

# 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Muskingum University

---

## Institution Profile

(Data Source: Muskingum University)

The mission of Muskingum University is to offer quality academic programs in the liberal arts and sciences in the setting of a residential, coeducational, church-related college and in the context of a caring community where individual fulfillment is encouraged and human dignity is respected. Its primary purpose is to develop—intellectually, spiritually, socially and physically—whole persons, by fostering critical thinking, positive action, ethical sensitivity and spiritual growth, so that they may lead vocationally productive, personally satisfying and socially responsible lives.

## Educator Preparation Provider

Muskingum's purpose is to educate students through quality academic programs that prepare them to lead vocationally productive, personally satisfying, and socially responsible lives. The Department of Education offers a range of licensure and degree opportunities at undergraduate and graduate levels. Our faculty consists of professional educators known for teaching excellence, extensive professional experience, and innovative scholarship. For mutual benefit we work closely with LEAs, state agencies and IHEs on initiatives to enhance our programs for MU teacher and administrator candidates.

---

## Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Muskingum University

Reporting period for 9/1/2011 through 8/31/2012

(Data Source: Muskingum University)

### Description of Data:

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that teacher candidates pass Praxis II® examinations by scoring at or above the state's established required score to be recommended for licensure and receive endorsements in specific fields. The reporting for Teacher Licensure Test Scores is based on Federal Title II data and therefore reflects only initial licensure for 2011-2012. Data are not provided for additional licenses that an educator earns after her/his initial license. Individual candidates often take more than one licensure examination; the number of licensure program completers reported reflects the unduplicated number of individuals taking examinations. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals, only the N is reported.

Summary Rating: Effective		
	Completers Tested	Pass Rate Percentage
All Teacher Licensure Tests	93	100%

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs**  
**at**  
**Muskingum University**

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013  
(Data Source: Muskingum University)

**Description of Data:**

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that principal candidates pass the Praxis II® examination (0411) by scoring at or above the state's established required score to be recommended for licensure. The scores are self-reported by each institution for 2012-2013.

	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>Principal Licensure Data</b>	23	100%

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at**  
**Muskingum University**  
Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

**Description of Data:**

Ohio's value-added data system provides educators a more complete picture of student growth. As a vital component of Ohio's accountability system, districts and educators have access to an extensive array of diagnostic data through the Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS). From a state perspective, value-added data provide insights into student performance. For example, schools that do not appear to be achieving at high levels as traditionally measured can demonstrate through value-added data that many of their students are achieving significant progress. It is important to recognize these gains, as schools work to support students who have chronically struggled to perform. Student growth measures also provide students and parents with evidence of the impact of their efforts.

Limitations of the Value-Added Data:

1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012.
2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on reading and mathematics achievement tests in grades 4-8.
3. The number of teachers and principals (N) with associated value-added data remains small at this point. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals with value-added data, only the N is reported.

**Value-Added Data for Muskingum University-Prepared Teachers**

Teachers with Effective Licensure Dates 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
156	22	N = 3 % = 14	N = 0 % = 0	N = 12 % = 55	N = 4 % = 18	N = 3 % = 14

## 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Muskingum University

### Demographic Information for Schools where Muskingum University-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve

<b>Characteristic</b>						
	<b>Elementary School</b>	<b>Middle School</b>	<b>Junior High School</b>	<b>High School</b>	<b>Ungraded</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by School Level</b>	N = 10 % = 45	N = 6 % = 27	N = 2 % = 9	N = 4 % = 18	N = 0 % = 0	
	<b>Community School</b>	<b>Public School</b>	<b>STEM School</b>	<b>Educational Service Center</b>		
<b>Teachers Serving by School Type</b>	N = 1 % = 5	N = 21 % = 95	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>NR</b>
<b>Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added</b>	N = 6 % = 29	N = 0 % = 0	N = 4 % = 19	N = 3 % = 14	N = 8 % = 38	N = 0 % = 0
	<b>High Minority</b>		<b>Middle Minority</b>		<b>Low Minority</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles</b>	N = 2 % = 9		N = 9 % = 41		N = 11 % = 50	
	<b>High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-Low Poverty</b>	<b>Low Poverty</b>		
<b>Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles</b>	N = 7 % = 32	N = 10 % = 45	N = 5 % = 23	N = 0 % = 0		

\* Due to the preliminary nature of the data and staffing at ESC/district level, certain demographic variables have not been reported for some schools.

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

**Value-Added Data for Muskingum University-Prepared Principals**

Principals with Effective Licensure Dates 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	A	B	C	D	F	NR
5	5	N = 1 % = 20	N = 0 % = 0	N = 4 % = 80			

**Demographic Information for Schools where Muskingum University-Prepared Principals with Value-Added Data Serve**

<b>Characteristic</b>						
	<b>Elementary School</b>	<b>Middle School</b>	<b>Junior High School</b>	<b>High School</b>	<b>Ungraded</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Level</b>	N = 2 % = 40	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 3 % = 60	N = 0 % = 0	
	<b>Community School</b>	<b>Public School</b>	<b>STEM School</b>		<b>Educational Service Center</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Type</b>	N = 0 % = 0	N = 5 % = 100	N = 0 % = 0		N = 0 % = 0	
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>NR</b>
<b>Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School</b>	<b>NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL 2015</b>					
	<b>High Minority</b>		<b>Middle Minority</b>		<b>Low Minority</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Minority Enrollment by Tertiles</b>	N = 0 % = 0		N = 3 % = 60		N = 2 % = 40	
	<b>High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-Low Poverty</b>		<b>Low Poverty</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles</b>	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 20	N = 3 % = 60		N = 1 % = 20	

# 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Muskingum University

## Muskingum University Candidate Academic Measures

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013  
(Data Source: Muskingum University)

### Description of Data:

Educator preparation programs (EPPs) reported academic measures for students completing their teacher and principal preparation programs. Academic measures reported include assessment results for the ACT®, SAT®, Praxis I®, GRE®, and MAT®, as well as high school, undergraduate, graduate, transfer grade point average, and program admission (GPA). The Ohio Board of Regents calculated statewide weighted mean values based on the EPP-reported data. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals, only the N is reported. Academic measures which do not apply to a specific unit or program are represented by NA.

### Teacher Preparation Programs

Criterion	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
<b>U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate</b>							
	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G
Praxis I Reading	170 / 172 / 173	12 / N<10 / N<10	176.9 / N<10 / N<10	58 / N<10 / 15	175.6 / N<10 / 179.2	24 / N<10 / N<10	176 / N<10 / N<10
ACT Composite Score	21 / 21 / 21	46 / N<10 / 16	23.6 / N<10 / 23.8	140 / N<10 / 43	23.7 / N<10 / 24.1	39 / N<10 / 20	23.2 / N<10 / 23.6
Praxis I Writing	170 / 173 / 172	11 / N<10 / 13	172.9 / N<10 / 174.8	59 / N<10 / 13	173.2 / N<10 / 175.3	24 / N<10 / N<10	174.1 / N<10 / N<10
Undergraduate GPA	2.5 / 2.5 / 2.5	76 / N<10 / 52	3.27 / N<10 / 3.18	221 / N<10 / 88	3.4 / N<10 / 3.59	62 / N<10 / 33	3.48 / N<10 / 3.55
Praxis I Math	170 / 172 / 172	12 / N<10 / N<10	176.5 / N<10 / N<10	58 / N<10 / 18	176 / N<10 / 177.8	24 / N<10 / N<10	176.1 / N<10 / N<10
SAT Composite Score	990 / 990 / 990	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10
GRE Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT English Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

Criterion	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
<b>U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate</b>							
	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>
Graduate GPA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
High School GPA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Transfer GPA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
<b>MAT</b>	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis II	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
<b>Other Criteria</b>		<b>Undergraduate</b>		<b>Post-Baccalaureate</b>		<b>Graduate</b>	
Dispositional Assessment		Y		Y		Y	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview		N		N		N	
Essay		N		N		N	
High School Class Rank		N		NA		NA	
Interview		N		N		N	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		N	
Letter of Recommendation		N		Y		Y	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		NA		N		N	
Portfolio		N		N		N	
Prerequisite Courses		Y		Y		Y	
SRI Teacher Perceiver		NA		NA		N	
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship		NA		NA		N	

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Teacher Insight	NA	N	N

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

**Principal Preparation Programs**

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Criterion	Required Score	Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Graduate GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
High School GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Writing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Undergraduate GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Criterion	Required Score	Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis II	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Other Criteria</b>							
<b>Portfolio</b>				N			
<b>Interview</b>				N			
<b>Letter of Recommendation</b>				Y			
<b>Essay</b>				N			
<b>Prerequisite Courses</b>				N			
<b>Dispositional Assessment</b>				N			
<b>Letter of Commitment</b>				N			
<b>Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship</b>				N			
<b>Myers-Briggs Type Indicator</b>				N			
<b>SRI Teacher Perceiver</b>				N			
<b>Teacher Insight</b>				N			
<b>EMPATHY/Omaha Interview</b>				N			

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**Field and Clinical Experiences for Muskingum University Candidates**

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

(Data Source: Muskingum University)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio requires that teacher candidates complete field and clinical experiences in school settings as part of their preparation. These experiences include early and ongoing field-based opportunities and the culminating pre-service clinical experience commonly referred to as "student teaching." The specific requirements beyond the requisite statewide minimums for these placements vary by institution and by program. The information below is calculated based on data reported at the unit level.

**Teacher Preparation Programs**

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Muskingum University Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	97
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	179
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	12
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	99.03%

**Principal Preparation Programs**

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	40
Number of candidates admitted to internship	27
Number of candidates completing internship	27
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

# 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Muskingum University

## Teacher Pre-Service Survey Results

### Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Pre-Service Teachers as a special research project. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their student teaching experiences and collected the data for the Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013. A total of 3570 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 81 percent.

**Muskingum University Survey Response Rate = 97.37%**

**Total Survey Responses = 74**

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.52	3.49
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.55	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.45	3.39
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.48	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.48	3.40
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.62	3.53
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.58	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.59	3.47
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.63	3.52
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.58	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.43	3.35
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively,	3.52	3.51

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	and/or a whole class.		
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.37	3.33
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.56	3.50
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.57	3.44
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.69	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.56	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.64	3.57
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.53	3.41
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.69	3.63
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.44	3.33
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.56	3.42
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.50	3.43
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.15	3.15
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	3.18	3.01
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.13	2.94
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.30	3.24
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.29	3.12
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core	3.50	3.43

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	State Standards.		
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.35	2.97
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.55	3.54
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.43	3.30
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.62	3.59
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.69	3.58
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.64	3.56
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.52	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.49	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.32	3.25
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.34	3.26
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.32	3.30
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.56	3.57
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.45	3.46
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.55	3.54
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.55	3.44
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.42	3.42
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted	3.58	3.60

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b> 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	<b>State Average (Mean)</b> 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	themselves in a professional manner.		
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.45	3.32
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.28	3.18
49	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.45	3.33

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**Statewide Survey of OHIO Resident Educators' Reflections on their Educator Preparation Program**

**Description of Data:**

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Resident Educators as a special research project. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their Resident Educator experiences and collected the data for the Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	N<10	3.40
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	N<10	3.21
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	N<10	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	N<10	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	N<10	3.28
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	N<10	3.24
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	N<10	3.24
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	N<10	3.24
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	N<10	3.24
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	N<10	3.24
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	N<10	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	N<10	3.36
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	N<10	3.27
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.40

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	N<10	3.39
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.56
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	N<10	3.29
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	N<10	3.28
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	N<10	3.55
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	N<10	3.23
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	N<10	3.36
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	N<10	3.31
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	N<10	2.97
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	N<10	2.40
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	N<10	2.40
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	N<10	3.07
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	N<10	2.93
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	N<10	2.98
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	N<10	2.61
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.58
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	N<10	3.31
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective	N<10	3.58

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	educator focused on student learning.		
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.53
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	N<10	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	N<10	3.27
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	N<10	3.17
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	N<10	3.16
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	N<10	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	N<10	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	N<10	3.37
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	N<10	3.47
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	N<10	3.31
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	N<10	3.25
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	N<10	3.56
46	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.30
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	N<10	3.12
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.29
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	N<10	3.17

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**National Accreditation**

(Data Source: Ohio Board of Regents)

**Description of Data:**

Educator preparation programs (EPPs) reported academic measures for students completing their teacher and principal preparation programs. Academic measures reported include assessment results for the ACT®, SAT®, Praxis I®, GRE®, and MAT®, as well as high school, undergraduate, graduate, transfer grade point average, and program admission (GPA). The Ohio Board of Regents calculated statewide weighted mean values based on the EPP-reported data. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals, only the N is reported. Academic measures which do not apply to a specific unit or program are represented by NA.

<b>Accrediting Agency</b>	NCATE
<b>Date of Last Review</b>	November 2009
<b>Accreditation Status</b>	Accredited

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**Teacher Residency Program**

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio is a broad system of support that encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system designed to improve teacher retention and increase student learning. Data are reported for those entering the Resident Educator Program in SY2011-2012 and SY2012-2013. Non-completion does not imply dismissal, but rather may be due to multiple factors.

**Percent of Newly Hired Teachers Completing the State Residency Program**  
**who were Prepared at Muskingum University**

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing	
123	120	98%	66	64	97%						

## 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Muskingum University

---

### Excellence and Innovation Initiatives at Muskingum University

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

(Data Source: Muskingum University)

#### Description of Data:

This section provides each program the opportunity to share information on a maximum of three initiatives geared to increase excellence and support innovation in the preparation of Ohio educators.

#### Teacher Licensure Programs

<b>Initiative:</b>	Professional Development for Ohio Common Core
<b>Purpose:</b>	Partnership with Local School Districts and Muskingum University Education Department
<b>Goal:</b>	Implement new Math Common Core Standards in Education Programs and Support Local Teachers
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	500
<b>Strategy:</b>	Muskingum University Education Professor, Dr. Ky Davis, has published materials for grades K-8 plus Algebra I that address the new Ohio Math Common Core Standards. Dr. Davis has provided regional support for local teachers K-8 in mathematics instruction. Through partnerships, MU has candidates in field and student teaching placements where they use the new Common Core Tool Kits and lessons jointly developed. Dr. Davis and MU teacher candidates model lessons, activities and materials with learning targets and assessments that align with the Standards and support student success.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Common Core Mathematics Toolkits K-8; Algebra I - published; Statewide number of workshops and feedback/evaluations from workshops; Conference presentations (Southeast Ohio Appalachia from an Assets Perspective Annual Conference) by Dr. Davis and MU students
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	
<b>Initiative:</b>	Co-Teaching and District Partnerships in Science
<b>Purpose:</b>	Promote Effective Science Instruction
<b>Goal:</b>	Improve Knowledge and Skills of Veteran Teachers and MU teacher candidates
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	40
<b>Strategy:</b>	In partnership with local schools, Muskingum University, specifically Dr. Linda Rogness, Education Professor with a doctorate in chemistry has forged positive relationships that are mutually beneficial. The focus is on the implementation of the new science standards and inquiry-based instruction. Dr. Rogness and MU candidates model lessons that are highly interactive, hands-on and inquiry-based. Innovative technology including Lego MindStorm robotics are included in these lessons with local elementary students.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Local News reports and articles that highlight the positive initiative; Parent feedback, student testimonial, teacher responses, Muskingum University student feedback and evaluations; Student teacher portfolios; Key Program and Key Licensure assessments that align to science standards and MU conceptual framework; scores on Praxis II content tests

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

<b>External Recognition:</b>	West Muskingum School District recognized Dr. Rogness' contribution to Falls Elementary 4th grade Ms. Erin Burkhart's science study
<b>Programs:</b>	
<b>Initiative:</b>	Teacher Candidate Internship
<b>Purpose:</b>	Year long Internship with Local Schools to Strengthen Candidate Preparation
<b>Goal:</b>	Transition from field to clinical experience gaining confidence, knowledge and skills of MU teacher candidates
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	3
<b>Strategy:</b>	Through a TeachOhio RttT grant and partnership with the Muskingum Valley ESC, Franklin Local, Ridgewood Local and Maysville Local School Districts, three Muskingum University students are supported in a year long experience. Beginning in August 2013, three seniors have attended the orientation sessions, training and professional development at local schools. In addition to completing their final semester of coursework, these candidates will do all field hours in the same setting and complete their clinical hours (student teaching) in the partner school by the end of May 2014. This builds on the Internship partnership of 2012-2013 with three new candidates.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Contracts, agreements with local MVEsc and districts; Evaluation of teacher candidates by cooperating teachers and university supervisors; Portfolio documentation All of the 2012-2013 interns secured teaching positions fall 2013 and indicated increased confidence in the year long experience
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Muskingum University**

---

**Principal Licensure Programs**

<b>Initiative:</b>	Leveraging Local Leadership
<b>Purpose:</b>	Improve Principal Preparation to Address Current Realities
<b>Goal:</b>	Provide Relevant Preparation Program and Align with ELCC Standards
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	17
<b>Strategy:</b>	Muskingum University utilizes practicing administrators in the preparation of principal candidates. By engaging local principals and superintendents as adjuncts and mentors, the coursework and internships can provide relevant, real-world current educational climate and the challenges they will face. This ensures a more authentic preparation for the principal role. In addition, local leaders help with the development of curriculum and review course syllabi to align with the ELCC and OLAC standards.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Feedback from Principal Candidates through surveys of principal graduates; Since 2006 - spring 2013 data indicate 100% agreement with the MU principal program survey items: encourage development of shared vision; clear school goals; promote ethical standards within school and community; promote continuous improvement; equip members of education community to provide high quality standards-based instruction that results in higher levels of achievement for all students. MU - EPAT (Educator Preparation Advisory Team) analysis and support
<b>External Recognition:</b>	NCATE Board of Examiners Comments from Spring 2013 On-site Review
<b>Programs:</b>	