### **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 2,200 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 graduate program in educational leadership that leads to a principal or CIPD licensure. Candidates in this program complete online coursework during the academic year and an on-campus institute each summer.

### **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

- Survey Results of Employer Perceptions of 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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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.

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 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.

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

3. Due to Ohio law, results must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 completers with OTES data.

	Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications					
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Skilled	# Developing	# Ineffective		
2012	32	24	N<10	N<10		
2013	24	23	N<10	N<10		
2014	12	18	N<10	N<10		
2015	12	N<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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.

Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications						
Initial Licensure # Accomplished # Skilled # Developing # Ineffective Effective Year						
N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A					

### Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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	130			
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	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	9				
Number of candidates completing internship	9				
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, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015 (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 2015-2016.

Teacher Licensure Tests				
Summary Rating: Effective				
Completers Tested Pass Rate				
50 100%				

### Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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 2015-2016 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

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

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

### **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, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.

2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on reading and mathematics achievement tests in grades 4-8.

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

	Effective Years 2014, 2015	Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
177	53	N=10	N=5	N=19	N=8	N=11
		19%	9%	36%	15%	21%

#### 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 Type					
N=23	N=14	N/A	N=16	N/A	
43%	26%	N/A	30%	N/A	

Teachers Serving by School Type					
Community School Public School STEM School Educational Service Cer					
N=1	N=52	N/A	N/A		
2%	98%	N/A	N/A		

Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added						
A B C D F NR						
N=25	N=3	N=7	N=5	N=13	N/A	
47%	6%	13%	9%	25%	N/A	

Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles					
High Minority Medium-High Minority Medium-Low Minority Low Minority					
N=8	N=11	N=16	N=18		
15%	21%	30%	34%		

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles					
High Poverty Medium-High Poverty Medium-Low Poverty Low Poverty					
N=9	N=15	N=15	N=14		
17%	28%	28%	26%		

\* 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 013, 2014, 2015	Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added			ed		
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	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	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 Sch		High School	No School Type			
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			
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	
Not Available Until 2018						

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles						
High Minority	High Minority Medium-High Minority Medium-Low Minority Low Minority					
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						
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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

### **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".

Teacher	Preparation	Programs
---------	-------------	----------

		Candidate	s Admitted	Candidate	es Enrolled	Candidates	Completing
		Canuluate	5 Aumilieu	Canuluate	es Ellioneu	Canuluales	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
GPA - 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
GPA -	U= 2.50	U=50	U= 3.41	U=128	U= 3.35	U=58	U= 3.63
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=15	G= 3.51	G=27	G= 3.53	G=N<10	G=N<10
GRE 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
GRE 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

#### U=Undergraduate P=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic	Required	Number	Average	Number	Average	Number	Average
Measure	Score	Admitted	Score	Enrolled	Score	Completed	Score
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
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
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
	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
	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
. axis / 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
Drevie II	U=N/A						
Praxis II	D=N/A P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A			P=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
	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
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
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 C	riteria	Underg	raduate	Post-Bace	calaureate	Grad	uate
Dispositio	nal Assessment	,	Y	N		Y	
	)maha Interview		N	,	N	N	1
			,	N		N	
	Essay	I	N	Ν		Y	
High Scl	nool Class Rank	Ν	//A	N	/A	N/	A
Interview Y		Y	1	N	Y	,	
Letter of Commitment			N	1	N	N	1
Letter of R	ecommendation		N	Ν		Y	,
Myers-Brigg	s Type Indicator	N	//A	1	N	N	
OAE Cont	ent Assessment	N	/A	N/A		N	

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Portfolio	Y	Ν	Ν
Prerequisite Courses	Y	Ν	Ν
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N/A	N/A	Ν
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N/A	N/A	Ν
Teacher Insight	Ν	N	Ν

		Candidate	s Admitted	Candidates Enrolled Candidates Com			Completing
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GPA - Undergraduate	2.75	15	3.51	27	3.53	N<10	N<10
GRE Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Writing Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Writing Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT English Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Math Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - Graduate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Verbal Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Reading Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - High School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Verbal Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Writing	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
SAT Composite Score	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
			Other C	riteria			
		Dispositi	onal Assessment			Y	
		EMPATHY	Omaha Interview			N	

## **Principal Preparation Programs**

Other Criteria					
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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

#### **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 3,445 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 69 percent.

### University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 90.32% Total Survey Responses = 56

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.47	3.50
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.	3.31	3.31
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.38	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.42	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.42	3.38
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.	3.56	3.61
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.38	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.40	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.44	3.53
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.	3.31	3.42
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.38	3.37
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.51	3.57
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.18	3.30
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.40	3.53
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication	3.44	3.51

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
	with families and caregivers.		
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.62	3.67
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.49	3.52
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.56	3.63
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.53	3.46
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.69	3.71
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.22	3.37
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.31	3.49
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.38	3.50
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.33	3.21
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	3.38	3.07
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.24	2.96
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.38	3.31
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.29	3.17
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.49	3.59
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.20	2.94
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.58	3.64
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.42	3.41
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.67	3.68
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.64	3.65
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.58	3.62
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.38	3.49
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.60	3.46

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.20	3.29
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.22	3.32
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.36	3.34
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.49	3.64
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.42	3.52
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.53	3.64
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.47	3.51
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.40	3.51
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.56	3.67
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.38	3.42
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.11	3.19
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.38	3.42

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

#### **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 1,910 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 29 percent.

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.60	3.42
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.	3.48	3.20
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.40	3.34
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.60	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.60	3.29
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.	3.64	3.44
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.48	3.34
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.56	3.36
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.64	3.41
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.	3.44	3.28
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.32	3.25
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.52	3.38
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.36	3.21
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.56	3.43

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.60	3.38
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.76	3.57
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.56	3.39
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.40	3.30
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.64	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.44	3.28
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.56	3.40
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.48	3.35
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.20	3.11
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.	3.04	2.89
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	3.04	2.89
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.44	3.22
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.24	3.07
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.28	3.33
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.08	2.79
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.56	3.55
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.72	3.37
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.64	3.56
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.60	3.53
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.52	3.50
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.40	3.30
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.48	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.52	3.21

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.40	3.22
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.48	3.28
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.72	3.53
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.48	3.45
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.56	3.52
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.48	3.42
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.60	3.39
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.68	3.57
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.48	3.35
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.28	3.19
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.44	3.34
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.44	3.27

### **Principal Intern Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

#### **Description of Data:**

To gather information 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 274 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 29 percent.

### University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 0% Total Survey Responses = 0

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	N/A	3.46
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	N/A	3.45
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N/A	3.45
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N/A	3.44
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.	N/A	3.42
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N/A	3.45
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N/A	3.49
8	My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	N/A	3.50
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N/A	3.44
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N/A	3.47
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N/A	3.49
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N/A	3.49
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N/A	3.33
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N/A	3.55
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N/A	3.53
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for	N/A	3.48

No.	Question		State Average
	collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.		
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N/A	3.54
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N/A	3.49
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N/A	3.56
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N/A	3.36
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N/A	3.46
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N/A	3.41
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N/A	3.45

### **Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

### **Description of Data:**

To gather information 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 100 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 17 percent.

### University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 0% Total Survey Responses = 0

#### 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/A	3.24
2	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand N/A leading the process of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.		3.24
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/A	3.28
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/A	3.23
5	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understandEnsuring effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N/A	3.23
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/A	3.32
7	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of data by self and staff.	N/A	3.32
8	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of research by self and staff.	N/A	3.33
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N/A	3.32
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/A	3.36
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/A	3.38
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N/A	3.19

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/A	3.39
14	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand connecting the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N/A	3.19
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N/A	3.22
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N/A	3.20
17	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand etablishing expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N/A	3.27
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N/A	2.55
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N/A	2.85
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N/A	2.18

### **Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education administered survey of Employers of Ohio Educators)

### **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 employers of Ohio educators. Questions on the survey are aligned with Ohio's Learning Standards, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 214 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of seven percent.

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	The institution prepares its graduates to understand student learning and development.	3.23	3.30
2	The institution prepares its graduates to respect the diversity of the students they teach.	3.31	3.34
3	The institution prepares its graduates to know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.	3.46	3.35
4	The institution prepares its graduates to understand and use content-specific instructional strategies to effectively teach the central concepts and skills of the discipline.	3.31	3.24
5	The institution prepares its graduates to be knowledgeable about assessment types, their purposes, and the data they generate.	2.85	3.04
6	The institution prepares its graduates to analyze data to monitor student progress and learning.	2.69	2.99
7	The institution prepares its graduates to use data to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction.	2.62	2.97
8	The institution prepares its graduates to align their instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities.	3.08	3.16
9	The institution prepares its graduates to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students.	2.85	3.02
10	The institution prepares its graduates to treat students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.23	3.36
11	The institution prepares its graduates to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.	3.15	3.30
12	The institution prepares its graduates to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.23	3.25
13	The institution prepares its graduates to collaborate effectively with other teachers, administrators, and district staff.	3.23	3.26
14	The institution prepares its graduates to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.15	3.33
15	The institution prepares its graduates to assume responsibility for professional growth.	3.15	3.29

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

### **National Accreditation Status**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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	NCATE
Date of Last Review	Nov-16
Accreditation Status	Accredited

### **Teacher Residency Program**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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. Of note, a Resident Educator entering a program year may fail to complete all the program year requirements within the same academic year. Within set parameters, the individual may re-attempt the program year requirements in the subsequent academic year. These rare instances may affect the reported data, for example, showing persistence rates greater than 100 percent for a particular program year.

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

Initial Licensure Effective Year	Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Completing	
2012	2	2	100%	10	10	100%	28	27	96.4%	38	38	100%
2013	10	9	90%	24	24	100%	35	35	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	19	19	100%	28	28	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	34	33	97.1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### **Excellence and Innovation Initiatives**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016 (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:	Raiders Aviators Connection (RAC) Partnership
Purpose:	Preservice teacher candidates tutored third grade students who were struggling in literacy development. Candidates had an opportunity to develop their teaching and assessment skills through tutoring.
Goal:	To enhance the literacy skills of the P-12 students identified with a need and enhance their confidence as they develop into independent readers and writers. To develop literacy related instructional and assessment skills of our candidates and develop an understanding of literacy development.
Number of Participants:	73
Strategy:	During Reading Assessment and Reading Methods classes, candidates took part in an experiential learning program where third grade students who are struggling in literacy development received literacy tutoring from the preservice teachers. Working with third graders from Rockhill Elementary School in Alliance, Ohio, candidates met twice a week throughout the fall and spring semesters to tutor the P-12 students in the areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Additionally the candidates assessed the students' literacy skills in order to make instructional decisions and determine impact on student learning. Since the partnership occurred off campus, the candidates attended class in the partner school. The professor in each course is the primary instructor, but various teachers and staff from Rockhill School provided professional development to the candidates.
Demonstration of Impact:	Survey and interview data indicated that the project was successful. P-12 students' developed their reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. This was documented in the P-12 surveys and interviews and by the fact that 100% of the students' iReady scores improved, The surveys and interviews also documented that the candidates developed literacy teaching skills and assessment skills. Both the P-12 students and candidates developed confidence in their abilities and expressed the importance of the program and recommended continuation.
External Recognition:	UMU teacher candidates were featured in newspaper articles. They also received certificates of
Programs:	appreciation by Rockhill School. Intervention Specialist (Mild/Moderate), Interventions Specialist (Early Childhood), Early Childhood
-	
Initiative:	Pen Pal Project-Luis Munoz Marin School, Clev, OH
Purpose:	To improve writing skills, communication skills, and encourage fourth grade students to consider attending college.
Goal:	P-12 Students: To improve letter writing and communication skills, bond with university students, and consider college as an option for their future. Candidates: To guide students during the semester through letter writing and get to know students and their interests and abilities at this level.
Number of Participants:	69
Strategy:	Candidates and P-12 students wrote pen pal letters throughout the semester. Communication and writing skills are worked on through this process, and candidates encouraged P-12 students to consider going to college. Candidates then prepared learning games and literacy centers based on students' needs. P-12 teachers sent lists of topics used for these games and centers based on criteria for standardized tests. When the pen pals met, candidates taught the P-12 students how to use the games/centers so they were able to teach their peers after the visit. During the fall semester, the candidates visited the students at Luis Munoz Marin School. In the spring, the Luis Munoz Marin students visited UMU's campus. The P-12 students took a tour of the campus with the UMU candidates leading the tour. While on campus several members of the UMU faculty and staff visited with the students and shared information about different majors and activities available to students on campus. The culminating activity was lunch in the dining hall with one of our UMU candidates telling the P-12 students about his adversities related to becoming a college graduate.

Demonstration of Impact:	The P-12 students completed a questionnaire based on the experience of having college level pen pals. They also rated the games and centers made by the UMU candidates. The P-12 teacher completed a survey about the experience and the impact the UMU candidates had on their students. The UMU candidates provided feedback on the experience. Survey and questionnaire data indicate that the project was successful.
External Recognition: Programs:	: Local newspapers in Alliance and Cleveland were present to take pictures and report on activities during the visits. The superintendent of Cleveland Schools sent a letter to UMU recognizing the partnership, and the building principal wrote letters of recommendation for each candidate. Early Childhood, Intervention Specialist (Mild Moderate & Early Childhood), and Middle Childhood

### **Principal Preparation Programs**

Initiative:	University of Mount Union SCHOLAR Day
Purpose:	Research the challenges/successes facing building/district level administrators. MAEL participants hone leadership skills through presenting and utilizing strategies to address educational research.
Goal:	To provide graduate students with research, proposal writing, presentation, and professional networking opportunities that highlight their knowledge of and experiences with educational administration.
Number of Participants:	20
Strategy:	All MAEL candidates work on crafting a peer- and professor-reviewed conference proposal that is reviewed through an Institutional Review Board. Once submitted, candidates are notified of their acceptance to present research in the public SCHOLAR Day held at the University. Following presentation of their research, candidates evaluate their work, and gain confidence for becoming a public advocate for education.
Demonstration of Impact:	MAEL candidates partake in a great deal of coursework that allows candidates to showcase knowledge of administrative content; however, SCHOLAR Day takes that showcasing one step forward and provides a public forum for candidates to make an impact with sharing their knowledge and research in the field of education.
External Recognition:	The MAEL candidates receive accolades from University professors, undergraduate students, and graduate peers. Their presentations promote research in the field and provide recruitment and recognition for our MAEL program.