

# 2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

## University of Mount Union

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

### Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at University of Mount Union

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
<b>2010</b>	<10	<10	20	16
<b>2011</b>	<10	<10	<10	<10
<b>2012</b>	<10	<10	11	13
<b>2013</b>	<10	<10	10	12



**Board of Regents**  
University System of Ohio

**John R. Kasich**, Governor  
**John Carey**, Chancellor

# 2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

## University of Mount Union

### Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs at University of Mount Union

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 University of Mount Union

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



Board of Regents  
University System of Ohio

John R. Kasich, Governor  
John Carey, Chancellor

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**Institution Profile**

(Data Source: University of Mount Union)

The University of Mount Union, in Alliance, Ohio, is a private institution offering baccalaureate and master's degrees with a current enrollment of over 2,200 students. The University is regionally accredited by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools and in September 2008, was accepted into the Academic Quality Improvement Program. In addition, the University possesses specialized accreditation for several of its professional programs and has been authorized by the Chancellor since January 1970.

**Teacher Education Program**

The University of Mount Union has been preparing teachers since the institution's beginning in 1846. Mount Union offers 12 undergraduate teacher education programs that lead to initial Ohio licensure, including early childhood, middle childhood, intervention specialist, adolescent to young adult, and multiage. The University also offers a graduate program educational leadership that leads to principal licensure. Candidates in this program complete online coursework during the academic year and an on-campus institute each summer.

---

**Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs**  
**at**  
**University of Mount Union**

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.

<b>Summary Rating: Effective</b>		
	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>All Teacher Licensure Tests</b>	102	100%

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs**  
**at**  
**University of Mount Union**  
Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014  
(Data Source: University of Mount Union)

**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.

	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>Principal Licensure Data</b>	5	100%

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at**  
**University of Mount Union**  
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 University of Mount Union-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
154	27	N = 3 % = 11	N = 6 % = 22	N = 14 % = 52	N = 2 % = 7	N = 2 % = 7

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

**Demographic Information for Schools where University of Mount Union-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve**

<b>Characteristic</b>						
	<b>Elementary School</b>	<b>Middle School</b>	<b>Junior High School</b>	<b>High School</b>	<b>Ungraded</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by School Level</b>	N = 16 % = 59	N = 9 % = 33	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 7	N = 0 % = 0	
	<b>Community School</b>	<b>Public School</b>	<b>STEM School</b>	<b>Educational Service Center</b>		
<b>Teachers Serving by School Type</b>	N = 1 % = 4	N = 26 % = 96	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>NR</b>
<b>Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added</b>	N = 17 % = 63	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 4	N = 3 % = 11	N = 6 % = 22	N = 0 % = 0
	<b>High Minority</b>		<b>Middle Minority</b>		<b>Low Minority</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles</b>	N = 1 % = 4		N = 16 % = 59		N = 10 % = 37	
	<b>High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-Low Poverty</b>	<b>Low Poverty</b>		
<b>Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles</b>	N = 2 % = 7	N = 4 % = 15	N = 11 % = 41	N = 10 % = 37		

\* 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**  
**University of Mount Union**

**Value-Added Data for University of Mount Union-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 University of Mount Union-Prepared Principals with Value-Added Data Serve

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



**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

Criterion	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
<b>U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate</b>							
	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
<b>MAT</b>	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
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	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis I Reading	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis II	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
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
<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Undergraduate</b>		<b>Post-Baccalaureate</b>		<b>Graduate</b>		
Dispositional Assessment	Y		N		Y		
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N		N		N		
Essay	N		N		Y		
High School Class Rank	NA		NA		NA		
Interview	Y		N		Y		
Letter of Commitment	N		N		N		
Letter of Recommendation	N		N		Y		

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Undergraduate</b>	<b>Post-Baccalaureate</b>	<b>Graduate</b>
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	NA	N	N
None of the Above	N	N	N
Portfolio	Y	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**  
**University of Mount Union**

**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	2.75	N<10	N<10	14	3.51	N<10	N<10
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**  
**University of Mount Union**

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

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**Field and Clinical Experiences for University of Mount Union Candidates**

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

(Data Source: University of Mount Union)

**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	University of Mount Union Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	130
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	265
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	14
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	100%

**Principal Preparation Programs**

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	45
Number of candidates admitted to internship	7
Number of candidates completing internship	7
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**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.

**University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 85.19%**

**Total Survey Responses = 69**

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	3.49
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.	3.14	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.13	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.22	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.20	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.	3.42	3.57
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.19	3.43
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.25	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.35	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.	3.20	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.09	3.32
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.28	3.50

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

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.	3.03	3.28
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.20	3.48
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.17	3.45
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.38	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.28	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.38	3.56
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.17	3.40
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.45	3.64
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.19	3.30
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.17	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.10	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).	2.83	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.	2.78	2.93
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	2.86	2.85
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	2.96	3.18
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	2.86	3.06
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.29	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.	2.87	2.91

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

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.	3.35	3.58
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.06	3.33
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.36	3.60
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.46	3.59
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.43	3.55
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.19	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.09	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	2.91	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	2.96	3.24
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.03	3.26
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.20	3.56
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.07	3.42
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.28	3.53
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.04	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.22	3.40
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.35	3.59
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.04	3.31
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	2.71	3.12
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate	3.00	3.31

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b> 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	<b>State Average (Mean)</b> 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	progression to program completion.		

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**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**  
**University of Mount Union**

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**  
**University of Mount Union**

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**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**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.

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

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**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 University of Mount Union**

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting	
68	68	100%	47	47	100%	13	13	100%			

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**Excellence and Innovation Initiatives**

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

(Data Source: University of Mount Union)

**Description of Data:**

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

**Teacher Licensure Programs**

<b>Initiative:</b>	Where is the Love? Service-Learning Conference
<b>Purpose:</b>	Preservice teacher candidates hosted a conference on Mount Union's campus for 100 middle school students. This all-day conference focused on topics such as bullying, race, gender and sexuality
<b>Goal:</b>	The goals of this project include increased awareness of bullying, race, gender, and sexuality to both preservice candidates and students in grades 6-8 and increased collaboration between UMU and Alliance City Schools.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	120
<b>Strategy:</b>	During Multicultural Education, a course typically taken during the sophomore year for preservice teachers in all program areas, candidates took part in a service-learning project. They conducted research, collected resources, collected data, and organized the conference sessions. After the conference they analyzed the data to determine the effectiveness of the conference for the middle school students, middle school staff, and Mount Union Students.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Students had the opportunity to organize, plan, and facilitate an all-day learning experience with 100 students. This experience gave pre-service teachers an idea of what it would be like not only to plan a field trip, but also to be the field trip. One student changed her major as a result of this experience because she liked working with this age group so much. Students also had the opportunity to interact with Alliance principals and teachers. In fact, the principal was so impressed with the students' professionalism, that he indicated that he would hire them directly up on graduation.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Following the conference, candidates in the course submitted proposals to present at SCHOLAR Day, Mount Union's Student Celebration Honoring Our Latest Academic Research. Proposals for the conference are reviewed by a committee of faculty members. Where is the Love was selected for the conference.
<b>Programs:</b>	Early childhood, middle childhood, intervention specialist, AYA, multiage
<b>Initiative:</b>	Technology Workshop
<b>Purpose:</b>	Preservice teacher candidates hosted an after school tech workshop for inservice teachers and administrators to show them the latest Web 2.0 tools/apps that could be utilized with their P-12 students
<b>Goal:</b>	The goals of this workshop include: 1) to provide a service to our partner schools by hosting a free technology workshop led by our candidates, 2) to increase collaboration between UMU and our partner districts, and 3) to increase technology skills of preservice and inservice educators.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	52
<b>Strategy:</b>	During their Educational Technology course, a course taken during the sophomore year

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

	by candidates of all licensure areas (early childhood, intervention specialist, AYA mathematics, multiage PE, etc.), preservice teacher candidates researched best practices in technology integration with relation to their licensure area. After creating professional presentations involving multimedia, electronic handouts, etc., candidates organized and hosted a conference. Preservice and inservice educators collaborated during the 14 breakout sessions while they learned about the latest Web 2.0 tools and apps for education.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	A survey, created by the preservice teachers, was administered following the conference, and it yielded positive results from all participants. Inservice teachers and administrators gave the conference high ratings, and preservice teacher candidates indicated that their technology skills increased as a result of the conference.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	Early childhood, middle childhood, intervention specialist, AYA, multiage
<b>Initiative:</b>	Read Everyday And Discover (R.E.A.D.)
<b>Purpose:</b>	READ Alliance was a literacy intervention program for 160 identified children and families in grades K-3 within the Alliance City School District.
<b>Goal:</b>	To increase early literacy skills, strengthen and enhance collaboration with the organizations, provide supplemental, directed, and intensive early intervention for literacy, utilize tech to promote 21st century skills, and to provide authentic experiences for candidates in teacher preparation.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	275
<b>Strategy:</b>	UMU identified eight Technology Fellows and eight Literacy Fellows to serve as lead preservice teacher candidates to organize the program. Utilizing a train-the-trainer model with the fellows, preservice teachers learned a tutoring protocol and data collection practice to provide evidence of K-3 literacy skills growth. Additionally, UMU hosted three, full-day literacy-focused workshops where preservice and inservice teachers attended the professional development together. Finally, UMU faculty and ACS administrators collaborated to facilitate monthly parent meetings to help update technology, troubleshoot, and provide literacy strategies to families and their children.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Survey data from preservice teachers, inservice teachers, and parents indicate that the project was successful. While barriers (such as scheduling, communication, etc.) occurred along the way, the K-3 students involved in R.E.A.D. Alliance improved literacy skills—a primary goal of the project. Furthermore, UMU candidates continue to collaborate with ACS teachers and students as a result of the work during the 2013-2014 academic year.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	Early childhood, middle childhood, intervention specialist, AYA, multiage

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**University of Mount Union**

---

**Principal Licensure Programs**

<b>Initiative:</b>	Master of Arts in Educational Leadership (MAEL) Pr
<b>Purpose:</b>	To connect MAEL candidates with local administrators, leaders, and nationally recognized scholars in the field of educational leadership
<b>Goal:</b>	To connect and engage 28 MAEL candidates with 25 area administrators and 3 nationally renowned speakers
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	56
<b>Strategy:</b>	To provide face to face networking and professional development opportunities for aspiring leaders (MAEL candidates) and practicing leaders in the field (local P-12 administrators)
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Following our survey evaluation, there was significant impact on the MAEL candidates and the local administrators. The majority of survey respondents showed a desire and interest to continue the program next year and increase the fall and spring collaboration between the University and the local P-12 school districts.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	This initiative launched a working committee between the University of Mount Union and Alliance City Schools in an effort to enhance the partnership between the two institutions. The MAEL team also received several appreciation notes from local administrators.
<b>Programs:</b>	