



## 5.4.1 TREND TRACKER

Initial and Advanced Programs

### OVERVIEW

The OBSOE Trend Tracker shows findings and adjustments over time for initial and advanced programs.

The information in the tracker comes from the Data Analysis Form, which faculty complete while working in their data teams. The form asks faculty to document findings, data analysis, and recommendations for improvement, and to note the setting where the data were reviewed, such as Data Day, Field Placement Data Day, A-TEAM meetings, faculty meetings, committee work, or stakeholder meetings. The Trend Tracker is a summary of what was entered by faculty in the form. However, faculty/ department chairs can always revisit their original form entries if needed.

The Trend Tracker is maintained by the Assistant Dean and the data manager and is shared with department chairs to support ongoing review and decision-making. It reflects data review that occurs throughout the year, not just at Data Day.

The Trend Tracker is used to track patterns over multiple years and document how the EPP responds to those patterns.

#### Standards Connection:

5.1; RA5.1; 5.3; RA 5.3; 5.4; RA 5.4

## OBSOE Trend Tracker

Program	AY	Findings	Adjustments
ESEC	2022-2023	<p>PEI and CPAST data indicated strong in establishing learning environments and professionalism, but lower performance in differentiation, monitoring student progress, and use of student work/data to inform next steps.</p> <p>Candidates often identified learner needs but relied on generic supports rather than data-driven instructional decisions.</p> <p>edTPA Task 1 and PEI results showed variability in connecting learner analysis to instructional choices, particularly for language demands and misconceptions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised PEI prompts to emphasize explicit connections between learner data and instructional supports.</li> <li>• Increased task meetings emphasis on differentiation, formative assessment, and pacing, especially in whole-group instruction.</li> <li>• Embedded case studies focused on assessment use and instructional adjustment.</li> </ul> <p>Added authentic data reports-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attended ALA conference and Conference on Assessment and grading</li> </ul> <p>Added 3 Rs book</p> <p>First year for CPAST- gathered baseline</p>
	2023-2024	<p>PEI, CPAST, and edTPA, candidates demonstrated strong developmental knowledge, positive learning environments, and improved differentiation.</p> <p>Growth observed in small-group instruction and engagement; however, whole-group engagement, of differentiation, and analysis of learner misconceptions remained inconsistent.</p> <p>Candidates identified learner needs but varied in explaining why learning difficulties occurred and how instruction should adjust.</p>	<p>Expanded learner-analysis prompts in PEI to strengthen developmental and data analysis.</p> <p>Increased seminar focus on engagement, pacing, and inclusive supports across contexts.</p> <p>Integrated SEL case studies representing.</p> <p>Provided additional modeling in small-group instruction- in literacy courses</p> <p>Attended conference on Assessment &amp; Grading.</p> <p>Added disaggregated data project</p>
	2024-2025	<p>PEI, CPAST, and edTPA data showed continued growth from midpoint to final, with improvements in differentiation, classroom climate, and instruction.</p> <p>Persistent trends included difficulty articulating how data informed instructional decisions, uneven whole-group engagement, and limited depth in academic language support and misconception analysis.</p> <p>Candidates explained <i>what</i> they were teaching more clearly than <i>how</i> and <i>why</i> instructional choices supported learning.</p>	<p>Integrated targeted instruction on academic language demands in Task groups</p> <p>More emphasis on whole-group engagement strategies, questioning, and formative assessment use.</p> <p>Invited PARCA as guest speaker</p> <p>Added lesson-analysis using real student work and misconception identification to strengthen instructional decision-making in math methods.</p> <p>Created edTPA FAQs</p> <p>Added additional text in Assessment course</p>
	2025-2026		
ELEM-CEM	2022-2023	<p>Candidates were inconsistent in alignment of standards, objectives, and lesson structure, with lower relative performance in using student work and assessment data to guide instructional next steps.</p>	<p>Faculty identified assessment as the primary growth area for the next cycle.</p> <p>Revised assignments to place greater emphasis on collecting, analyzing, and interpreting student work samples.</p>

		Candidates demonstrated strong engagement and classroom climate lesson planning but were less consistent in analyzing learner data and misconceptions, particularly during reflective components of instruction in edTPA.	Increased structured opportunities for lesson planning, standard unpacking, and peer feedback to strengthen instructional decision-making. Updated assessment directions to clarify expectations for data analysis and reflection.
	2023-2024	ELEM–CEM candidates performed consistently with ESEC peers across PEI, CFAST, and edTPA. Christian education and missions coursework added strength in cultural awareness, contextual sensitivity, and relationship-building. Areas for growth included articulating how learner data informs instructional choices, strengthening support for multilingual learners, and increasing rigor and questioning strategies to deepen student reasoning.	Integrated learner-analysis activities connecting developmental needs to cross-cultural and missions-based educational contexts. Strengthened expectations for data-driven instructional planning within methods courses and seminar. Enhanced instruction focused on linguistic diversity and culturally responsive practices, aligned with global and missions-oriented teaching contexts. Increased emphasis on questioning strategies and formative assessment use during internship.
	2024-2025	Assessment results showed clearer learner analyses, stronger alignment between learner needs and instructional supports, and continued strength in learning environments. Content knowledge remained strong in literacy and social studies, with persistent variability in mathematics and science conceptual reasoning, consistent with ESEC trends. Instructional practice improved in modeling, sequencing, and engagement; however, deeper inquiry, multi-representational modeling, and explicit use of formative data remained growth areas. Professional responsibility remained a strength, with notable development in ethical practice, reflection, and cultural humility supported by Christian education coursework.	Added learner-analysis and content-adaptation tasks in missions coursework linking global and multilingual contexts to instructional planning. Increased emphasis on conceptual reasoning in mathematics and inquiry-based science instruction across methods courses. Required stronger use of multiple representations and formative assessment checkpoints in PEI lesson designs. Expanded guided practice in family communication, collaboration with specialists, and reflective analysis of teaching decisions.
	2025-2026		
SEED	2022-2023	PEI, CFAST, and program review data showed strong engagement, classroom climate, and professionalism, with all candidates meeting or exceeding expectations across outcomes. Learner engagement and lesson structure were consistent strengths. Relative growth needs emerged in addressing individual learning differences, discipline-specific content pedagogy, and designing assessments aligned to lesson	Faculty identified content specific pedagogy as a primary growth area for the next cycle. Added instruction focused on content-specific pedagogy and academic language within secondary methods courses. Increased emphasis on assessment design and alignment in junior-level coursework. Incorporated additional tools and examples to support planning for individual learning differences.

		<p>objectives, particularly given limited pre-internship clinical experience due to COVID disruptions.</p> <p>Candidates often demonstrated content accuracy but less depth in discipline-specific academic language and pedagogy.</p>	
	2023-2024	<p>Across PEI, CPAST, ACD, and edTPA, SEED candidates demonstrated solid competence in understanding adolescent learners and creating supportive secondary learning environments.</p> <p>Clear growth from midpoint to final was observed in classroom routines, engagement, and instructional organization.</p> <p>Learner analysis was often accurate but broad, with inconsistent links between learner data and discipline-specific instructional supports.</p> <p>Content knowledge was strong overall; however, conceptual reasoning in mathematics, disciplinary rigor in social studies, and academic-language scaffolding remained uneven across content areas.</p>	<p>Revised PEI expectations to prompt explicit learner-data-to-instruction connections.</p> <p>Strengthened methods coursework to emphasize discipline-specific learner analysis, including misconceptions and academic language demands.</p> <p>Expanded focus on multilingual learners and diverse classrooms within secondary content contexts.</p> <p>Increased supervisor feedback targeting engagement strategies, questioning, and responsiveness during internship.</p>
	2024-2025	<p>PEI, CPAST, and edTPA results indicated that SEED candidates met or exceeded expectations across learner &amp; learning, content knowledge, and instructional practice. Candidates showed improved instructional sequencing, engagement routines, and responsiveness to learners across ELA, Mathematics, and Social Studies placements. Persistent growth needs included deeper analytic use of learner data, more proactive anticipation of misconceptions, greater cognitive rigor, and clearer assessment-driven instructional adjustments.</p> <p>Candidates more consistently described <i>what</i> they taught than <i>why</i> specific instructional decisions supported learning.</p>	<p>Embedded structured learner-data; instructional decision prompts into PEI templates.</p> <p>Increased expectations for discipline-specific differentiation and misconception analysis in methods and seminar.</p> <p>Strengthened seminar emphasis on formative assessment use, feedback specificity, and proactive planning.</p> <p>Added targeted activities focused on cognitive rigor, questioning strategies, and assessment-aligned lesson design across secondary content areas.</p>
	2025-2026		
EALTA	2022-2023	<p>PEI midpoint and internship data showed strong performance in learning environments, professionalism, and lesson organization, with most candidates meeting or exceeding expectations.</p> <p>Lower relative performance appeared in analysis of student work, justification of instructional decisions, and use of assessment data to plan next steps, particularly at midpoint.</p>	<p>Faculty increased explicit instruction in formative assessment, data collection, and analysis of student work.</p> <p>Added case studies and guided practice focused on interpreting assessment data and identifying next instructional steps.</p> <p>Reinforced expectations that midpoint PEI is developmental, with targeted feedback designed to support growth by internship</p>

		Candidates demonstrated accurate content knowledge but limited depth in explaining misconceptions and adjusting instruction based on evidence. COVID impacts (stamina, focus, interrupted coursework) were noted as contextual factors affecting performance.	
	2023-2024	Across PEI, CCAST, and edTPA, EALTA candidates met or exceeded benchmarks for learner & learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professionalism. Clear strengths emerged in elementary classroom management, routines, small-group instruction, literacy and math scaffolding, and rapport with students. Persistent growth needs included justifying differentiation choices, making learner data visible in planning, task rigor beyond recall, and precision of feedback. Candidates often selected appropriate strategies but struggled to articulate why those strategies aligned to learner needs.	Revised PEI templates to require explicit justification of supports tied to learner data and developmental needs. Embedded seminar modules on engagement evidence, academic language across content areas, and analysis of student work. Increased supervisor calibration to strengthen feedback on task rigor, assessment alignment, and instructional clarity. Added data-analysis activities using real student work samples.
	2024-2025	PEI, CCAST, and edTPA data showed continued strength in classroom climate, differentiation, content accuracy, and instructional organization. Growth was observed in anticipating misconceptions, use of formative assessment, and instructional pacing, particularly from midpoint to final. Ongoing trends included limited sophistication in explaining the rationale for instructional decisions, uneven culturally responsive practice, and variable flexibility during whole-group instruction. Graduate-level expectations highlighted the need for deeper professional reasoning, task rigor, and assessment-driven adjustment.	Strengthened seminar emphasis on conceptual reasoning, task rigor, and evidence-based instructional decision-making. Integrated culturally responsive practice modules into seminar and planning expectations. Added case study scenarios Enhanced PEI requirements to explicitly address Tier 1 and Tier 2 support justification and use of assessment patterns.
	2025-2026		
CALTA	2022-2023	PEI, CCAST, edTPA, and Praxis data showed 100% of candidates meeting or exceeding expectations across learner & learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility. Clear strengths in inclusive learning environments, classroom climate, differentiation awareness, and professionalism, reflecting candidates' concurrent teaching roles. Growth needs emerged in depth of content analysis, unpacking standards, maintaining high expectations for all	Faculty increased emphasis on content pedagogy and unpacking standards within planning coursework. Revised PEI directions to require deeper analysis of learner data and clearer justification of instructional decisions. Strengthened guidance on developmentally appropriate assessment design and monitoring student progress. Used cross-assessment triangulation (PEI, edTPA, Praxis, CCAST) to contextualize findings rather than relying on a single measure.

		<p>learners, and using assessment evidence to drive instructional adjustments.</p> <p>Faculty noted possible assessment fatigue on lower-stakes measures, requiring careful triangulation across assessments.</p>	
	2023-2024	<p>Across PEI, CCAST, edTPA, and Praxis II, all CALTA candidates again met or exceeded minimum and ideal targets.</p> <p>Strong performance in inclusive practices, engagement strategies, multisensory instruction, and instructional adaptability across collaborative settings.</p> <p>Persistent growth areas included raising cognitive demand, precision of academic language, higher-order questioning, and explicit connections between assessment results and next instructional steps.</p> <p>Candidates demonstrated strong competence, with opportunities to push graduate-level rigor rather than basic proficiency.</p>	<p>Updated planning-course assignments to require explicit content decomposition, identification of disciplinary big ideas, and justification of representations.</p> <p>Embedded higher-order task design and questioning strategies into methods and seminar coursework.</p> <p>Strengthened PEI and CCAST reflection prompts to require specific next steps based on learner evidence.</p> <p>Conducted supervisor calibration sessions to align expectations for content rigor, differentiation, and assessment use.</p>
	2024-2025	<p>PEI, CCAST, and edTPA data showed continued 100% proficiency, with CCAST means remaining in the upper Met/Exceeds range at midpoint and final</p> <p>Improvements observed in articulation of learner profiles, visible differentiation, academic language supports, and documentation of learning environment evidence.</p> <p>Remaining trends included over-scaffolding that limited cognitive challenge, variable depth of analytic reflection, and inconsistent evidence collection across collaborative contexts.</p> <p>Growth needs reflected depth and sophistication, not gaps in foundational competence.</p>	<p>Revised internship seminar to require Learner &amp; Learning evidence packets from multiple collaborative contexts (co-taught, pull-out, intervention).</p> <p>Added cognitive-demand checks to planning and reflection tasks to balance access and rigor.</p> <p>Strengthened seminar emphasis on assessment-driven instructional adjustments and analytic reasoning.</p> <p>Coordinated ALT-A faculty data review with EALTA and SALTA to align expectations across shared coursework and seminars</p>
	2025-2026		
SALTA	2022-2023	<p>SALTA candidates demonstrated overall proficiency across learner &amp; learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility, with all candidates completing internship and passing edTPA.</p> <p>Strengths included rapport with adolescents, classroom climate, content accuracy, and basic instructional organization.</p> <p>Areas of concern emerged in modifying instruction to meet diverse learner needs, depth of reflection, and use of assessment data to inform instructional decisions,</p>	<p>Faculty reviewed assessment timing and emphasized triangulation of evidence rather than reliance on a single measure.</p> <p>Updated assessment directions to clarify expectations for learner modification and reflective analysis.</p> <p>Increased focus on reflection quality and instructional adaptation in coursework and supervision feedback.</p>

		particularly on lower-stakes assessments. Faculty identified possible assessment fatigue and uneven effort on non-high-stakes measures, requiring triangulation across PEI, edTPA, and Praxis	
	2023-2024	Across PEI, CPAST, and edTPA, SALTA candidates met benchmarks for learner & learning, content knowledge, instructional practice, and professional responsibility. Strengths included professional conduct, classroom routines, engagement strategies, and content-area accuracy across secondary disciplines. Growth needs persisted in explicit use of learner data, subgroup differentiation, real-time instructional adjustments, and discipline-specific rigor, particularly in math and science contexts. Candidates demonstrated improvement over time but often articulated <i>what</i> occurred rather than <i>why</i> instructional decisions supported learning.	Embedded case-based seminar discussions focused on adolescent development, subgroup needs, and secondary learner profiles. Required explicit learner-data justification within PEI submissions. Expanded supervisor coaching on adaptive instruction and in-the-moment adjustments. Added discipline-specific resources addressing literacy demands, conceptual reasoning, and adolescent learning challenges.
	2024-2025	PEI, CPAST, and edTPA data indicated continued proficiency across all outcomes, with improved clarity in instructional delivery and classroom management. Content knowledge remained strong; candidates demonstrated growing use of disciplinary representations and academic language. Persistent trends included surface-level differentiation, limited higher-order questioning, variable rigor of tasks, and inconsistent translation of formative assessment into instructional adjustments. Professional responsibility remained a strength, with growth needed in depth of reflection, leadership initiative, and confidence in challenging conversations.	Strengthened seminar emphasis on learner-data analysis, subgroup supports, and culturally responsive practice in secondary contexts. Increased expectations for rigorous disciplinary task design and higher-order questioning. Required candidates to rehearse content-specific explanations and feedback strategies using student work. Expanded structured reflection prompts to require specific, data-informed professional next steps.
	2025-2026		
MSE-IL/18 Hour	2022-2023	MSE-IL candidates demonstrated 100% proficiency across data literacy, research methodology, and collaborative leadership, primarily evidenced through the Capstone Project. Strengths included use of multiple data sources, alignment of research to authentic school problems, and completion of action plans with timelines and responsibilities. Faculty identified a clear growth need in communicating data and findings to stakeholders, particularly families	Identified the need to revise the Capstone Project to strengthen expectations for stakeholder communication. Began discussions to incorporate broader stakeholder input into leadership projects. Data communication as a priority area. Recognized need for a more formalized internship assessment Began work researching dispositions instruments. Began researching how to embed budget emphasis in key assessments

		and non-educator audiences. Collaboration was present but largely internal (teachers and administrators), with limited external stakeholder engagement.	
	2023-2024	Across PBL, Action Research, and ACD, all MSE-IL candidates met or exceeded targets for data literacy, research use, and collaboration. Candidates demonstrated accurate interpretation of school-level data and logical alignment between findings and proposed improvement actions. Improvements were noted in root-cause analysis, but some projects relied heavily on single data sources or provided surface-level limitations analysis. Communication of data was effective with educators but less accessible for families or community partners.	Embedded data driven instruction in coursework. Revised PBL and AR templates to require multi-source data use and clearer justification of conclusions. Introduced family project to model accessible communication. Finalized Leadership portfolio & SILIE Gathered input from P-12 partners on all key assessments ACD finalized and piloted Leadership portfolio canvas course is piloted
	2024-2025	MSE-IL candidates continued to demonstrate strong school-level leadership competence, meeting both minimum and ideal targets across outcomes. Clear gains were observed in triangulating multiple data sources, aligning findings to school improvement priorities, and professional, ethical data use. Research showed stronger methodological alignment, though depth was limited Collaboration remained a strength, with candidates increasingly facilitating PLCs and school teams, but family and community engagement remained inconsistent.	Added requirements for stakeholder communication artifacts (e.g., family comm, summaries). Integrated expectations requiring candidates to lead at least one collaborative activity. Strengthened rubric language to emphasize actionability, communication clarity, and leadership initiative.
	2025-2026		
Ed.S-IL	2022-2023	Ed.S. candidates demonstrated 100% proficiency in data literacy, research methodology, and analytic reasoning across Action Research, Problem-Based Learning, and School Budget assessments. Candidates showed strong command of fiscal analysis, mixed-methods reasoning, and ethical data use, including accurate use of state budgeting codes and resource allocation models. Collaboration and internal communication were strengths; however, faculty identified a gap in community communication and dissemination of complex data and budget narratives. Growth needs centered on translating technical analyses	Revised School Budget assessment to require two budget scenarios (school-level and system-level) Identified the need to integrate communication strategies into leadership coursework. Began planning for stakeholder communication. Added character crosswalk standards to coursework

		for non-technical audiences and marketing improvement initiatives to stakeholders beyond school leadership teams.	
	2023-2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across Data Literacy, Research &amp; Methodological Expertise, and Collaborative Leadership, all Ed.S. candidates again met or exceeded targets.</li> <li>• Candidates demonstrated advanced district-level thinking, including multi-school data analysis, nuanced interpretation of limitations, and evidence-based leadership judgments.</li> <li>• Research products showed strong methodological rigor and alignment to district improvement priorities.</li> <li>• Persistent growth needs remained in public-facing dissemination, storytelling with data, and strategic communication for families and community groups rather than internal leadership audiences only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed plans to embed stakeholder-facing communication products into Action Research and PBL (e.g., data briefs, summaries, presentations).</li> <li>• Planned creation of standardized communication templates to support clarity and accessibility.</li> <li>• Increased expectations for explicit budget/resource implications in all leadership narratives.</li> <li>• Identified district mentor feedback as a needed data source for evaluating communication effectiveness.</li> </ul>
	2024-2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ed.S. candidates continued to demonstrate advanced proficiency across all outcomes, including sophisticated data triangulation, research design, and collaborative leadership behaviors.</li> <li>• Candidates effectively used quantitative and qualitative data, budget information, and organizational context to inform district-level decision-making.</li> <li>• Collaboration within schools and districts was strong, with increased leadership initiative in facilitating teams.</li> <li>• Ongoing trends included limited community-facing dissemination, uneven integration of budget implications into public narratives, and opportunities to strengthen structured facilitation across broader stakeholder groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented required community-facing data communication artifacts within Action Research or PBL.</li> <li>• Added instruction on accessible data visualization and translating technical analysis into infographics and briefs.</li> <li>• Required explicit budget and resource narratives in all improvement plans.</li> <li>• Expanded expectations for collaboration beyond internal teams, including families and community organizations, supported by district mentor feedback.</li> </ul>
	2025-2026		

## General Findings

Field Placement Data Day	2022-2023	<p>Faculty and P-12 partners identified a consistent drop in candidate performance from Placement I to Placement II, particularly in instructional strategies and assessment use.</p> <p>Candidates often self-rated lower than supervisors and cooperating teachers, suggesting gaps in self-efficacy and reflective confidence.</p> <p>Cooperating teachers requested clearer expectations, easier access to resources, and more structured mentor support, especially for newer mentors.</p>	<p>Created and launched external Canvas courses for cooperating teachers and supervisors (Fall 2022).</p> <p>Piloted a refresher seminar between Placement I and II focused on instructional strategies and assessment design.</p> <p>Strengthened triangulation of candidate self-assessment, supervisor feedback, and CPAST data to inform support decisions.</p> <p>Began intentional documentation of partner feedback for follow-up in subsequent years.</p>
--------------------------	-----------	---	---

		COVID-related disruptions resulted in some candidates entering internship with reduced pre-internship field experience, impacting readiness.	
	2023-2024	Data across CFAST, edTPA, dispositions, and first-year teacher surveys indicated strong overall preparation, with growth needs in classroom environment, initiative, and use of statewide assessment data. Candidates demonstrated professionalism and preparedness but sometimes waited for direction rather than acting proactively in classrooms. Faculty identified specific edTPA task patterns (Tasks 2 & 3) that required targeted instructional support. Family engagement was identified as uneven across programs and placements.	Launched targeted edTPA task-focused seminars emphasizing student learning and content integration. Embedded real student data and statewide assessment reports into coursework and seminars. Expanded family engagement assignments across all initial programs (including secondary and ALTA). Integrated leadership and initiative expectations into early field experiences and seminars.
	2024-2025	Faculty and partners identified candidate persistence and resilience as a growing area of concern, prompted by a small number of early-career attrition cases. CFAST and disposition data highlighted the need for stronger formative assessment practices, explicit instruction, and alignment between coursework and Placement II expectations. Variability was noted in how cooperating teachers delivered feedback and interpreted expectations. Candidates continued to demonstrate strong professionalism, but realistic self-assessment and stamina needed reinforcement	Developed and distributed a 1-page Cooperating Teacher Expectations Overview. Streamlined Canvas field modules and documentation for clarity and accessibility. Embedded formative assessment strategies, modeling, and checks for understanding into lesson templates and seminars. Required mid-placement reflection on disposition feedback and increased calibration training for faculty, CTs, and supervisors.
QAS	2022-2023	The EPP collected substantial assessment and survey data, but access and visibility were uneven, with data housed across multiple platforms (e.g., Teams, individual drives). Faculty primarily engaged with data during Data Day, with limited ongoing access or follow-up during the academic year. Candidate progress monitoring occurred, but processes varied by program, making cross-program tracking and early intervention less efficient. Advanced programs lacked a centralized mechanism comparable to BAPE for tracking completion of non-course-embedded requirements (e.g., internships, practica).	Began formal review of QAS structure and identification of gaps in accessibility and consistency. Initiated conversations around centralized data access, standardized tracking, and predictable review cycles. Identified need to strengthen candidate progression monitoring across both initial and advanced programs.

	2023-2024	<p>Faculty and leadership identified the need for greater transparency and alignment across programs, particularly related to key assessments, timing, and evidence location.</p> <p>Preparation for ALSDE review highlighted inconsistencies in curriculum documentation, field placement descriptions, and standards crosswalks.</p> <p>Data review structures existed but were not always systematic or predictable, limiting follow-through on findings.</p> <p>Advanced program candidates completed requirements successfully, but tracking was fragmented when assessments were not tied to a specific course</p>	<p>Developed program-level assessment matrices listing key assessments, timing, rubrics, and data locations.</p> <p>Updated and clarified the Field Placement Scope and Sequence to improve alignment and consistency.</p> <p>Established departmental repositories with shared syllabi, course descriptions, standards alignments, and field materials.</p> <p>Formalized predictable A-TEAM agendas to ensure regular review of candidate progression data.</p> <p>Created One Stop docs for faculty across all programs</p>
	2024-2025	<p>With improved structures in place, faculty could more clearly identify cross-cutting trends (e.g., data use, differentiation, communication, candidate persistence)</p> <p>Standing committees (e.g., diversity and technology) proved effective but needed clear charge and routine access to relevant data. Candidate communication and tracking improved, yet faculty noted the need for even more streamlined, centralized systems to support efficiency and follow-up.</p> <p>Advanced programs required parity with initial programs in tracking and evidence management.</p>	<p>Expanded the role of Diversity and Technology Committees to conduct focused data reviews and make recommendations.</p> <p>Strengthened and expanded BAPE as a centralized hub for candidate tracking and communication.</p> <p>Created Canvas portfolio courses for advanced programs to centralize assessments, rubrics, and requirements.</p> <p>Updated calibration trainings and “look-for” documents following technical studies of key assessments.</p>
	2025	<p>The EPP reached a point where the primary need was intentional use of data throughout the year, not just collection.</p> <p>Faculty and leadership emphasized the importance of seeing data in context, across programs and time, to support decision-making.</p> <p>The QAS required tools that made data easier to access, easier to interpret, and easier to act on across roles.</p>	<p>Implemented a robust interactive assessment calendar identifying when data are collected, cleaned, reviewed, and discussed.</p> <p>Launched a centralized online data dashboard housing key assessment and survey results alongside essential forms and documentation.</p> <p>Continued refinement of shared tools to support systematic review, follow-up, and continuous improvement across initial and advanced programs.</p>
Stakeholder Findings/ Recommendations	2022-2023	<p>Stakeholder feedback across advisory boards and clinical partners indicated a need for clearer and more consistent expectations for clinical roles, observation processes, and feedback mechanisms. Variability was noted in how cooperating teachers and supervisors interpreted assessment criteria and observation tools. Stakeholders emphasized the importance of more systematic</p>	<p>The EPP formalized Field Placement Data Day as an annual, structured review process with documented analysis and action steps. Key assessment tools and observation protocols were reviewed and clarified in collaboration with P-12 partners. Standardized forms and tracking mechanisms were implemented to capture stakeholder input and resulting actions consistently across the EPP.</p>

		documentation of feedback and follow-up actions to ensure input meaningfully informed improvement efforts.	
	2023-2024	Ongoing stakeholder engagement confirmed strong partnerships and meaningful collaboration, while also highlighting the need for greater alignment between coursework, clinical experiences, and state initiatives (e.g., Literacy and Numeracy Acts). Stakeholders noted the importance of calibration among clinical educators to ensure consistent expectations and feedback. Praxis performance data revealed content areas requiring coordinated response across academic units.	The EPP expanded interdisciplinary collaboration through the Praxis Improvement Team to address identified content gaps. Coursework and clinical expectations were revised to better reflect state priorities. Mentor teacher and supervisor resources were updated and clarified to support more consistent feedback and evaluation practices.
	2024-2025	Analysis of stakeholder engagement records showed increased frequency and consistency of partner involvement, with recurring themes related to candidate communication, professional responsibilities, and leadership capacity. Stakeholders expressed a desire to move beyond feedback toward deeper co-construction of learning experiences and professional development. Data also pointed to the value of structured communication scenarios for both initial and advanced candidates	Faculty revised assignments and seminars to incorporate simulations, case studies, and applied communication tasks. Clinical walkthrough protocols and supervisor support structures were piloted and refined based on partner input. Practitioner-authored Commitment-based resources were adopted to embed stakeholder voice directly into coursework and professional learning.
Clinical Task Force	2022-2023	Review of field placement evaluations, candidate feedback, and partner input indicated strong professionalism and commitment among candidates, but emerging concerns related to candidate initiative, reflective depth, instructional autonomy, and preparedness for the realities of early-career teaching. Early indicators suggested that some candidates entered internship and the profession with limited resilience and realistic expectations, influenced in part by COVID-disrupted clinical experiences.	Faculty began examining patterns across field placement evaluations and partner feedback rather than isolated incidents. Data review protocols were refined to emphasize triangulation across clinical evaluations, surveys, and dispositions. Initial conversations began regarding alignment of clinical experiences to national expectations and the need for clearer clinical scaffolding.
	2023-2024	Persistence data revealed a small but significant number of completers leaving the profession mid-year, prompting concern despite historically strong retention. Clinical partners and administrators reported emotional overwhelm, classroom management challenges, and lack of first-year support as contributing factors. Data Day and advisory board input reinforced the need to examine clinical preparation through the lens of transition into teaching, not just program completion.	The EPP convened a Clinical Task Force to conduct a focused, cross-role review of persistence data, clinical structures, and partner feedback. Clinical experiences were examined against ATE Clinical Practice Standards. Field Placement Scope and Sequence and Clinical Expectations were reviewed and revised to improve clarity, consistency, and alignment with current school contexts.
	2024-2025	Continued analysis confirmed strengths in candidate professionalism and instructional foundations, alongside	The EPP implemented targeted revisions to clinical preparation, including clearer professional expectations, enhanced seminars, and calibrated supervision practices.

		<p>persistent trends related to initiative, formative assessment use, classroom management, reflective practice, and dispositional demands of teaching. Stakeholders emphasized the need for structured induction supports beyond graduation. Closing-the-loop analysis showed increased coherence in data review processes, but highlighted the importance of acting on findings related to early-career persistence.</p>	<p>Based on Clinical Task Force recommendations, the EPP began designing a structured first-year teacher support system, including alumni mentoring and communication supports. Data review processes were strengthened to ensure findings informed both immediate adjustments and longer-term system design.</p>
Initial ACD	2022-2023	<p>Initial administration of the Candidate Dispositions Self-Assessment revealed consistent patterns across programs in candidates' self-perceptions. Candidates rated themselves strongest in Commitment to Professional Ethics and Commitment to Collaboration, while Commitment to Learning and Commitment to Professional Growth emerged as the lowest self-rated commitments. Findings indicated that candidates often valued professionalism and relationships but had more difficulty articulating ongoing learning, initiative, and use of feedback for improvement.</p>	<p>The EPP formalized the midpoint dispositions self-assessment process and required all candidates to develop a Professional Learning Plan (PLP) based on their results. Faculty mentors were designated to meet individually with candidates to review PLPs and identify targeted growth actions prior to internship. Aggregated results were reviewed to inform calibration and support needs.</p>
	2023-2024	<p>Aggregated self-assessment data continued to show stable strengths in Ethics and Collaboration and persistent growth needs in Learning and Professional Growth across cohorts. Variation across programs confirmed that these patterns reflected system-level developmental needs, not isolated program issues. Analysis also indicated that some candidates struggled to translate reflection into concrete action steps without structured guidance.</p>	<p>Faculty integrated guided reflection prompts and modeled use of feedback within methods courses and seminars. The EPP strengthened connections between dispositions language and clinical expectations, ensuring candidates encountered the Eight Commitments consistently across coursework, field experiences, and feedback conversations. Dispositions data were used to inform faculty calibration discussions.</p>
	2024-2025	<p>Review of dispositions self-assessment data alongside clinical evaluations highlighted alignment between lower self-ratings in Learning and Professional Growth and observed needs related to initiative, reflective depth, and persistence. While candidates demonstrated professionalism and ethical behavior, findings suggested that developing habits of continuous improvement required more explicit scaffolding.</p>	<p>The EPP clarified developmental expectations for dispositions by updating the Look-For Document to be more growth-oriented. Faculty emphasized continuity between the midpoint PLP and the internship CPAST-based Professional Learning Plan, reinforcing dispositions as a developmental progression rather than a one-time check. Targeted supports were designed to strengthen habits of reflection, feedback use, and professional learning.</p>
Advanced ACD	2022-2023	<p>Initial administration of the Advanced Dispositions Self-Assessment established a baseline across advanced programs. Candidates consistently rated themselves</p>	<p>Faculty clarified expectations for advanced dispositions by explicitly aligning reflections and mentoring conversations to the Six Commitments of Educational Leaders. Reflection prompts within Action Research and PBL were revised to require explicit</p>

		strongest in Commitment to Professional Relationships, Commitment to Professional Ethics and Norms, and Commitment to Character. Relative growth needs emerged in Commitment to Equity and Commitment to Effective Communication, particularly in articulating how leadership decisions addressed systemic inequities and how complex information was communicated to diverse stakeholder groups.	attention to equity, ethical implications, and leadership communication. Dispositions data were reviewed in aggregate to inform faculty mentoring approaches.
	2023-2024	Aggregated beginning and completion self-assessment data indicated growth across all six commitments, with the most notable gains in Professional Relationships and Ethics and Norms. Patterns persisted in Equity and Effective Communication, where candidates demonstrated commitment in principle but varied in their ability to operationalize these commitments in leadership practice. Differences across programs confirmed these were developmental leadership patterns, not isolated issues.	Faculty strengthened mentoring structures by requiring candidates to connect dispositions reflections to specific leadership actions within their school or district contexts. Action Research and PBL requirements were adjusted to include explicit discussion of equity considerations and stakeholder communication strategies. Advanced dispositions data were incorporated into Data Day discussions for calibration and follow-up.
	2024-2025	Review of dispositions data alongside leadership performance assessments (PBL, Action Research, ACD) showed strong alignment between self-reported strengths in ethics and relationships and observed leadership behaviors. Continued growth needs were evident in making equity visible in decision-making, communicating data and improvement plans to non-technical audiences, and documenting professional growth beyond program requirements.	The EPP refined the Advanced Dispositions Self-Assessment process to strengthen accuracy and usability. Planned enhancements included calibration training for candidates and mentors, clearer differentiation between beginning and completion self-assessments, and improved survey structure to support data integrity. Faculty increased emphasis on stakeholder-facing communication artifacts and equity-focused leadership narratives