### 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 1,889 students and 239 graduate students. The University is regionally accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, most recently reaffirmed in 2020-21, and is in the Open Pathway. 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 primary education, middle childhood, intervention specialist, adolescence to young adult education, and multiage education. The University also offers a master of education program that leads to an Ohio principal's license.

### **Report Overview**

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

- Ohio Teacher Evaluation System Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider
- Ohio Principal Evaluation System Results for for Ohio Principals Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider
- Field and Clinical Experiences Required by Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Candidates
- Licensure Test Results for Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Program Completers
- Value-added Data for K-12 Students Taught by Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider
- Demographic Information for Schools in Which Ohio Educator Preparation Provider-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve
- Academic Measures Used to Inform Admissions Decisions at Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Survey Results of Pre-Service Teacher Candidates Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Survey Results of Ohio Resident Educators Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers
- Survey Results of Ohio Principal Interns Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Survey Results of Mentors Serving Principal Interns Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider National Accreditation Status
- Persistence in the Ohio Resident Educator Program of Teachers Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers
- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

# Ohio 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 September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

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

Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a detailed view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement. The system is research-based and designed to be transparent, fair, and adaptable to the specific contexts of Ohio's school districts. Furthermore, it builds on what educators know about the importance of ongoing assessment and feedback as a powerful vehicle to support improved practice. Teacher performance and student academic growth are the two key components of Ohio's evaluation system.

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

Limitations of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Data:

- 1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2018, 2019, 2020 and 2021.
- 2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education.
- 3. Due to ORC 3333.041(B), annual results must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 completers with OTES data.

	Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications					
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Skilled	# Developing	# Ineffective		
2018	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2019	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2020	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2021	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		

### 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 September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (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 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.

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

Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications						
Initial Licensure # Accomplished # Skilled # Developing # Ineffect Effective Year						
2018	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2019	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2021	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

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

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (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	100				
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	300				
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	16				
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	100%				

Principal Preparation Programs					
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements				
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	45				
Number of candidates who started internship	13				
Number of candidates who completed internship	13				
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%				

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

Description	of Data:
-------------	----------

Teacher Licensure Tests				
Summary Rating: EFFECTIVE				
Completers Tested Pass Rate				
42	98%			

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

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (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 2019-2020 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

Principal Licensure Tests				
Completers Tested Pass Rate				
14	100%			

### 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 September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

### **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 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020.
- 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.

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

	sure Effective 019, 2020, 2021	Associated Value-Added Classifications		tions
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Yellow Green Light Blue		
106	39	N=8 21%	N=26 67%	N=5 13%

# 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 Leve						
N=13	N=11	N=1	N=14	N/A		
33%	28%	3%	36%	N/A		

Teachers Serving by School Type					
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center	Career-Tech	No School Type
N/A	N=39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

	Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added					
A B C D F NR						
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N=39	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	

Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles						
High Minority Medium-High Minority Medium-Low Minority Low Minority No Minority Qu						
N=6	N=10	N=12	N=11	N/A		
15%	26%	31%	28%	N/A		

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles						
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty	No Poverty Quartile		
N=8	N=14	N=7	N=10	N/A		
21%	36%	18%	26%	N/A		

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

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

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

	ure Effective 119, 2020, 2021	Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added				dded
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value- Added Data	Α	В	С	D	F
N<10	N<10	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A

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

Principals Serving by School Level						
Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	No School Level		
N<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	Career-Tech	No School Type	
N/A	N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

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

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles						
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority	No Minority Quartile		
N/A	N/A	N<10	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles						
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty	No Poverty Quartile		
N/A	N/A	N<10	N/A	N/A		
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

### **University of Mount Union Candidate Academic Measures**

(Data Source:University of Mount Union)
Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

### **Undergraduate Admission Requirements**

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

### **Graduate Admission Requirements**

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

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

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

Candidates Admitted is the number admitted (for fall or spring) during the academic year.

Candidates Enrolled is the total number of candidates admitted and enrolled (including program completers) during the academic year.

Candidates Completing is the number meeting all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program during the academic year.

#### **Teacher Preparation Programs**

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

		Candidate	s Admitted	Candidate	Candidates Enrolled		Completing
Academic	Required	Number	Average	Number	Average	Number	Average
Measure	Score	Admitted	Score	Enrolled	Score	Completed	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 Essay	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
(Optional)	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
ACT Science	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

Academic Measure	Required			i		1	
Wicasurc	Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
PA - High School	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
FA - High School	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
GFA - ITALISIEI	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=60	U= 3.44	U=119	U= 3.45	U=45	U= 3.54
Undergraduate	0= 2.30 P=N/A	P=N/A	0= 3.44 P=N/A	0=119 P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	0= 3.34 P=N/A
Unidergraduate	G= 2.75	G=N<10	G=N<10	G=26	G= 3.42	G=13	G= 3.50
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
ocore	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	U=N/A P=N/A	D=N/A P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
Subscore	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ODE Variation							
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 G=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
005.14.11	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
raxis 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
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis I Writing	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
Praxis II	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
i iunio ii	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
SAT Composite							
Score	U=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 P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A
Score	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
CAT Econo		U=N/A		U=N/A		U=N/A	U=N/A
SAT Essay,	U=N/A	U=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 P=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A
Vriting (Optional)	P=N/A						
CATM	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
SAT 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
SAT Reading/	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Vriting 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 Cri	iteria	Underg	raduate	Post-Bace	calaureate	Gradu	uate
Disposition	al Assessment	,	Y	1	N	Y	
P140.4 T10.41=	maka kata				\ <u>\</u>		
EMPATHY/O	maha Interview	ſ	N	·	N	N	

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Essay	N	N	Υ
High School Class Rank	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interview	Υ	N	Υ
Letter of Commitment	N	N	N
Letter of Recommendation	N	N	Υ
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N/A	N	N
OAE Content Assessment	N/A	N/A	N
Portfolio	N	N	N
Prerequisite Courses	Υ	N	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N/A	N/A	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N/A	N/A	N
Teacher Insight	N	N	N

# 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	N<10	N<10	26	3.42	13	3.50
SPA - 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 Math Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Reading/ 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
ACT Science Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Essay (Optional)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Essay, Writing (Optional)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

### **Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results**

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

### **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 2,514 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 51.6 percent.

### University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 103.51% Total Survey Responses = 59

#### 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.	3.61	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.	3.45	3.33
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.55	3.37
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.49	3.47
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.45	3.41
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.61	3.67
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.47	3.48
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.69	3.54
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.55	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 atrisk students.	3.35	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.41	3.42
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.71	3.60
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.45	3.32
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.65	3.57

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average			
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.61	3.53			
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.63	3.69			
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.59	3.57			
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.59	3.63			
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.51	3.52			
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.67	3.75			
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.47	3.50			
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.49	3.52			
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.69	3.56			
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.39	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.	3.31	3.15			
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	3.49	3.10			
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.67	3.40			
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.61	3.27			
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.67	3.67			
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.41	2.99			
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.73	3.66			
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).					
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.  3.73					
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.76	3.70			
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.76	3.64			
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.55	3.56			

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.41	3.54
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.33	3.27
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.45	3.32
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.55	3.40
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.67	3.67
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.63	3.56
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.71	3.66
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.65	3.58
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.67	3.63
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.78	3.70
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.63	3.49
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.53	3.27
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.57	3.49

### 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 September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

### **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 456 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 12.5 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.	N<10	3.37	
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	N<10	3.10	
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	N<10	3.21	
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	N<10	3.31	
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	N<10	3.26	
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	N<10	3.51	
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	N<10	3.33	
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	N<10	3.36	
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	N<10	3.36	
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.	N<10	3.20	
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	N<10	3.15	
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	N<10	3.29	
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	N<10	2.93	

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average		
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.34		
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	N<10	3.32		
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.51		
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	N<10	3.40		
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	N<10	3.21		
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	N<10	3.53		
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	N<10	3.31		
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	N<10	3.33		
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	N<10	3.28		
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	N<10	3.02		
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	N<10	2.98		
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	N<10	2.98		
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	N<10	3.21		
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	N<10	2.99		
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	N<10	3.44		
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	N<10	2.68		
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.49		
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	N<10	3.23		
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	upported my N<10			
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.47		
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).				
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	N<10	3.21		

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	N<10	3.23
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	N<10	3.04
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	N<10	3.07
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	N<10	3.14
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	N<10	3.47
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	N<10	3.35
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	N<10	3.43
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	N<10	3.31
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	N<10	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	N<10	3.50
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.32
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	N<10	3.06
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.32
49	My teacher licensure program prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	N<10	3.21

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

### **Principal Intern Survey Results**

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

### **Description of Data:**

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation providers, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 292 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 20.9 percent.

### University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 83.33% Total Survey Responses = 10

#### 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.	3.83	3.59
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	3.92	3.58
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	3.75	3.59
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	3.42	3.54
5	My program prepared me to ensure the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	3.58	3.58
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	3.67	3.61
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	3.92	3.64
8	My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.50	3.64
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	3.75	3.60
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	3.83	3.62
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	3.92	3.67
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	3.92	3.65
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	3.42	3.54
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	4.00	3.71
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	3.75	3.74

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average	
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	3.92	3.69	
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	3.83	3.69	
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	3.92	3.67	
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	4.00	3.71	
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	3.75	3.52	
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	3.67	3.59	
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	3.67	3.53	
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	3.92	3.60	

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

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

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022.

### **Description of Data:**

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by 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 8.8 percent.

## University of Mount Union Survey Response Rate = 650% Total Survey Responses = 13

### 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	3.35	
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	3.30	
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	3.32	
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	3.39	
5	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand ensuring effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.39	
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	3.37	
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	3.43	
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	3.42	
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.42	
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	3.38	
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	3.41	
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.38	

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	3.47
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	3.26
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.28
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.28
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	3.36
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.78
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.86
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.22

### **National Accreditation Status**

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (Data Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education)

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

All educator preparation programs (EPPs) in Ohio are required to be accredited by either the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), or their successor agency, the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Accreditation is a mechanism to ensure the quality of an institution and its programs. The accreditation of an institution and/or program helps employers evaluate the professional preparation of job applicants.

Accrediting Agency	CAEP
Date of Last Review	April 2017
Accreditation Status	Accredited

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

### **Teacher Residency Program**

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (Data Source: University of Mount Union)

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

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

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

Some of the scenarios addressed in the design of the table are as follows:

- 1. A normal scenario, where a student is reported each year and is listed as completed. In this case, we include them in only the Entering/Persisting counts for the current year.
- 2. A scenario where a student is reported as entering one year, but not as completed, but then reported the following year as completing the previous year and current year. In this case, we include them in the Persisting count for the previous year, but not the Entering count. We also include them in the Entering and Persisting counts for the current year.
- 3. A scenario where a student is not reported for one year, but reported with records for the previous year and the current year the following year (both as completed). In this scenario, we include them in both the Entering and Persisting counts for both years.
- 4. A scenario involving a registration fluke where a student completes Year 1 of the RE program with an issued RE license, but not an effective or valid license until the following school year. For example, a teacher has all the qualifications for a full license, but completed Year 1 under a sub-license (in which the work is counted) and Year 2 under a RE license.

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

Initial Licensure Effective Year	sure			Resid	lency Ye	ar 2	Resid	lency Ye	ear 3	Resid	ency Ye	ar 4
	Entering Persisting Ente		Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Com	pleting	
2018	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	23	23	100%
2019	2 1 50%		4	4	100%	23	23	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2020	11 10 90.9%		31	31	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
2021	25	25	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Mount Union

### **Excellence and Innovation Initiatives**

Reporting period from September 1, 2021 to August 31, 2022. (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: 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:	80
Strategy:	The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Town Poverty Simulation is an immersion experience designed to sensitize participants to the realities of poverty. UMU senior candidates in clinical practice participated in the simulation to learn more about poverty, while Education faculty and community members served as facilitators of the experience. Education faculty and community members facilitated by taking on the roles of landlords, bankers, shop owners, teachers, police officers, and more. Candidates assumed the roles of family members living in poverty and had to learn how to find and pay for transportation, pay rent, find childcare, get to work on time, buy food, etc. At the end of the simulation, facilitators led candidates through a debriefing activity where they discussed their strengths, challenges, feelings/emotions, takeaways, and more.
Demonstration of Impact:	Anecdotally, during the debriefing session and during clinical seminar the next day, candidates expressed how much the experience opened their eyes to facets of poverty they hadn't considered previously. Candidates noted a stronger sense of awareness and empathy that could both inform their teaching.
External Recognition:	None
Programs:	Primary, Middle Childhood, Intervention Specialist, Multiage, AYA

Initiative:	Theater and Education: A Natural Partnership
Purpose:	Theater and Education candidates created and delivered face-to-face lessons for Alliance City School District's Summer Explorers Program
Goal:	Alliance City School students in grades 2-5 received art-embedded opportunities aligned with the thematic learning goals of a summer bridge program, which improved reading comprehension.
Number of Participants:	90
Strategy:	University of Mount Union professors in Education and Theater offered in-person and virtual workshops to candidates related to actor training techniques and effective lesson planning. Then, UMU candidates collaborated with the ACS's staff to develop four, weeklong thematic units that were later taught to ACS students in the Summer Explorers Program.
Demonstration of Impact:	ACS grades 2-5 students were identified based on literacy and mathematics scores to participate in the Summer Explorers Program. By the end of the program, 100% of the 85 students improved their scores on their literacy post-tests. The goal was for 70% to improve post-test scores. Additionally, students in the program completed a survey at the end, and the Average Rating (number of "yes" responses that the program asset was present compared to responses of "no" on the above 20 questions) was 96%. The program was very well received by ACS students, families, and staff, and by UMU faculty and candidates.
External Recognition:	This led to two international conference presentations. The sessions, "Lights, Camera, Teach: Building Engaged Play through Theater-Based Pedagogy" and "Rucksacks in the Limelight: A Duet between Play and Acting" were presented at EECERA in Glasgow, Scotland in 2022.

Programs: Primary, Middle Childhood, Intervention Specialist, Multiage, AYA