

2017

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

University of Mount Union

Institution Profile

(Data Source: University of Mount Union)

The University of Mount Union, in Alliance, Ohio, is a private institution offering baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degrees with a current enrollment of 2,095 students and 162 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
- 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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

**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, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.
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
2013	24	22	N<10	N<10
2014	16	18	N<10	N<10
2015	16	12	N<10	N<10
2016	10	15	N<10	N<10

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.

Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications				
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Skilled	# Developing	# Ineffective
2015	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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	N
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	120
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 admitted to internship	16
Number of candidates completing internship	16
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(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 2016-2017.

Teacher Licensure Tests	
Summary Rating: Effective	
Completers Tested	Pass Rate
56	100%

Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Mount Union

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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
12	100%

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.
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.
4. Due to system parameters excluding records with missing demographic data, some records have not been reported.

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

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
144	53	N=7 13%	N=9 17%	N=19 36%	N=7 13%	N=11 21%

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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=21	N=11	N=2	N=19	N/A
40%	21%	4%	36%	N/A

Teachers Serving by School Type

Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
N=6	N=47	N/A	N/A
11%	89%	N/A	N/A

Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added

A	B	C	D	F	NR
N=18	N=1	N=6	N=2	N=26	N/A
34%	2%	11%	4%	49%	N/A

Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles

High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N=11	N=9	N=21	N=12
21%	17%	40%	23%

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles

High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N=8	N=13	N=11	N=21
15%	25%	21%	40%

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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	A	B	C	D	F	NR
N<10	N<10	N/A	N/A	N<10	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 Type
N<10	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<10	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School					
A	B	C	D	F	NR
Not Available Until 2018					

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles			
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N/A	N/A	N<10	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<10
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GRE Verbal Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
GRE Writing Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
MAT	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis CORE Math	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis CORE Reading	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis CORE Writing	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis I Math	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis I Reading	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis I Writing	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis II	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Composite Score	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Quantitative Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Verbal Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Writing Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Other Criteria		Undergraduate		Post-Baccalaureate		Graduate	
Dispositional Assessment		Y		N		Y	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview		N		N		N	
Essay		N		N		Y	
High School Class Rank		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Interview		Y		N		Y	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		N	
Letter of Recommendation		N		N		Y	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		N/A		N		N	
OAE Content Assessment		N/A		N/A		N	

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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.

Principal Preparation Programs

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GPA - Undergraduate	2.75	12	3.54	28	3.49	12	3.99
GPA - High School	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
ACT Composite Score	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
ACT Reading Subscore	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
SAT Composite Score	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 Verbal 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
Praxis I Reading	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
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
GRE Composite Score	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
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
MAT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Criteria							
Dispositional Assessment				Y			

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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

2017 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 3,341 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 69 percent.

University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 100%

Total Survey Responses = 52

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.77	3.51
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.	3.58	3.32
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.62	3.36
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.58	3.48
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.60	3.43
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.	3.60	3.62
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.65	3.48
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.67	3.50
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.71	3.55
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.58	3.46
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.65	3.39
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.73	3.58
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.58	3.32
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.73	3.55
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication	3.69	3.54

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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.	3.87	3.68
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.79	3.55
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.79	3.63
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.79	3.49
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.92	3.72
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.65	3.42
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.79	3.51
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.69	3.52
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.63	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.	3.48	3.07
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.44	3.03
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.75	3.34
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.58	3.21
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.63	3.58
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.38	2.95
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.79	3.67
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.65	3.40
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.83	3.69
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.83	3.68
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.79	3.63
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.56	3.52
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.56	3.49

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.40	3.29
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.54	3.30
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.58	3.34
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.85	3.65
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.81	3.55
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.83	3.65
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.77	3.55
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.69	3.54
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.87	3.68
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.75	3.41
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.65	3.20
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.71	3.41

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 854 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 19 percent.

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.47	3.46
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.	3.13	3.19
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.33	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.33	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.53	3.31
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.	3.60	3.50
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.27	3.38
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.60	3.39
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.60	3.43
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.40	3.30
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.27	3.24
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.47	3.37
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.20	3.15
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.40	3.43

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.53	3.37
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.67	3.58
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.60	3.41
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.47	3.33
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.73	3.59
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.33	3.28
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.53	3.40
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.60	3.34
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	2.93	3.12
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	2.93	2.96
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.93	2.96
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.13	3.26
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.20	3.10
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.47	3.39
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.07	2.69
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.67	3.53
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.53	3.33
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.67	3.53
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.67	3.54
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.60	3.54
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.40	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.40	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.40	3.19

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.40	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.33	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.60	3.54
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.53	3.44
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.73	3.53
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.73	3.43
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.	3.73	3.59
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.53	3.36
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.33	3.18
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.53	3.37
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.60	3.28

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

Principal Intern Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 478 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 40 percent.

University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 30%

Total Survey Responses = 6

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<10	3.54
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	3.50
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.51
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	3.49
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<10	3.47
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	3.57
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	3.53
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	3.53
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	3.59
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.57
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.47
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N<10	3.64
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N<10	3.65
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for	N<10	3.62

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
	collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.		
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N<10	3.65
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.60
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	3.49
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.55
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.47
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.51

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 209 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 21 percent.

University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 20%
Total Survey Responses = 4

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	3.30
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	3.31
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	3.28
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<10	3.34
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<10	3.34
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	3.34
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	3.36
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	3.30
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.29
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	3.41
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	3.37
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.28

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

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	3.46
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	3.23
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.23
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.22
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	3.24
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.62
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.90
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.14

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

(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 94 respondents completed the survey statewide.

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	The institution prepares its graduates to understand student learning and development.	N<10	3.34
2	The institution prepares its graduates to respect the diversity of the students they teach.	N<10	3.32
3	The institution prepares its graduates to know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.	N<10	3.39
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.	N<10	3.24
5	The institution prepares its graduates to be knowledgeable about assessment types, their purposes, and the data they generate.	N<10	3.10
6	The institution prepares its graduates to analyze data to monitor student progress and learning.	N<10	3.01
7	The institution prepares its graduates to use data to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction.	N<10	2.99
8	The institution prepares its graduates to align their instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities.	N<10	3.21
9	The institution prepares its graduates to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students.	N<10	3.05
10	The institution prepares its graduates to treat students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	N<10	3.39
11	The institution prepares its graduates to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.	N<10	3.36
12	The institution prepares its graduates to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.35
13	The institution prepares its graduates to collaborate effectively with other teachers, administrators, and district staff.	N<10	3.31
14	The institution prepares its graduates to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.39
15	The institution prepares its graduates to assume responsibility for professional growth.	N<10	3.29

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

National Accreditation Status

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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	16-Nov
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2017

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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:	TANF Town Poverty Simulation
Purpose:	To help candidates, faculty, and inservice professionals work together to gain a deeper understanding of families living in poverty
Goal:	Participants in TANF Town: 1) Gain empathy and a better understanding of the impact of poverty on families, 2) Recognize poverty as a non-academic barrier to children's learning, and 3) Consider learning supports and strategies that can be used to counteract the impact of poverty on learning.
Number of Participants:	97
Strategy:	The TANF Town Poverty Simulation is an immersion experience designed to sensitize participants to the realities of poverty. UMU candidates, faculty, and inservice professionals participate together in a building in Alliance City Schools to take on the roles of members of families facing a variety of challenging, but typical, circumstances. Examples of families include: Grandparents Raising Grandchildren; Working Parents; Single Parent Households; and Young Adult Caring for Underage Siblings. It is the families' responsibility to provide food, shelter, and other basic necessities by accessing various community resources during the course of four 15-minute "weeks." In addition, about 20 volunteers play the roles of resource providers in the community. Volunteers are candidates who have participated in the simulation in prior years. The TANF Town Poverty Simulation is conducted in a large room. The three-hour activity includes an introduction and briefing, the simulation exercise, and a guided debriefing in which participants and volunteers share their observations and insights from the activity.
Demonstration of Impact:	Candidates complete a survey and reflection after the simulation, and the results were positive. For instance, one question stated, "On a scale of 1-4, with 1 being low and 4 being high, my knowledge and understanding of the impact of poverty on students and families prior to this presentation was: 1, 2, 3, 4," and 76% of respondents indicated their knowledge was low (1 or 2). After the simulation, results improved, as 100% of participants indicated their knowledge was a 3 or 4. Further, 100% of candidates strongly agree or agree that they would recommend this simulation activity to others and that the activities were helpful in increasing understanding of the impact of poverty.
External Recognition:	This was the fourth year of the simulation partnership between Alliance City Schools and various agencies across the area, and plans for the simulation to continue during the 2017-2018 year for candidates and inservice professionals are already in place.
Programs:	Early Childhood, Middle Childhood, Intervention Specialist, Multiage, AYA

Initiative:	International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme
Purpose:	Unite middle school candidates with middle school students
Goal:	Prepare teacher candidates for Project-Based Learning, familiarize them with the International Baccalaureate program, and have them experience creative Learning Units with a focus on literacy and P-12 student interest.
Number of Participants:	31
Strategy:	MCH 345: Middle School Content Area Literacy is focused on the unique features of Project-Based or Problem-Based (PBL) teaching and learning as it pertains to the International Baccalaureate Middle Years Programme (IB MYP). Over the course of two years, Alliance Middle School (AMS) began and entered candidacy for IB MYP. During those two years, candidates from MCH 345 spent every Friday at AMS. They were involved in instruction, teaching, and interviewing 6th graders, including designing Student Interest Surveys regarding PBL. Their participation included teaching high interest lessons, an Interactive Mediaeval Museum, and two Book Fairs. Candidates and the Assistant Principal from AMS traveled to Shaker Heights Middle School (SHMS) to investigate a well-established IB MYP; while at

2017

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

Demonstration of Impact:	SHMS, they were able to interact with teachers, administrators, and most importantly SHMS students during their observations in various classrooms. The culmination of the course included a group presentation of an IB/PBL Unit to the 6th grade students and AMS administrators, and teachers. P-12 student data was gathered regarding the impact of the UMU candidates, and all results were favorable and included recognizing the value of mentoring. AMS students especially valued having input into the design and assessment of the Learning Units. Candidates' evaluations and reflections were especially favorable in that the content of the course was new to them and quite informative. Further, two candidates reported that they secured employment in STEM schools in large part due to their knowledge of interdisciplinary teaching and their ability to design and implement the IB Curriculum.
External Recognition:	Candidates in MCH 345 were asked to present their findings at an Alliance City School Board Meeting.
Programs:	Middle Childhood
Initiative:	IT'S Math Professional Learning Community
Purpose:	IT'S Math, or "I Teach Students Math," is a Professional Learning Community (PLC) developed to provide candidates opportunities to share ideas and learn strategies for teaching mathematics.
Goal:	The goal of IT'S Math is to bridge the gap between early childhood, middle childhood, and high school mathematics preservice teachers and to provide candidates the opportunity to become a member of a PLC that fosters collaboration, learning, and growth.
Number of Participants:	25
Strategy:	Our adolescent to young adult (AYA) math methods professor was interested in providing opportunities for early childhood and middle childhood candidates to join AYA candidates to better understand vertical alignment and the entire scope and sequence of math from preschool through grade 12. After identifying candidates to serve as leaders who would become the Core Members, they created a PLC that focuses on collaboration, results, and improved instruction. The professor teaches the Core Members, and they in turn teach their peers at IT'S Math workshops. IT'S Math gatherings are not tied to a course, nor are they required. These completely voluntary events are attracting more than one-third of our candidates who plan to teach math. Sessions are grounded in research, incorporate multiple activities, and have become true PLCs. This real-world professional development is aligned to OSPD standards, it has helped candidates further their appreciation for all grade bands, and it has helped them increase their drive for professional development.
Demonstration of Impact:	After IT'S Math PLC workshops, the Core candidates distribute surveys to determine effectiveness. All results have been positive, as 100% of the participants indicated that they were either "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" (with 72% indicating that they were "very satisfied") on a scale of "very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neutral, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied." Further, content related survey data reveal that 90% of participants' skills increased when asked questions such as, "Has your ability to explain why we multiply and divide fractions using the 'rules' we do increased or stayed the same?"
External Recognition:	Core Members submitted a proposal to UMU's annual SCHOLAR Day Conference, and it was accepted. Proposals are reviewed by faculty from all disciplines; a limited number are accepted. The session focused on research of PLCs, fostering collaboration, and boosting confidence levels and knowledge.
Programs:	Early Childhood, Middle Childhood, Intervention Specialist, AYA

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
University of Mount Union

Principal Preparation Programs

Initiative:	Innovative Technologies Impact Online Learning
Purpose:	To engage graduate candidates with innovative technologies that drive content mastery and build relationships with peers and faculty
Goal:	Utilize innovative technologies to master content regarding the following areas: 1) Value diversity, 2) Analyze cutting-edge theories, assessment and leadership, and 3) Apply educational research and research techniques.
Number of Participants:	30
Strategy:	The Master of Arts in Educational Leadership program engages candidates with technologies like Google Hangout, Voice Thread, screencasts, interactive timelines, collaborative spreadsheets and presentations, and several other web tools that enhance candidate learning and peer-faculty engagement. Although our course management system has capabilities for high levels of engagement, the innovative use of technology is limited when transferring skill sets to the P-12 sector. Our work with integrating innovative web technologies helps take the relationship building and content connectivity to a higher level. Through our online orientation, we walk candidates through a series of introductory videos that highlights the innovative technologies utilized. Candidates have described our choice of technology integration as meaningful, powerful, and describe the technologies as those they would use with P-12 candidates. Utilizing these technologies has helped us achieve a high success of reaching our learning goals for the candidates.
Demonstration of Impact:	Exit survey data demonstrate that our innovative usage of technology and pedagogy clearly impacts candidate learning, and candidate evaluations also demonstrate high satisfaction with courses that utilize these technologies. Between 92%-100% of candidates reported that they recognize diversity in teaching and learning, understand and analyze cutting-edge theories and practices of instruction, curriculum development, assessment, and leadership, and apply educational research to implement data-driven decision making.