Institution Profile

(Data Source: University of Mount Union)

The University of Mount Union, in Alliance, Ohio, is a private institution offering baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degrees with a current enrollment of 2,035 students and 208 graduate students. The University is regionally accredited by the Higher Learning Commission 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 13 undergraduate teacher education programs that lead to initial Ohio licensure, including early childhood, middle childhood, intervention specialist, adolescence to young adult, and multiage. The University also offers a master's degree in educational leadership that leads to an Ohio principal's license.

Report Overview

The Ohio Department of Higher Education gathers data annually from multiple sources to report the following performance metrics in the Educator Preparation Provider Performance Reports:

- Ohio Teacher Evaluation System Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider

- Ohio Principal Evaluation System Results for for Ohio Principals Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider

- Field and Clinical Experiences Required by Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Candidates

- Licensure Test Results for Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Program Completers

- Value-added Data for K-12 Students Taught by Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider

- Demographic Information for Schools in Which Ohio Educator Preparation Provider-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve

- Academic Measures Used to Inform Admissions Decisions at Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs

- Survey Results of Pre-Service Teacher Candidates Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs

- Survey Results of Ohio Resident Educators Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers

- Survey Results of Ohio Principal Interns Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs

- Survey Results of Mentors Serving Principal Interns Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs

- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider National Accreditation Status

- Persistence in the Ohio Resident Educator Program of Teachers Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers

- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a 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 school 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.

An apparent dip in evaluations for the most recent "Initial License Effective Year" cohort comes from the perception that any given year's evaluation results is actually a chronological view of evaluations. Rather, it's a view of the evaluations from that school year, showing four different cohorts of licensed educators. The most recently licensed cohort will eventually have more evaluation results in its second year as more educators find employment as teachers or principals.

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 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education.

3. Due to ORC 3333.041(B), annual results must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 completers with OTES data.

	Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications							
Initial Licensure # Accomplished # Skilled # Developing # Inef								
2015	15	12	N<10	N<10				
2016	19	12	N<10	N<10				
2017	N<10	14	N<10	N<10				
2018	N<10	10	N<10	N<10				

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

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

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 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

An apparent dip in evaluations for the most recent "Initial License Effective Year" cohort comes from the perception that any given year's evaluation results is actually a chronological view of evaluations. Rather, it's a view of the evaluations from that school year, showing four different cohorts of licensed educators. The most recently licensed cohort will eventually have more evaluation results in its second year as more educators find employment as teachers or principals.

Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications							
Initial Licensure Effective Year							
2017	2017 N<10 N<10 N<10 N<10						

Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: University of Mount Union)

Description of Data:

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

Teacher Preparation Programs					
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements				
Require edTPA National Scoring from candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	Ν				
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	100				
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	300				
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	15				
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	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 who started internship	8				
Number of candidates who completed internship	8				
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%				

Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018 (Data Source: USDOE Title II Report)

Description of Data:

Ohio educator licensure requirements include passage of all requisite licensure examinations at the state determined cut score. The reported results reflect Title II data, and therefore represent pass rate data solely for initial licenses. Further, because the data are gathered from the Title II reports, there is a one year lag in accessing the data. Teacher licensure pass rate data are the only reported metric for which the data do not reflect the reporting year 2018-2019.

As of 2013, the Ohio Assessments for Educators replaced the Praxis subject assessments for initial licensure. Some Praxis II assessments are still being reported because recent program completers took those tests in or before 2013.

Teacher Licensure Tests					
Summary Rating: EFFECTIVE					
Completers Tested Pass Rate					
42	100%				

Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: University of Mount Union)

Description of Data:

Ohio requires that principal candidates pass the requisite state examination to be recommended for licensure. The 2018-2019 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

Principal Licensure Tests				
Completers Tested	Pass Rate			
N<10	N/A			

Value-Added Data for Students Taught by Teachers Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019

Description of Data:

Ohio's value-added data system provides information on student academic gains. 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). Schools can demonstrate through value-added data that many of their students are achieving significant progress. Student growth measures also provide students and parents with evidence of the impact of their efforts. Educators and schools further use value-added data to inform instructional practices.

Limitations of the Value-Added Data:

1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on Elementary and Middle School Tests (Grades 4-8) and End-of-Course Tests for high school credit.

3. For Educator Preparation Providers with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals with value-added data, only the number (N) is reported.

	ure Effective 016, 2017, 2018	Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value- Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
110	44	N=9 20%	N=4 9%	N=16 36%	N=4 9%	N=11 25%

Value-Added Data for University of Mount Union-Prepared Teachers

Demographic Information for Schools where University of Mount Union-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve Teachers Serving by School Level

Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	No School Level
N=15	N=9	N=2	N=18	N/A
34%	20%	5%	41%	N/A

Teachers Serving by School Type						
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center	Career-Tech	No School Type	
N=3	N=41	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
7%	93%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added							
A B C D F NR							
N=6	N=10	N=4	N=7	N=16	N=1		
14%	23%	9%	16%	36%	2%		

Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles							
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority	No Minority Quartile			
N=9	N=10	N=9	N=16	N/A			
20%	23%	20%	36%	N/A			

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles							
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty	No Poverty Quartile			
N=10	N=10	N=17	N=7	N/A			
23%	23%	39%	16%	N/A			

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

Value-Added Data for University of Mount Union-Prepared Principals

	ure Effective 16, 2017, 2018	Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added			dded	
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value- Added Data	A	В	С	D	F
N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Principals Serving by School Level						
Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	No School Level		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Principals Serving by School Type							
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center	Career-Tech	No School Type		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School							
A	В	С	D	F	NR		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles						
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority	No Minority Quartile		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles						
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty	No Poverty Quartile		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

University of Mount Union Candidate Academic Measures

(Data Source:University of Mount Union) Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019

Undergraduate Admission Requirements

Program admission is determined at the end of the sophomore year in a focused review by the Subcommittee on Teacher Education. The assessment of teacher education candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are considered during the review. Candidates in all programs must complete all admission requirements including field experiences to be eligible to enroll in 300-level education classes. The content of the admission requirements are updated when program and unit changes are implemented.

Graduate Admission Requirements

Program admission is determined in a focused review by the committee of graduate faculty. The assessment of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are considered during an interview and through the review of all application materials, including GPA, letters of recommendation, dispositional assessment, and an essay.

Description of Data:

The data in this section are the average scores of candidates on academic measures reported by the provider. If a measure is not applicable to a level of delivery (undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, graduate) the table reflects "N/A". In the "Dispositional Assessments and Other Measures" portion, if the provider did not indicate using a measure, OR if the institution does not offer a program at the designated level of delivery, the table reflects "N".

Candidates Admitted are the number admitted in the most recent year. Candidates Enrolled are the total number of candidates enrolled. Candidates Completing are the number completing in the most recent year.

Teacher Preparation Programs

		Candidate	s Admitted	Candidate	s Enrolled	Candidates	Completing
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
ACT Composite	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Score	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT English	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT Math	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT Reading	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
GPA - Graduate	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
PA - High School	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
-	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
GPA - Transfer	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GPA -	U= 2.50	U=79	U= 3.48	U=144	U= 3.49	U=43	U= 3.57
Undergraduate	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
-	G= 2.75	G=16	G= 3.50	G=26	G= 3.50	G=N<10	G=N<10
RE Composite	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Score	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
RE Quantitative	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
GRE Verbal	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
GRE Writing	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
Subscore	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
MAT							
MAT	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
axis CORE Math	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis CORE	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Reading	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis CORE	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Writing	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
J	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis I Math	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
- Tuxio - Matri	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis I Reading	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
raxis i Reduing							
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis I Writing	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis II	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
SAT Composite	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Score	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
AT Quantitative	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
50550016	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
SAT Verbal	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	D=N/A P=N/A
Subscore							
OATING	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
SAT Writing	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Other Cr	iteria	Underg	raduate	Post-Baco	calaureate	Gradu	uate
Disposition	al Assessment		(١	1	Y	
EMPATHY/O	maha Interview	Ν		N		N	
	Essay	1	N	١	1	Y	
High Sch	ool Class Rank	N	/Α	N	/A	N//	4
	Interview		(N		Y	

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Letter of Commitment	Ν	N	Ν
Letter of Recommendation	Ν	N	Y
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N/A	N	Ν
OAE Content Assessment	N/A	N/A	Ν
Portfolio	Y	N	Ν
Prerequisite Courses	Y	N	Ν
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N/A	N/A	Ν
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N/A	N/A	Ν
Teacher Insight	Ν	N	Ν

Principal Program Admission Requirements

Program admission is determined in a focused review by the committee of graduate faculty. The assessment of candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are considered during an interview and through the review of all application materials, including GPA, letters of recommendation, dispositional assessment, and an essay.

Academic MeasureRequired ScoreNumber AdmittedAverage ScoreNumber EnrolledAverage ScoreGPA - Undergraduate2.75163.50263.50ACT Reading SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I MathN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Math SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I ReadingN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Composite SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - High SchoolN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/A	Completed N<10 N/A N/A N/A	Average Score N<10 N/A N/A
UndergraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Reading SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I MathN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Math SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I Reading ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal 	N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A
SubscoreImage: Constraint of the state of the	N/A N/A	N/A
SAT Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Math SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I ReadingN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I ReadingN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Composite SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal 	N/A	
SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Math SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I ReadingN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I ReadingN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/A		N/A
SubscoreImage: Construct of the second of the s	N1/A	
GRE Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Writing SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - High School N/AN/AN/AN/AN/AN/A	N/A	N/A
ScoreImage: scoreImage: scoreGRE Quantitative SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - GraduateN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Writing SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - High School N/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT CompositeN/AN/AN/AN/A	N/A	N/A
SubscoreImage: Constraint of the state of the	N/A	N/A
SAT Writing SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I Writing ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - High School N/AN/AN/AN/AN/AACT Composite N/AN/AN/AN/AN/A	N/A	N/A
SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGRE Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I Writing SAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - High School ACT CompositeN/AN/AN/AN/A	N/A	N/A
SubscoreImage: Constraint of the subscoreN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Verbal SubscoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/APraxis I Writing SAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/ASAT Composite ScoreN/AN/AN/AN/AN/AGPA - High School ACT CompositeN/AN/AN/AN/AN/A	N/A	N/A
SubscoreImage: Constraint of the second	N/A	N/A
SAT Composite Score N/A N/A N/A N/A GPA - High School N/A N/A N/A N/A ACT Composite N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A
Score Image: Constraint of the state of the	N/A	N/A
ACT Composite N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A
ACT English N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Writing N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A
MAT N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis II N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Criteria		<u>.</u>
Dispositional Assessment	Y	

Principal Preparation Programs

Other Criteria				
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	Ν			
Essay	Y			
Interview	Y			
Letter of Commitment	Ν			
Letter of Recommendation	Y			
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	Ν			
Portfolio	Ν			
Prerequisite Courses	Ν			
SRI Teacher Perceiver	Ν			
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	Ν			
Teacher Insight	Ν			

Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019

Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio candidates receive an invitation to complete the survey during their professional internship (student teaching). The results of this survey are reflected here. A total of 3,156 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 70 percent.

University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 76.47% Total Survey Responses = 39

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.21	3.52
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.	2.97	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.28	3.39
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.28	3.48
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.05	3.44
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.41	3.67
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.10	3.47
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.62	3.51
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.41	3.57
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 atrisk students.	3.21	3.46
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.10	3.41
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.46	3.60
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.18	3.31
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.49	3.57

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average 3.56					
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.46						
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.59	3.70					
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.33	3.57					
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.49	3.65					
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.18	3.52					
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring. 3.59							
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning. 2.95							
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.21	3.53					
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.26	3.53					
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	2.97	3.26					
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.	2.79	3.11					
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.64	3.01					
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.46	3.38					
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	2.92	3.24					
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.38	3.64					
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.18	2.97					
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.64	3.68					
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.05	3.42					
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.62	3.69					
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.69	3.68					
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.56	3.64					
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.13	3.54					

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average					
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.26	3.52					
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	2.69	3.30					
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	2.77	3.33					
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	2.82	3.36					
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.33	3.66					
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.26	3.55					
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.26	3.66					
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.03	3.56					
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.05	3.54					
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.38	3.67					
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.		3.43					
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	2.85	3.22					
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.13	3.44					

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019

Description of Data:

To gather information on alumni satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio Resident Educators who completed their preparation in Ohio receive an invitation to complete the survey in the fall semester as they enter Year 2 of the Resident Educator program. A total of 399 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 12 percent.

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average				
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	N<10	3.43				
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	3.16				
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 N<10 my content area.						
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	N<10	3.31				
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	N<10	3.53				
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	N<10	3.40				
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	arly communicate learning goals to students. N<10					
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	N<10	3.44				
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 atrisk students.						
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	N<10	3.25				
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	3.15				

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average	
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.46	
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	N<10	3.43	
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.57	
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	N<10	3.43	
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	N<10	3.31	
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	N<10	3.57	
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	N<10	3.31	
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	N<10	3.41	
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	N<10	3.43	
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	3.18	
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	3.08	
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	N<10	3.08	
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	N<10	3.27	
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	N<10	3.10	
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	N<10	3.43	
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	2.71	
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.56	
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	N<10	3.32	
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.54	
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.51	
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	

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average			
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	N<10	3.33			
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	N<10	3.18			
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	N<10	3.22			
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.	er licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their N<10				
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	N<10	3.47			
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	N<10	3.54			
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	N<10	3.45			
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	N<10	3.43			
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	N<10	3.57			
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.40			
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	N<10	3.23			
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.36			
49	My teacher licensure program prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	N<10	3.34			

Principal Intern Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019

Description of Data:

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation providers, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 392 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 41 percent.

University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 62.5% Total Survey Responses = 5

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average 3.53				
1	My program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	N<10					
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	N<10	3.53				
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.53				
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	3.50				
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.	ic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the					
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.54				
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.54				
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.	N<10	3.56				
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.51				
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	3.56				
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N<10	3.61				
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment N<10 addressing the physical and mental health needs of all. N<10						
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.48				
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N<10	3.65				
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N<10	3.66				

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	N<10	3.64
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N<10	3.66
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.63
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N<10	3.66
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.44
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.50
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.46
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.51

Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019

Description of Data:

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to individuals who serve as mentors to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 190 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 21 percent.

University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 12.5% Total Survey Responses = 1

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand leading and facilitating continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	N<10	3.42
2	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand leading the process of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	N<10	3.41
3	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand anticipating, monitoring, and responding to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.40
4	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand ensuring the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (i.e., national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	N<10	3.45
5	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand ensuring effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.45
6	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand advocating for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.	N<10	3.45
7	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.49
8	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.40
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.44
10	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N<10	3.49
11	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.47
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.43

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average	
13	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand upholding and modeling professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct.	N<10	3.53	
14	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand connecting the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.38	
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.36	
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.34	
17	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.38	
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.73	
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.91	
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.18	

National Accreditation Status

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education)

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 professional preparation of job applicants.

Accrediting Agency	CAEP
Date of Last Review	17-Apr
Accreditation Status	Accredited

Teacher Residency Program

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: University of Mount Union)

Description of Data:

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system. The data below show the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program.

Data from this table captures a year-to-year snapshot of the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program. Corrections to prior year reporting may be captured in the current year's reporting. Data used to create this "snapshot" table is sourced not only from the current year's resident educator completion data results, but also prior year results because a Resident Educator may fail to complete all the program year requirements within the same academic year.

Numerous scenarios were taken into account and discussions were held on how each should impact the counts. Some of the scenarios addressed in the design of the table are as follows:

1. A normal scenario, where a student is reported each year and is listed as completed. In this case, we only include them in the Entering/Persisting counts for the current year.

2. A scenario where a student is reported as entering one year, but not as completed, but then reported the following year as completing the previous year and current year. In this case, we include them in the Persisting count for the previous year, but not the Entering count. We also include them in the Entering and Persisting counts for the current year.

3. A scenario where a student is not reported one year, but reported with records for the previous year and the current year the following year (both as completed). In this scenario, we include them in both the Entering and Persisting counts for both years.

Initial Licensure Effective Year	Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
	Entering Persisting		Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Com	pleting	
2015	2	1	50%	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	12	100%	23	23	100%
2016	3	3	100%	6	6	100%	32	32	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2017	17 6 6 100%		25	25	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2018	2018 29		96.6%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Ohio EPP Program Completers Persisting in the State Resident Educator Program who were Prepared at University of Mount Union

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (Data Source: University of Mount Union)

Description of Data:

This section reflects self-reported information from Ohio Educator Preparation Providers on a maximum of three initiatives geared to increase excellence and support innovation in the preparation of Ohio educators.

Teacher Preparation Programs

Initiative:	STEM Navigator Program
Purpose:	The program provided Ohio Learning Standard aligned activities to 4th and 5th grade students at the Northside Intermediate School, in Alliance, Ohio during the after school Navigators Program.
Goal:	Provide hands-on review of 4th/5th grade math and science standards in order to support students as they prepare and complete the Ohio AIR assessment.
Number of Participants:	90
Strategy: Demonstration of Impact:	During a 4-week period in the spring of 2019, teacher candidates seeking the 4th and 5th grade early childhood endorsement prepared and delivered eight STEM sessions that aligned to 4th and 5th grade math and science skills. During the teacher candidates' time at the school, they spent 30 minutes with students and providing homework support. Immediately following, the 50 students in the Navigators program were divided into two groups. Then, each group received a mini-lesson that reviewed a science or math standard. Finally, students participated in a hands-on lab that applied the reviewed skill. While the STEM Navigator program was a small part of Northside Intermediate Schools plan to impact student learning and success, school report card data did indicate positive growth in the area of 4th grade math and 5th grade math for the school. Furthermore, teacher candidate qualitative surveys taken at the end of the program demonstrated trends indicating that the experience increased comfort teaching math and science topics with hands-on activities, as well as comfort integrating STEM in the classroom.
External Recognition:	None
Programs:	Early Childhood
Initiative:	Raider for a Day
Initiative: Purpose:	Raider for a Day Raider for a Day was developed to provide candidates the opportunity to teach students from multiple grade levels and to allow faculty/staff to bring their own children to campus.
	Raider for a Day was developed to provide candidates the opportunity to teach students from multiple grade levels and to allow faculty/staff to bring their own children to campus. The primary goal of Raider for a Day was to afford UMU candidates a field experience working with P-12 students of diverse ages. A secondary goal was to provide UMU employees a day of childcare/
Purpose:	Raider for a Day was developed to provide candidates the opportunity to teach students from multiple grade levels and to allow faculty/staff to bring their own children to campus. The primary goal of Raider for a Day was to afford UMU candidates a field experience working with
Purpose: Goal:	Raider for a Day was developed to provide candidates the opportunity to teach students from multiple grade levels and to allow faculty/staff to bring their own children to campus. The primary goal of Raider for a Day was to afford UMU candidates a field experience working with P-12 students of diverse ages. A secondary goal was to provide UMU employees a day of childcare/ schooling for their own children during spring break.

External Recognition:	of the day, and candidates valued working with a wide range of students and abilities. Plans are in place to expand this experience to a larger audience on our campus. None
Programs:	Early Childhood, Middle Childhood, Adolescence to Young Adult Education, Intervention Specialist, Multiage Education