2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

Muskingum 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 Muskingum College

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	46	31
2011	<10	<10	10	10
2012	<10	<10	34	14
2013	<10	11	22	<10

2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

Muskingum University

Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs at Muskingum 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	4	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 50	N = 2 % = 50
2011	3	N = 1 % = 33	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 67	N = 0 % = 0
2012	3	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 33	N = 2 % = 67	N = 0 % = 0
2013	1	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 100

edTPA™ Assessment Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at Muskingum 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
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 9/1/2012 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	101	99%

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014
(Data Source: Muskingum University)

Description of Data:

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that principal candidates pass the Ohio Assessment for Educators (015 Educational Leadership) 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 2013-2014.

	Completers Tested	Pass Rate Percentage
Principal Licensure Data	12	100%

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Muskingum 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 Muskingum 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
251	51	N = 4 % = 8	N = 4 % = 8	N = 26 % = 51	N = 11 % = 22	N = 6 % = 12

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Demographic Information for Schools where Muskingum 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 = 25 % = 49	N = 18 % = 35	N = 7 % = 14	N = 1 % = 2	N = 0 % = 0

	Community School	**Public School**	**STEM School**	**Educational Service Center**
Teachers Serving by School Type	N = 1 % = 2	N = 50 % = 98	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added	N = 15 % = 29	N = 2 % = 4	N = 8 % = 16	N = 4 % = 8	N = 22 % = 43	N = 0 % = 0

	High Minority	**Middle Minority**	**Low Minority**
Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 8 % = 16	N = 41 % = 80	N = 2 % = 4

	High Poverty	**Medium-High Poverty**	**Medium-Low Poverty**	**Low Poverty**
Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 2 % = 4	N = 8 % = 16	N = 19 % = 37	N = 22 % = 43

*** 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
Muskingum University

Value-Added Data for Muskingum 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**
8	4	N = 1 % = 25	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 25	N = 1 % = 25	N = 1 % = 25	N = 0 % = 0

Demographic Information for Schools where Muskingum 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 = 4 % = 100	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 = 4 % = 100	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 = 4 % = 100	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 = 1 % = 25	N = 3 % = 75

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Muskingum University Candidate Academic Measures

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

		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	21 / 21 / 21	34 / N<10 / 19	24 / N<10 / 24	132 / N<10 / 28	24 / N<10 / 24.35	35 / N<10 / 13	24.71 / N<10 / 24.07
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 / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
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	2.5 / 2.5 / 2.5	61 / N<10 / 40	3.37 / N<10 / 3.25	219 / N<10 / 71	3.42 / N<10 / 3.83	59 / N<10 / 43	3.56 / N<10 / 3.23
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
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**
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	150 / 150 / 150	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
Praxis CORE Reading	156 / 156 / 156	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
Praxis CORE Writing	162 / 162 / 162	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
Praxis I Math	170 / 172 / 172	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	38 / N<10 / 20	175.78 / N<10 / 176.55	18 / N<10 / 13	176.05 / N<10 / 176.3
Praxis I Reading	170 / 173 / 173	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	37 / N<10 / 11	176.23 / N<10 / 178.18	19 / N<10 / N<10	175.11 / N<10 / N<10
Praxis I Writing	170 / 172 / 172	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	N<10 / N<10 / N<10	38 / N<10 / 12	172.81 / N<10 / 175.16	18 / N<10 / N<10	173.05 / N<10 / N<10
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	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
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	Y	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	N	N	N

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum 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	Y	Y
SRI Teacher Perceiver	NA	NA	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	NA	NA	N
Teacher Insight	N	N	N

2014
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**
ACT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - Graduate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - High School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - Undergraduate	2.5	15	3.44	29	3.59	10	3.75
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Writing	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

2014
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 Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Other Criteria

Interview	Y
Letter of Recommendation	Y
Dispositional Assessment	N
None of the Above	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N
Prerequisite Courses	N
Teacher Insight	N
Portfolio	N
Essay	N
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N
Letter of Commitment	N

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Field and Clinical Experiences for Muskingum University Candidates

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

(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: 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	Muskingum University Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	103
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	239
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	13
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	97.64%

Principal Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	52
Number of candidates admitted to internship	17
Number of candidates completing internship	12
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	70.59%

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum 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.

Muskingum University Survey Response Rate = 78%

Total Survey Responses = 117

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.	3.62	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.	3.54	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.40	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.56	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.53	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.	3.62	3.57
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.62	3.43
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.67	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.61	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.	3.62	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.39	3.32
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.58	3.50

2014
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
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.	3.63	3.48
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.66	3.45
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.68	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.67	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.70	3.56
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.56	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.	3.39	3.30
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.56	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.54	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).	3.24	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.	3.13	2.93
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.10	2.85
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.36	3.18
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.32	3.06
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.56	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.	3.35	2.91

2014
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
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.58	3.58
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.59	3.33
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.64	3.60
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.63	3.59
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.66	3.55
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.59	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.	3.28	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.27	3.24
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.30	3.26
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.63	3.56
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.50	3.42
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.63	3.53
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.51	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.47	3.40
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.67	3.59
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.44	3.31
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.28	3.12
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate	3.42	3.31

2014
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
	progression to program completion.		

2014
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. 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.	3.26	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.	3.37	3.24
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.11	3.30
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.16	3.40
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.32	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.	3.16	3.26
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.16	3.26
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.16	3.26
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.16	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.	3.16	3.26
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.16	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.16	3.38
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.32	3.26
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.42	3.44
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the	3.37	3.40

2014
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
	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.	3.47	3.55
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.21	3.34
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.26	3.30
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.58	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.11	3.21
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.26	3.37
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.26	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).	3.00	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.	2.68	2.41
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.68	2.41
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.21	3.09
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.11	2.88
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.11	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.	2.68	2.51
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.47	3.59
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.26	3.34
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.42	3.59

2014
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
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.32	3.58
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.37	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.37	3.33
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.42	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.21	3.22
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.11	3.21
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.21	3.25
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.	3.58	3.39
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.63	3.49
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.53	3.38
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.16	3.29
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.63	3.54
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.32	3.27
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.11	3.11
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.32	3.28
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.05	3.13

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Principal Intern Survey Results

Description of Data:

To gather information on principal intern satisfaction with their 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 Principal Interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, 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 207 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 20 percent.

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 program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	3.17	3.47
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	3.17	3.44
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	3.17	3.46
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	3.33	3.41
5	My program prepared me to ensure the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	3.25	3.32
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	3.25	3.41
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	3.42	3.49
8	My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.33	3.43
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	3.33	3.43
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	3.33	3.40
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	3.50	3.53
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	3.50	3.46
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	3.25	3.31
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics;	3.42	3.58

2014
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
	local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct		
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	3.50	3.68
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	3.50	3.60
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	3.58	3.65
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	3.42	3.53
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	3.50	3.62
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	3.25	3.39
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	3.42	3.48
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	3.33	3.38
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	3.33	3.43

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum 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 2013
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum 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 Muskingum University

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting	
81	77	95%	59	59	100%	6	6	100%			

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

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

(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

Initiative:	PD for New Ohio Learning Standards
Purpose:	Partnerships with Local School Districts and Muskingum University
Goal:	Implementing the the new Ohio Learning Standards (Common Core) for Mathematics
Number of Participants:	500
Strategy:	Muskingum University Education Professor Dr. Ky Davis has expanded her published materials for grades K-8 to include high school courses (algebra, geometry) that align with the new K-12 standards. Dr. Davis has provided regional support to local k-12 teachers in mathematics instruction. Through partnerships MU has candidates in field and student teaching placements who model lessons, activities and hands-on materials (including interactive technology) that align with the standards and support student success.
Demonstration of Impact:	Common core Mathematics K-12 published; number of workshops and feedback/evaluations from workshops; and Conference presentations by Dr. Davis and Muskingum University education students.
External Recognition:	Educational Service Centers, Local Educational Agencies, and Invitations to speak and present at regional conferences.
Programs:	Partnerships have been established with LEAs (RttT & TIF recipients, excellent report cards or expressed a need for PD). Faculty conducted 30+ presentations at LEAs & ESCs on math/science standards plus teacher candidates volunteer after school & at curricular events to support preK-12 students..
[redacted]	
Initiative:	Embedded School-based Clinical Experiences
Purpose:	Promote School Partnerships
Goal:	Improve knowledge and skills of veteran teachers and Muskingum University Teacher Candidates
Number of Participants:	50
Strategy:	In partnerships 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, integrated within science methods courses is to promote inquiry-based instruction and best practices in the field of science. Dr. Rogness and MU candidates model lessons, aligned to the new standards, that are highly interactive, hands-on and inquiry based. MU teacher candidates use innovative technology in the classroom and lead after school exploration in special science projects such as robot-building and programming. Additionally, MU piloted an embedded phonics course that included on campus classes within integrated school-based application at Roseville Elementary (K-6) in utilizing instructional time within the school day for MU

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

	teacher candidates to work in small group or one to one phonics instruction. This authentic learning promotes student reading success and allows MU teacher candidates to gain valuable teaching experience.
Demonstration of Impact:	Interviews with teachers and students who participated/partnered; Local News reports and articles that highlight the positive initiative focused on science at Zanesville City Schools and National Road elementary; undergraduate and graduate student assessment data from Key Licensure and Program Assessments aligned to the National Science Standards and the MU Conceptual Framework (Shared Values/Beliefs); and Scores on OAE content tests for licensure (previously Praxis II content tests).
External Recognition:	Zanesville media print, radio and television; and district letters of appreciation.
Programs:	After School Program at National Road Elementary.
Initiative:	1 Year ClInical Internships for Teacher Candidates
Purpose:	Promote Co-Teaching and P-12 learning through sustained clinical experiences
Goal:	Enhance Muskingum University teacher candidates' knowledge, skill and professional dispositions and expand the achievement/progress and success of their P-12 students by supporting classroom teachers.
Number of Participants:	5
Strategy:	Internships have been established through partnerships with Maysville, Franklin, West Muskingum and Ridgewood Local School Districts. The internships are to utilize the clinical model of preparation for a year-long (fall through spring or spring through fall) student teaching. The interns were selected through an interview process, first by nomination by the Muskingum University Department of Education, then by the local school district administrators. Memorandums of understanding outline the responsibilities of all partners, including defining the mentor teacher, and university supervisor roles, and the intern.
Demonstration of Impact:	Feedback from school district partners; individual intern participants; P-12 student evaluations; Mock Interview feedback; and mentor teacher feedback on students' achievement/ progress reports
External Recognition:	Invitations for Interns and Mentor Teachers to present at regional conferences; MU Black & Magenta articles.
Programs:	none

2014
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Muskingum University

Principal Licensure Programs

Initiative:	Leveraging Local Leadership
Purpose:	Improve Prinicpal Preparation Program to Address Current Realities of Leadership in Ohio
Goal:	provide Relevant Preparation Program for Ohio Principal Candidates
Number of Participants:	17
Strategy:	Muskingum University utilizes practicing administrators in the preparation program for principal candidates. By engaging local principals and superintendents as adjuncts with significant skills and knowledge as course instructors, we can provide relevant, real-world examples of the current educational climate and the challenges candidates will face. This ensures principal candidates are given an authentic preparation for their principal role. In addition, local administrators assist in developing curriculum, reviewing course syllabi to align with standards and conducting mock interviews.
Demonstration of Impact:	Adjunct Faculty; Syllabi; Feedback from Principal Candidates; Curriculum alignment results; and Mock Interview Schedules.
External Recognition:	LEA; ESC; and hiring patterns of our principal licensure graduates.
Programs:	
[redacted]	