.76 |
| Spring 24 | 3.05 | —* | 3.55 |
| Fall 24 | 2.97 | 2.99 | 3.33 |
| Spring 25 | 3.06 | —* | 3.23 |

*In Spring 24 and Spring 25, there were no Senior teacher candidates who were not Student Teaching.

Overall Observations

- Strongest performance consistently occurs in Student Teaching, particularly Spring 24 (3.55).
- Juniors show steady growth from Fall 23 (2.85) to Spring 25 (3.06), indicating growth over time for the cohort.
- Environment domain scores are consistently the highest across all semesters.
- Instructional indicators (Questioning, Academic Feedback, Problem Solving) are consistently lower than Environment and Planning indicators.

Semester-by-Semester Analysis:

| Semester | Strengths | Areas for Growth |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fall 23 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seniors strong overall (3.38). Environment indicators (Respectful Culture, Managing Behavior) consistently above 3.2. Teacher Content Knowledge is relatively strong across groups (~3.0+ for Seniors). Planning is stronger than instructional delivery for Seniors. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Juniors lower in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questioning (2.61) Academic Feedback (2.82) Problem Solving (2.56) Student Teachers struggled in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards & Objectives (2.51) Teacher Knowledge of Students (2.44) Instructional depth (Thinking/Problem Solving) inconsistent. |
| Spring 24 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear growth from Fall 23. Junior Avg increased to 3.05. Student Teaching showed strong improvement (3.55 overall). Environment extremely strong (3.95–3.97 range for ST). Instruction averages improved significantly (3.35+ for ST). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Juniors still slightly lower in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher Knowledge of Students (~2.71) Problem Solving (~2.88) Instructional differentiation and higher-level questioning remain moderate rather than high. |
| Fall 24 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Teaching remains strong (3.33). Environment continues to be highest-performing domain (3.68 ST Avg). Planning stable across levels (~3.0+). Strong Respectful Culture and Expectations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senior overall average decreased (2.99). Juniors lower in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Feedback (2.55) Knowledge of Students (2.58) Secondary and PE candidates particularly lower in instructional indicators. Problem Solving and Thinking scores remained below 2.8 for many groups. |
| Spring 25 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Junior average highest yet (3.06). Student Teaching stable (3.23). Strong Environment domain again (3.62 ST Avg). Improved Planning averages (~3.13 for Juniors). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questioning and Academic Feedback remain lowest instructional indicators (~2.7–2.9). Problem Solving remains below 2.8 for several groups. |

Analysis of the four semesters of data indicates that while candidates consistently demonstrate strengths in classroom environment and instructional planning, growth is needed in the areas of higher-order questioning, academic feedback, problem solving, differentiation, and deeper instructional rigor. In response, the EPP will implement a series of targeted, program-wide actions designed to strengthen candidate performance in these areas and promote measurable impact on student learning.

To address weaknesses in questioning and higher-order thinking, the EPP will strengthen explicit instruction in methods courses related to Bloom's Taxonomy, Webb's Depth of Knowledge, and inquiry-based instructional strategies. Candidates will be required to intentionally plan higher-order questions aligned to standards and objectives within lesson and unit plans. In-class teaching opportunities will be embedded in coursework to allow candidates to practice questioning techniques and receive structured feedback from faculty and peers.

In response to lower scores related to academic feedback, the EPP will incorporate structured assignments requiring candidates to analyze student work and provide specific feedback. Candidates will participate in guided reflection activities, including video-based self-analysis, to evaluate the effectiveness of their feedback and instructional decisions.

The EPP will also provide additional Cooperating Teacher mentoring to ensure consistency in support across placements. Professional development will be offered to Cooperating Teachers to strengthen their ability to model and coach effective questioning, feedback, and differentiation strategies.

Finally, the EPP will continue to collect and disaggregate data across semesters, candidate levels, and program areas to monitor progress and evaluate the effectiveness of implemented changes. Data will be reviewed annually by EPP faculty and the Quality Assurance Team, as well as shared with stakeholders on the Teacher Education Committee, to inform course revisions, clinical expectations, and professional development priorities.

Through these intentional, data-driven actions, the EPP aims to strengthen candidates' instructional depth, increase their ability to apply content knowledge in meaningful ways, and enhance their measurable impact on P-12 student learning while maintaining existing strengths in classroom environment and planning.