

2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report University of Dayton

Institution Profile

(Data Source: University of Dayton)

The University of Dayton (UD) is a private institution founded by the Society of Mary (the Marianists), a Roman Catholic teaching order. The University of Dayton is a research intensive doctoral degree granting university, listed in the top 100 research universities in the United States. It is a Catholic university located in an urban setting. The University is also a community that looks beyond itself by rendering public service, a community of servant leaders from the President to the candidates, able to connect scholarship and learning with leadership and service.

School of Education and Health Sciences

The School of Education and Health Sciences (SEHS) consists of the Teacher Education Department, Health and Sports Science, Educational Leadership, Counselor Education, Doctor of Physical Therapy, and Physician Assistant's Program. As appropriate, each of these programs/departments are recognized by the proper accrediting body.

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at University of Dayton

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

(Data Source: University of Dayton)

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	237	99%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs
at
University of Dayton

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

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.

	Completers Tested	Pass Rate Percentage
Principal Licensure Data	55	98%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at
University of Dayton
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 University of Dayton-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
187	40	N = 11 % = 28	N = 6 % = 15	N = 13 % = 33	N = 3 % = 8	N = 7 % = 18

2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report University of Dayton

Demographic Information for Schools where University of Dayton-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve

Characteristic						
	Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	Ungraded	
Teachers Serving by School Level	N = 16 % = 40	N = 14 % = 35	N = 4 % = 10	N = 5 % = 13	N = 1 % = 3	
	Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center		
Teachers Serving by School Type	N = 5 % = 13	N = 34 % = 87	N = 1 % = 3	N = 0 % = 0		
	A	B	C	D	F	NR
Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added	N = 14 % = 35	N = 2 % = 5	N = 8 % = 20	N = 2 % = 5	N = 14 % = 35	N = 0 % = 0
	High Minority		Middle Minority		Low Minority	
Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 14 % = 35		N = 23 % = 58		N = 3 % = 8	
	High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty		
Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 16 % = 40	N = 10 % = 25	N = 5 % = 13	N = 9 % = 23		

* 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
University of Dayton

Value-Added Data for University of Dayton-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
50	49	N = 12 % = 24	N = 6 % = 12	N = 5 % = 10	N = 3 % = 6	N = 11 % = 22	N = 12 % = 24

Demographic Information for Schools where University of Dayton-Prepared Principals with Value-Added Data Serve

Characteristic						
	Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	Ungraded	
Principals Serving by School Level	N = 28 % = 57	N = 5 % = 10	N = 2 % = 4	N = 14 % = 29	N = 0 % = 0	
	Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center		
Principals Serving by School Type	N = 1 % = 2	N = 48 % = 98	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0		
	A	B	C	D	F	NR
Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School	NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL 2015					
	High Minority	Middle Minority		Low Minority		
Principals Serving by School Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 7 % = 15	N = 29 % = 60		N = 12 % = 25		
	High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty		
Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 13 % = 27	N = 8 % = 16	N = 14 % = 29	N = 14 % = 29		

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

University of Dayton Candidate Academic Measures

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

(Data Source: University of Dayton)

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
U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate							
	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G
ACT Composite Score	24 / NA / NA	181 / NA / NA	25 / NA / NA	622 / NA / NA	24.9 / NA / NA	143 / NA / NA	23.8 / NA / NA
Praxis I Reading	173 / NA / NA	181 / NA / NA	175.3 / NA / NA	622 / NA / NA	174.9 / NA / NA	143 / NA / NA	177 / NA / NA
SAT Composite Score	1110 / NA / NA	181 / NA / NA	1116 / NA / NA	622 / NA / NA	1158 / NA / NA	143 / NA / NA	1166 / NA / NA
Praxis I Math	173 / NA / NA	181 / NA / NA	177.5 / NA / NA	622 / NA / NA	177 / NA / NA	143 / NA / NA	177 / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	173 / NA / NA	181 / NA / NA	174.9 / NA / NA	622 / NA / NA	174.6 / NA / NA	143 / NA / NA	175.2 / NA / NA
Undergraduate GPA	2.5 / 2.75 / 2.75	181 / 34 / 34	3.59 / 3.95 / 3.95	622 / 72 / 72	3.5 / 3.8 / 3.8	143 / 50 / 50	3.66 / 3.86 / 3.86
Transfer GPA	2.75 / NA / NA	42 / NA / NA	3 / NA / NA	127 / NA / NA	3.8 / NA / NA	35 / NA / NA	3.66 / 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 / 156 / 156	NA / 34 / 34	NA / 169 / 169	NA / 72 / 72	NA / 169 / 169	NA / 50 / 50	NA / 169 / 169
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 Verbal 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
University of Dayton

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
U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate							
	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G
ACT English 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
High School GPA	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
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 Verbal Subscore	NA / 149 / 149	NA / 34 / 34	NA / 152 / 152	NA / 72 / 72	NA / 151 / 151	NA / 50 / 50	NA / 150 / 150
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
MAT	NA / 396 / 396	NA / 34 / 34	NA / 405 / 405	NA / 72 / 72	NA / 422 / 422	NA / 50 / 50	NA / 408 / 408
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / 4 / 4	NA / 34 / 34	NA / 4 / 4	NA / 72 / 72	NA / 4 / 4	NA / 50 / 50	NA / 4 / 4
Graduate GPA	NA / NA / 3	NA / NA / 34	NA / NA / 3.95	NA / NA / 72	NA / NA / 3.8	NA / NA / 50	NA / NA / 3.86
Other Criteria		Undergraduate		Post-Baccalaureate		Graduate	
Dispositional Assessment		N		N		N	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview		N		N		N	
Essay		N		Y		Y	
High School Class Rank		N		NA		NA	
Interview		Y		Y		Y	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		N	
Letter of Recommendation		Y		Y		Y	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		NA		N		N	
Portfolio		N		N		N	
Prerequisite Courses		N		N		N	
SRI Teacher Perceiver		NA		NA		N	
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship		NA		NA		N	

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis II	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
High School GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Undergraduate GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	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 Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

		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 Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Writing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Graduate GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Criteria							
Portfolio				N			
Interview				N			
Letter of Recommendation				N			
Essay				N			
Prerequisite Courses				Y			
Dispositional Assessment				N			
Letter of Commitment				N			
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship				N			
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator				N			
SRI Teacher Perceiver				N			
Teacher Insight				N			
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview				N			

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

Field and Clinical Experiences for University of Dayton Candidates

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

(Data Source: University of Dayton)

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	University of Dayton Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	150
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	320
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	15
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	98.63%

Principal Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	36
Number of candidates admitted to internship	102
Number of candidates completing internship	63
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	61.76%

**2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton**

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.

University of Dayton Survey Response Rate = 100%

Total Survey Responses = 200

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.	3.66	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.	3.47	3.39
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.58	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.54	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.	3.70	3.53
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.67	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.64	3.47
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.67	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.	3.63	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.45	3.35
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively,	3.65	3.51

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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.	3.43	3.33
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.58	3.50
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.64	3.44
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.71	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.64	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.67	3.57
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.57	3.41
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.73	3.63
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.41	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.	3.51	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).	3.36	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.	3.19	3.01
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.04	2.94
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.48	3.24
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.33	3.12
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core	3.60	3.43

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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.	3.19	2.97
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.66	3.54
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.50	3.30
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.69	3.59
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.66	3.58
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.62	3.56
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.56	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.54	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.40	3.25
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.40	3.26
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.38	3.30
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.64	3.57
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.58	3.46
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.65	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.	3.53	3.42
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted	3.68	3.60

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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
	themselves in a professional manner.		
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.44	3.32
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.32	3.18
49	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.46	3.33

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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.	3.71	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.	3.47	3.21
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.41	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.47	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.47	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.	3.41	3.24
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.41	3.24
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.41	3.24
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.41	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.	3.41	3.24
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.35	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.35	3.36
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.18	3.27
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.29	3.40

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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.	3.65	3.39
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.76	3.56
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.53	3.29
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.35	3.28
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.53	3.55
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.12	3.23
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.59	3.36
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.35	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).	3.06	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.	2.41	2.40
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.41	2.40
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.35	3.07
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.24	2.93
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.24	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.	2.88	2.61
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.53	3.58
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.24	3.31
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective	3.53	3.58

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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).	3.65	3.53
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.65	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.24	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.29	3.27
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.41	3.17
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.41	3.16
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.35	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.53	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.41	3.37
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.65	3.47
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.47	3.31
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.41	3.25
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.53	3.56
46	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.41	3.30
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.24	3.12
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.35	3.29
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.47	3.17

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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.

Accrediting Agency	NCATE
Date of Last Review	September 2009
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

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 University of Dayton

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing	
173	170	98%	83	81	98%						

2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report University of Dayton

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives at University of Dayton

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

(Data Source: University of Dayton)

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

Initiative:	The Intercultural Action Plan (ICAP)
Purpose:	To Increase the Intercultural Competence of Early Childhood Teacher Candidates
Goal:	To engage our candidates in activities that will raise their intercultural competence through interactions with children and families of diverse cultures and/or those living in poverty.
Number of Participants:	68
Strategy:	UD is committed to social justice and an educational experience for all students that leads to intercultural competence. The early childhood program has been intentional in developing a course of study that includes a cohesive curriculum related to diversity, inclusion and intercultural competence. The program includes multiple experiences with diverse children and families as well as opportunities for the critical reflection needed to develop an expanded world view which is the basis for the intercultural competence required of effective early childhood professionals in the 21st century. At the beginning of the sophomore year, the candidates complete the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), they then development the ICAP where the students are asked to describe the experiences that they plan to include (required and optional) in their 4 year program to expand their worldview and develop intercultural competence. They are required to state anticipated outcomes and identify what they expect to get out of the experiences.. A posttest of retaking the IDI documents growth in the candidates Intercultural Competence
Demonstration of Impact:	While we have not been giving the IDI for enough years to compare the same students, our data does show that since we started the ICAP, we are showing a slight increase in scores on the IDI for our recently graduated seniors (2013), from the scores we received from the seniors of 2012.
External Recognition:	The IDI is a nationally recognized valid and reliable assessment of intercultural sensitivity. It is used in k-12 education, business and higher education. The ICAP has been presented to the UD Diversity Committee, the School of Business Administration, and the UD Assessment Committee.
Programs:	
Initiative:	Urban Teacher Academy
Purpose:	The University of Dayton Urban Teacher Academy (UTA) is a specialized program for pre-service teachers who have an interest in urban teaching. Students are traditional undergraduate students who have
Goal:	To increase the number of teacher education graduates teaching in urban school districts. To have 50% or more of UTA grads remain teaching in urban districts for 3 or more years
Number of Participants:	44

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

Strategy:	The academy concept addresses the most critical dimensions of the problem: • Identifying pre-service teachers most likely to succeed in an urban school district. • Providing them specialized training. • Pairing them with successful mentor teachers who can help them cope with the challenges of teaching in today's urban classroom. In our enmeshed program, students are selected using elements of the Haberman Star Teacher interview protocol. Students interested in participating submit a formal application along with an essay and personal recommendations and undergo a formal interview. UTA students are placed with mentors who are committed to urban environments and believe in the success of urban learners. Once students are admitted to the Urban Teacher Academy (UTA), they are placed in a cohort, given placements in urban schools and assigned to highly qualified veteran teachers who work at the assigned schools. All the students attend university-recognized transcribed courses and urban professional seminars each semester to build their knowledge about urban environments.
Demonstration of Impact:	• Since 2001, teacher education grads teaching in urban districts has increased from 13 to 64% • A total of 108 students have completed the program. Seventy percent of the graduates continue to teach in urban districts after three years of professional experience.
External Recognition:	Successful students are given priority on job placements within the Dayton Public Schools. A contract between the University of Dayton and the Dayton Public Schools assures graduates an opportunity to secure a teaching position within the district after graduation.
Programs:	Priority also extends to participants of the University of Dayton's urban Catholic Lalanne Program.
Initiative:	Woodrow Wilson Fellows Program
Purpose:	To graduate STEM content specialists in mathematics and science with Adolescence to Young Adult licensure in mathematics or science content and a masters degree in education
Goal:	To graduate AYA teachers in mathematics and science who will work in critical urban or rural high needs high schools providing high quality education to those students
Number of Participants:	11
Strategy:	The creators of the Woodrow Wilson Fellows Program at UD created an intense one year program that is clinically-based. Fellows are required to take courses on pedagogy, diverse student populations, and research. The fellows are placed in urban or rural high needs schools at the start of the program with an experienced mentor. They learn in the actual environment that they will be teaching in the next year. The highly experienced mentors share pedagogical and behavioral techniques that engage and help the students achieve. The mentors co-teach in the fall to prepare the fellows for solo teaching in the spring semester. The program begins in the summer with work in classrooms, courses focused on diverse student learners and research methods. Classes focus on pedagogical methods in their specific content field, urban teaching, and content focused reading and pedagogical skills. This model is followed each semester with increasing hours and responsibility. A final course on constructing research produces a research paper using data collected during student teaching that qualifies them for the Master's degree.
Demonstration of Impact:	Ten of the 11 fellows in the program graduated and were hired to teach in urban, high need school Districts, with several teaching in Dayton Public Schools. One fellow had grave health problems and is completing the program this year. All fellows passed Praxis II in their content areas. Their Five Lesson Unit completed in the fall semester had one element that required the fellows to pre-test their students, teach five days of a unit of content, post- test to provide evidence as to their skill as teachers. Each of those assessments provided evidence that the Fellows did improve student achievement. The WWF program at UD graduated 10 very skilled high school teachers in mathematics and the sciences.

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

External Recognition:	The WWF program at UD has been verbally recognized by the state as successfully producing urban teachers
Programs:	

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
University of Dayton

Principal Licensure Programs

Initiative:	Advance International and Intercultural Engagement
Purpose:	Improve/increase access to University supports for racially and ethnically diverse international students
Goal:	International Engagement
Number of Participants:	37
Strategy:	During the reporting period, the Department of Educational Leadership (EDA) has noticed an increase in international students in some of our classes; 37 of 58 students in three classes are international students. Specifically, the students' command of English language and required APA format varies. EDA faculty are committed to success of all of our students and have recently made adjustments and adaptations to our teaching methods in order to provide foundational background information and experiences (i.e., with basics of APA format) to address some identified student needs during classes, making outside-of-class arrangements as appropriate and requested by students. The faculty members have explored and identified University supports that have been suggested to students beyond the support of individual faculty members.
Demonstration of Impact:	Identified faculty members have increased their hours of faculty and student contact outside of actual class time (by two to three times of the past contact hours). The contact hours have been both in person (increased office visits) and online with students sharing drafts of completed work, the faculty member making revisions and returning the work to students prior to the final due dates. Selected faculty members have also participated in expanded training opportunities related to international students.
External Recognition:	
Programs:	