2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

Cedarville University

Report Overview

To continuously improve the quality of educator preparation programs in Ohio, H.B. 1 of the 128th General Assembly directed the Chancellor of the Board of Regents to develop a system for evaluating Ohio's educator preparation programs and holding institutions of higher education accountable for their graduates' success. H.B. 290 of the 128th General Assembly provided for the sharing of data between the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education to link the performance of educators to the institutions that prepared them.

The identification of metrics and the report format were developed in collaboration with representatives from the 13 public and 38 private educator preparation providers in Ohio, as well as state agencies, and organizations. The Board of Regents works with the Ohio Department of Education and educator preparation programs to collect data on the following identified preparation metrics for the annual reports:

- Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Program Completers
- Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Program Completers
- edTPA™ Results for Program Completers
- Licensure Test Results for Program Completers
- Value-added Data (EVAAS) for K-12 Students Taught by Program Completers
- Candidate Academic Measures
- Field/Clinical Experiences
- Pre-Service Teacher Candidate Survey Results
- Resident Educator Survey Results
- Resident Educator Persistence Data
- Excellence and Innovation Initiatives
- National Accreditation

Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at Cedarville University

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

Description of Data:
Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a rich and detailed view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement. The system is research-based and designed to be transparent, fair, and adaptable to the specific contexts of Ohio's districts. Furthermore, it builds on what educators know about the importance of ongoing assessment and feedback as a powerful vehicle to support improved practice. Teacher performance and student academic growth are the two key components of Ohio's evaluation system.

Limitations of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Data:
1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.
2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education based on the original framework of 50 percent teacher evaluation and 50 percent student growth measure.
3. The number of teachers (N) with associated OTES data remains small at this point, and due to Ohio Revised Code, must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers.

Effective Licensure Year	Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications			
	# Ineffective	# Developing	# Skilled	# Accomplished
2010	<10	<10	<10	<10
2011	<10	<10	<10	<10
2012	<10	<10	<10	<10
2013	<10	<10	<10	<10

2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

Cedarville University

Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs at Cedarville University

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

Description of Data:
Ohio's system for evaluating principals (Ohio's Principal Evaluation System) provides building leaders with a richer and more detailed view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement.

Evaluations have two components, each weighted at 50 percent:

1. Principal performance rating, determined from:
    a. A professional growth plan
    b. Two 30 minute observations
    c. Walkthroughs of building classrooms
2. Student academic growth rating for the building

The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) data reported here are limited in that the information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Effective Licensure Year	Number of Principals with OPES Data	Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications			
		Ineffective	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
2010	0	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A
2011	0	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A
2012	0	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A
2013	0	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A	N = N/A % = N/A

edTPA™ Assessment Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at Cedarville University

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

Description of Data:
Ohio educator preparation programs have participated in the development of the edTPA™, a performance assessment for educator candidates. At this time, the edTPA™ is not an Ohio licensure requirement or a program completion requirement. In this report, only results from the edTPA™ national scoring process are reported. Results from candidates whose assessments were scored locally are not reported.

Score Range	Institution Average Score	Ohio State Average Score	National Mean Score
15 - 75	N/A	41.9	43.7

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Institution Profile

(Data Source: Cedarville University)

Located in southwest Ohio, Cedarville University attracts 3,400 undergraduate, graduate, and online students to more than 100 areas of study. Cedarville is a Christ-centered learning community recognized nationally for rigorous academic programs, strong graduation and retention rates, accredited professional and health science offerings, and leading student satisfaction ratings.

The School of Education at Cedarville University

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Cedarville University

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

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

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 2012-2013. The data also reflect the best attempt of each test taker. Data are not provided for additional licenses that an educator earns after her/his initial license. Most licenses in Ohio require that candidates pass more than one licensure examination, therefore the number of "Completers Tested" in the first table is smaller than the sum total of all takers of all assessments in the subsequent table. 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	52	96%

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Cedarville University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

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, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.
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.

Value-Added Data for Cedarville University-Prepared Teachers

Teachers with Effective Licensure Dates 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
49	11	N = 1 % = 9	N = 1 % = 9	N = 7 % = 64	N = 1 % = 9	N = 1 % = 9

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

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

Characteristic					
	Elementary School	**Middle School**	**Junior High School**	**High School**	**Ungraded**
Teachers Serving by School Level	N = 3 % = 27	N = 4 % = 36	N = 1 % = 9	N = 3 % = 27	N = 0 % = 0

	Community School	**Public School**	**STEM School**	**Educational Service Center**
Teachers Serving by School Type	N = 2 % = 18	N = 9 % = 82	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added	N = 2 % = 18	N = 2 % = 18	N = 2 % = 18	N = 1 % = 9	N = 4 % = 36	N = 0 % = 0

	High Minority	**Middle Minority**	**Low Minority**
Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 2 % = 18	N = 6 % = 55	N = 3 % = 27

	High Poverty	**Medium-High Poverty**	**Medium-Low Poverty**	**Low Poverty**
Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 1 % = 9	N = 4 % = 36	N = 3 % = 27	N = 3 % = 27

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

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Value-Added Data for Cedarville University-Prepared Principals

Principals with Effective Licensure Dates 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	**Principals with Value-Added Data**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
0	0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

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

Characteristic

	Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	Ungraded
Principals Serving by School Level	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
Principals Serving by School Type	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	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 = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Cedarville University Candidate Academic Measures

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014
(Data Source: Cedarville 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

		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**
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	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
ACT Math 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
GPA - Graduate	NA / NA / 2.75	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10
GPA - High School	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GPA - Transfer	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GPA - Undergraduate	2.7 / NA / 2.75	61 / NA / N<10	3.55 / NA / N<10	138 / NA / N<10	3.55 / NA / N<10	65 / NA / N<10	3.52 / NA / 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 Quantitative Subscore	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

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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**
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**
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
MAT	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis CORE Math	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis CORE Reading	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis CORE Writing	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis I Math	175 / NA / NA	61 / NA / NA	183.2 / NA / NA	138 / NA / NA	183.1 / NA / NA	65 / NA / NA	182.9 / NA / NA
Praxis I Reading	175 / NA / NA	61 / NA / NA	181.4 / NA / NA	138 / NA / NA	181.4 / NA / NA	65 / NA / NA	181 / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	174 / NA / NA	61 / NA / NA	179.9 / NA / NA	138 / NA / NA	179.8 / NA / NA	65 / NA / NA	178.6 / 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
SAT Composite Score	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
SAT Verbal 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

Other Criteria	**Undergraduate**	**Post-Baccalaureate**	**Graduate**
Dispositional Assessment	Y	N	Y
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N	N	N
Essay	N	N	N
High School Class Rank	NA	NA	NA
Interview	N	N	N
Letter of Commitment	N	N	N
Letter of Recommendation	Y	N	Y

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	NA	N	N
None of the Above	N	N	N
Portfolio	N	N	N
Prerequisite Courses	Y	N	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	NA	NA	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	NA	NA	N
Teacher Insight	N	N	N

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Field and Clinical Experiences for Cedarville University Candidates

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: Cedarville 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: 1) early and ongoing field-based opportunities for candidates to engage with K-12 students in Ohio classrooms prior to their formal student teaching; and 2) the culminating clinical experience commonly referred to as student teaching. Early field/clinical experiences are reported in hours. Student teaching is reported in weeks. Beyond the requisite statewide minimums, institutional requirements for candidates can vary by institution and by program. The information below is reported at the unit level.

Teacher Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Cedarville University Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	190
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	562
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	16
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	96.97%

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Pre-Service Teacher 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 from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014. A total of 4206 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 70 percent.

Cedarville University Survey Response Rate = 83.82%

Total Survey Responses = 57

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.	3.70	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.	3.44	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.53	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.61	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.54	3.41
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.	3.72	3.57
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.56	3.43
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.63	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.67	3.51
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.	3.35	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.51	3.32
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.67	3.50

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.40	3.28
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.54	3.48
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.51	3.45
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.67	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.	3.63	3.56
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.33	3.40
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.72	3.64
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.51	3.30
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.65	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.65	3.41
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.35	3.08
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.	3.14	2.93
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.14	2.85
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.30	3.18
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.26	3.06
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.54	3.49
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.30	2.91

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.79	3.58
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.79	3.33
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.82	3.60
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.79	3.59
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.75	3.55
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.63	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.47	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.26	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.21	3.24
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.16	3.26
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.67	3.56
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.60	3.42
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.67	3.53
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.60	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.58	3.40
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.72	3.59
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.53	3.31
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.40	3.12
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate	3.49	3.31

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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
	progression to program completion.		

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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. A total of 434 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 16 Percent. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their Resident Educator experiences and collected the data for the Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014.

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	3.44
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	3.24
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	N<10	3.30
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	N<10	3.40
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	N<10	3.30
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	3.26
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	N<10	3.26
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	N<10	3.26
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	N<10	3.26
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	3.26
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	3.38
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	N<10	3.26
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.44
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the	N<10	3.40

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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
	importance of communication with families and caregivers.		
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.55
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	N<10	3.34
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	N<10	3.30
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	N<10	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	N<10	3.21
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	N<10	3.37
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	N<10	3.32
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	3.02
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	2.41
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	N<10	2.41
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	N<10	3.09
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	N<10	2.88
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	N<10	3.00
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	2.51
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.59
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	N<10	3.34
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.59

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville 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
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.58
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	3.33
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	N<10	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	N<10	3.22
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	N<10	3.21
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	N<10	3.25
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	3.39
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	N<10	3.49
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	N<10	3.38
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	N<10	3.29
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	N<10	3.54
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.27
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	N<10	3.11
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.28
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	N<10	3.13

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

National Accreditation

(Data Source: Ohio Board of Regents)

Description of Data:

All educator preparation programs (EPPs) in Ohio are required to be accredited by either the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), or their successor agency, the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Accreditation is a mechanism to ensure the quality of an institution and its programs. The accreditation of an institution and/or program helps employers evaluate the credential of job applicants.

Accrediting Agency	NCATE
Date of Last Review	March 2014
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Teacher Residency Program

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio is a 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 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Non-completion does not imply dismissal, as leaving the program may be due to multiple factors.

Percent of Newly Hired Teachers Persisting in the State Residency Program

who were Prepared at Cedarville University

Residency Year 1			**Residency Year 2**			**Residency Year 3**			**Residency Year 4**		
Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting	
24	24	100%	17	17	100%	3	3	100%			

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Cedarville University

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: Cedarville 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

Initiative:	Producing Significant School Academic Improvement
Purpose:	To create a model project to improve proficiency test scores in 7th Grade
Goal:	To provide opportunities for pre-service teachers to collaborate with in-service teachers
Number of Participants:	15
Strategy:	A partnership was established over a 3 year period between a private rural college and an urban middle school to create a model project to improve proficiency test scores in the 7th grade. This is the second year of the program. The school provided access for teacher candidates to middle school administration,counselors, curriculum directors, and the teaching staff during the first half of the day with the second half of the day being spent in a two hour specific tutorial setting with the school's 7th graders. A pre- and post-test were implemented to show academic progress for individual students. The Middle Childhood majors developed brain-compatible high interest activities to address seven identified specific academic weaknesses in Reading and Math from the previous year's assessment. The 7th graders were divided into random groups of 7-10 students and given a pretest over the identified weak skill areas in Reading and Math. Middle School Education majors created high interest activities in either a deficit Reading or Math area. This project was conducted once a week for a total of 10 weeks.
Demonstration of Impact:	During the 3 years this model has been employed the middle school participating in this project moved from a Continuous Improvement Rating to an Excellent Rating on the Ohio Proficiency Assessment with those deficit areas improving significantly. This was the only school in this school district to achieve these results.
External Recognition:	
Programs:	
Initiative:	EDSE 4100 Professional Learning Network Twitter
Purpose:	Build a Professional Learning Network of content and pedagogical experts.
Goal:	Participate in weekly educational conversations in specific fields of study.
Number of Participants:	12
Strategy:	EDSE 4100 Professional Learning Network (PLN) Twitter Project where each candidate is expected to tweet, reply & re-tweet using the #EDSE4100 in response to each of the professor's initial tweets. Reflect activity in a journal about entire process.
Demonstration of Impact:	Reflection Journal based on personal reflection: How does my personal background affect (content or style) my Tweets? What was my impact on other Tweets or people I follow?

	Could I have done anything differently (including technological equipment) to alter/improve what I experienced and learned? If so, what? Impact: What have I learned about myself through this experience? Have any of my basic values been challenged? What did I learn about teaching & learning (e.g., pedagogy)? What Twitter handle did I follow in the area of teaching & learning, which had the greatest impact? Why? What did I learn about my specific content (Spanish, English/Language Arts, Bible, Social Studies, Mathematics, Science? What new skills did I learn during this experience?
External Recognition:	
Programs:	
[redacted]	