

2016 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Institution Profile

(Data Source: Muskingum University)

The mission of Muskingum University is to offer quality academic programs in the liberal arts and sciences in the setting of a residential, coeducational, church-related college and in the context of a caring community where individual fulfillment is encouraged and human dignity is respected. Its primary purpose is to develop? intellectually, spiritually, socially and physically?whole persons, by fostering critical thinking, positive action, ethical sensitivity and spiritual growth, so that they may lead vocationally productive, personally satisfying and socially responsible lives.

Educator Preparation Provider

Muskingum's purpose is to educate students through quality academic programs that prepare them to lead vocationally productive, personally satisfying, and socially responsible lives. The Department of Education offers a range of licensure and degree opportunities at undergraduate and graduate levels. Our faculty consists of professional educators known for teaching excellence, extensive professional experience, and innovative scholarship. For mutual benefit we work closely with LEAs, state agencies and IHEs on initiatives to enhance our programs for MU teacher and administrator candidates.

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

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

**Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider at Muskingum University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

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

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

1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.
2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education.
3. Due to Ohio law, results must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 completers with OTES data.

Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications				
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Skilled	# Developing	# Ineffective
2012	28	40	N<10	N<10
2013	27	36	N<10	N<10
2014	23	56	N<10	N<10
2015	16	28	N<10	N<10

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

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

The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) data reported here are limited in that the information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.

Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications				
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Skilled	# Developing	# Ineffective
2012	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
2013	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
2014	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
2015	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at Muskingum University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Muskingum University)

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	103
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	249
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	14
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	97.44%

Principal Preparation Programs	
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	52
Number of candidates admitted to internship	14
Number of candidates completing internship	13
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	92.86%

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Muskingum University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015
(Data Source: USDOE Title II Report)

Description of Data:

Ohio educator licensure requirements include passage of all requisite licensure examinations at the state determined cut score. The reported results reflect Title II data, and therefore represent pass rate data solely for initial licenses.

Further, because the data are gathered from the Title II reports, there is a one year lag in accessing the data. Teacher licensure pass rate data are the only reported metric for which the data do not reflect the reporting year 2015-2016.

Teacher Licensure Tests	
Summary Rating: Effective	
Completers Tested	Pass Rate
99	99%

Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Muskingum University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Muskingum University)

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
20	70%

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

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

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

Description of Data:

Ohio's value-added data system provides information on student academic gains. As a vital component of Ohio's accountability system, districts and educators have access to an extensive array of diagnostic data through the Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS). Schools can demonstrate through value-added data that many of their students are achieving significant progress. Student growth measures also provide students and parents with evidence of the impact of their efforts. Educators and schools further use value-added data to inform instructional practices.

Limitations of the Value-Added Data:

1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015.
2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on reading and mathematics achievement tests in grades 4-8.
3. For Educator Preparation Providers with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals with value-added data, only the number (N) is reported.

Value-Added Data for Muskingum University-Prepared Teachers

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
280	100	N=16 16%	N=6 6%	N=35 35%	N=15 15%	N=28 28%

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Demographic Information for Schools where Muskingum University-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=25	N=21	N=6	N=48	N/A
25%	21%	6%	48%	N/A

Teachers Serving by School Type

Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
N=4	N=96	N/A	N/A
4%	96%	N/A	N/A

Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added

A	B	C	D	F	NR
N=29	N=7	N=9	N=7	N=46	N=2
29%	7%	9%	7%	46%	2%

Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles

High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N=4	N=20	N=23	N=53
4%	20%	23%	53%

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles

High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N=21	N=37	N=28	N=14
21%	37%	28%	14%

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

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Value-Added Data for Muskingum University-Prepared Principals

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	A	B	C	D	F	NR
12	11	N=4 36%	N/A N/A	N=2 18%	N=1 9%	N=4 36%	N/A N/A

Demographic Information for Schools where Muskingum University-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=7	N=3	N/A	N=1	N/A
64%	27%	N/A	9%	N/A

Principals Serving by School Type			
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
N/A	N=11	N/A	N/A
N/A	100%	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=3	N=3	N=5
N/A	27%	27%	45%

Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles			
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N=3	N=4	N=4	N/A
27%	36%	36%	N/A

2016

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Muskingum University Candidate Academic Measures

(Data Source: Muskingum University)
Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

Undergraduate Admission Requirements

Candidates complete an application. The secretary audits the application to confirm GPA, EDUC 110/112 grades, current FBI/BCI, passing score on KP#1 Professional Dispositions I, and that Gateway One Academic requirements are met. Each candidate's name goes on the Application for Admission to Teacher Education form. The Education faculty review and vote on the candidates during the department meetings. Candidates receive a letter indicating the department's decision regarding acceptance.

Post-Baccalaureate Admission Requirements

Candidates complete an application & pay fee, provide copies of FBI/BCI and/or current teaching license, UG transcripts, recommendation letters and proof of meeting Academic Requirements. They are placed on the GCS Accepted List notifying completion of the Gateway one Academic Requirements. The data represented are for the first of two steps in the Admission process.

Graduate Admission Requirements

Candidates complete an application & pay fee, provide copies of FBI/BCI and/or current teaching license, UG transcripts, recommendation letters and proof of meeting Academic Requirements. They are placed on the GCS Accepted List notifying completion of the Gateway one Academic Requirements. The data represented are for the first of two steps in the Admission process.

Description of Data:

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

Teacher Preparation Programs

U=Undergraduate P=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
ACT Composite Score	U=21 P=21 G=21	U=31 P=N<10 G=13	U=23.03 P=N<10 G=23.38	U=132 P=N<10 G=35	U=23.69 P=N<10 G=24.17	U=27 P=N<10 G=13	U=23.9 P=N<10 G=24
ACT English 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
ACT Math 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
ACT Reading 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
GPA - Graduate	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
GPA - High School	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
GPA - Transfer	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
GPA - Undergraduate	U= 3.00 P= 2.50	U=36 P=N<10	U= 3.59 P=N<10	U=179 P=N<10	U= 3.44 P=N<10	U=45 P=N<10	U= 3.50 P=N<10

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
	G= 2.50	G=41	G= 3.16	G=80	G= 3.09	G=34	G= 3.26
GRE 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
GRE Quantitative Subscore	U=N/A P=134 G=134	U=N/A P=N<10 G=20	U=N/A P=N<10 G=140.2	U=N/A P=N<10 G=20	U=N/A P=N<10 G=139.6	U=N/A P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N/A P=N<10 G=N<10
GRE Verbal Subscore	U=N/A P=138 G=138	U=N/A P=N<10 G=20	U=N/A P=N<10 G=142.3	U=N/A P=N<10 G=20	U=N/A P=N<10 G=142.55	U=N/A P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N/A P=N<10 G=N<10
GRE Writing Subscore	U=N/A P=2 G=2	U=N/A P=N<10 G=19	U=N/A P=N<10 G=2.61	U=N/A P=N<10 G=19	U=N/A P=N<10 G=2.82	U=N/A P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N/A P=N<10 G=N<10
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=150 P=150 G=150	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
Praxis CORE Reading	U=156 P=156 G=156	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
Praxis CORE Writing	U=162 P=162 G=162	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
Praxis I Math	U=170 P=172 G=172	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=15 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=176.6 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
Praxis I Reading	U=170 P=173 G=173	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=15 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=177 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
Praxis I Writing	U=170 P=172 G=172	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=14 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=172.71 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
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=990 P=990 G=990	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10	U=N<10 P=N<10 G=N<10
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		N	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview		N		N		N	
Essay		N		N		N	
High School Class Rank		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Interview		N		Y		Y	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		N	

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Letter of Recommendation	N	Y	Y
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N/A	N	N
OAE Content Assessment	N/A	N/A	N
Portfolio	N	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

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Principal Program Admission Requirements

Candidates complete an application, pay the registration fee, interview with GCS Adviser, and provide the following: 3 letters of recommendation, an official transcript, and a copy of his/her current teaching license. They are placed on the GCS Accepted list which notifies the Assessment Specialist to add the candidates name to the Application for Admission to the Principal Program. The Education faculty review and vote on the candidates during the department meeting.

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	2.50	N<10	N<10	14	3.71	14	3.59
Praxis I Reading	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
SAT Composite Score	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
GRE Writing Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - High School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Writing Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Math Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - Graduate	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
ACT Composite Score	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
GRE Verbal Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAT	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 Verbal Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Criteria							
Dispositional Assessment				N			

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Other Criteria	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N
Essay	N
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

2016 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

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

Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio candidates receive an invitation to complete the survey during their professional internship (student teaching). The results of this survey are reflected here. A total of 3,445 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 69 percent.

Muskingum University Survey Response Rate = 78.7%

Total Survey Responses = 85

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.	3.62	3.50
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.48	3.31
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.35	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.57	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.60	3.38
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.73	3.61
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.69	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.69	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.66	3.53
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.62	3.42
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.55	3.37
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.66	3.57
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.47	3.30
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.64	3.53
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication	3.74	3.51

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

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.	3.70	3.67
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.70	3.52
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.68	3.63
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.65	3.46
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.73	3.71
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.51	3.37
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.65	3.49
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.56	3.50
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.44	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.	3.36	3.07
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.26	2.96
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.55	3.31
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.47	3.17
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.65	3.59
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.39	2.94
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.68	3.64
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.66	3.41
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.74	3.68
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.68	3.65
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.78	3.62
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.62	3.49
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.78	3.46

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.55	3.29
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.57	3.32
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.62	3.34
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.66	3.64
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.64	3.52
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.74	3.64
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.69	3.51
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.69	3.51
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.73	3.67
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.58	3.42
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.51	3.19
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.62	3.42

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

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

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

Description of Data:

To gather information on alumni satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio Resident Educators who completed their preparation in Ohio receive an invitation to complete the survey in the fall semester as they enter Year 2 of the Resident Educator program. A total of 1,910 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 29 percent.

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.	3.50	3.42
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.36	3.20
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.45	3.34
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.48	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.33	3.29
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.52	3.44
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.55	3.34
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.48	3.36
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.60	3.41
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.52	3.28
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.40	3.25
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.48	3.38
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.31	3.21
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.50	3.43

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.40	3.38
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.57	3.57
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.52	3.39
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.40	3.30
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.55	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.36	3.28
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.45	3.40
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.50	3.35
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.24	3.11
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	2.76	2.89
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.76	2.89
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.36	3.22
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.10	3.07
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.45	3.33
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.12	2.79
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.64	3.55
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.57	3.37
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.64	3.56
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.60	3.53
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.60	3.50
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.48	3.30
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.38	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.21	3.21

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.26	3.22
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.33	3.28
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.55	3.53
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.52	3.45
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.52	3.52
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.45	3.42
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.43	3.39
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.62	3.57
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.40	3.35
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.36	3.19
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.38	3.34
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.29	3.27

2016 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Principal Intern Survey Results

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

Description of Data:

To gather information the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation providers, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 274 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 29 percent.

Muskingum University Survey Response Rate = 50%

Total Survey Responses = 3

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	3.46
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	N<10	3.45
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.45
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	3.44
5	My program prepared me to ensure the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	N<10	3.42
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.45
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.49
8	My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	N<10	3.50
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.44
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	3.47
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N<10	3.49
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.49
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.33
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N<10	3.55
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N<10	3.53
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for	N<10	3.48

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

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	3.54
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.49
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N<10	3.56
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.36
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.46
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.41
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.45

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results

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

Description of Data:

To gather information the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to individuals who serve as mentors to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 100 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 17 percent.

Muskingum University Survey Response Rate = 10%
Total Survey Responses = 1

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand leading and facilitating continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	N<10	3.24
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	3.24
3	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand anticipating, monitoring, and responding to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<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	3.23
5	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understandEnsuring effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.23
6	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand advocating for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.	N<10	3.32
7	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.32
8	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.33
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.32
10	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N<10	3.36
11	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.38
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.19

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

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	3.39
14	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand connecting the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.19
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.22
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.20
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	3.27
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.55
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.85
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.18

2016 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results

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

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

Description of Data:

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation providers, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to employers of Ohio educators. Questions on the survey are aligned with Ohio's Learning Standards, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 214 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of seven percent.

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	3.30
2	The institution prepares its graduates to respect the diversity of the students they teach.	N<10	3.34
3	The institution prepares its graduates to know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.	N<10	3.35
4	The institution prepares its graduates to understand and use content-specific instructional strategies to effectively teach the central concepts and skills of the discipline.	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	3.04
6	The institution prepares its graduates to analyze data to monitor student progress and learning.	N<10	2.99
7	The institution prepares its graduates to use data to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction.	N<10	2.97
8	The institution prepares its graduates to align their instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities.	N<10	3.16
9	The institution prepares its graduates to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students.	N<10	3.02
10	The institution prepares its graduates to treat students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	N<10	3.36
11	The institution prepares its graduates to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.	N<10	3.30
12	The institution prepares its graduates to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.25
13	The institution prepares its graduates to collaborate effectively with other teachers, administrators, and district staff.	N<10	3.26
14	The institution prepares its graduates to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.33
15	The institution prepares its graduates to assume responsibility for professional growth.	N<10	3.29

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

National Accreditation Status

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education)

Description of Data:

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

Accrediting Agency	NCATE
Date of Last Review	Mar-13
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2016

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Muskingum University)

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:	Year-long Clinical Internships-Teacher Candidates
Purpose:	The purpose of the Internships is to promote Co-Teaching and P-12 learning through extended clinical experiences.
Goal:	The goal is to meet local needs for teachers in shortage areas and to enhance Muskingum University teacher candidates' knowledge, skill and professional dispositions with the added benefit of significant achievement/progress and success of P-12 students by having capable interns who can support indi
Number of Participants:	4
Strategy:	Year-long internships have been established over the past four years with the following districts: Maysville, Franklin Local, West Muskingum, Ridgewood, Northern Local and Rolling Hills Local. The internships are to utilize the clinical model of preparation for a year-long (fall through spring or spring through fall) student teaching. The interns have been selected through an interview process, first by nomination by the Muskingum University Department of Education, then by interviewing with local school district administrators. Memoranda of Understanding outline the responsibilities of all parties, including defining the mentor teacher, the intern, and the university supervisor roles.
Demonstration of Impact:	Surveys results from school district partners; individual intern participants' feedback; P-12 student evaluations; mock interview feedback; and mentor teacher feedback on students' achievement/progress reports. Indications are that the year-long interns are able to positively impact P-12 student learning and the teacher candidates report increased confidence in their abilities.
External Recognition:	Invitations for Interns and Mentor Teachers to present at regional conferences; MU Black & Magenta articles; BASA, CORAS and SEOTDC connections and requests to present information on our internship program.
Programs:	The structure has been unique with each intern placement due to the LEA's current and future needs. All interns received full time teaching positions as the districts had retirements. Interns were given first consideration in the interview process.
Initiative:	Professional Development
Purpose:	To expand on partnerships with local school districts and Muskingum University for mutual benefit to improve the professional skills of teachers, administrators and college faculty.
Goal:	The goals are to build upon the knowledge and skills of veteran teachers specifically in mathematics and ELL instruction and to improve the Muskingum University teacher candidates' experiences in the P-12 school settings as well as their preparation coursework.
Number of Participants:	500
Strategy:	With a focus on the Ohio Learning Standards and the changing demographics of the Ohio student population we are embracing professional learning in a systematic way. Muskingum University Education Professor Dr. Ky Davis continues to expand her published materials for grades K-8 to include high school courses (algebra, geometry) that align with the Ohio K-12 Mathematics Learning Standards and offers school district/ESC professional learning workshops. Through partnerships MU has candidates in field and student teacher placements who model lessons, activities and hands-on materials (including interactive technology) that align with the standards and support student success. Another Muskingum University education professor, Dr. Joy Cowdery, offered workshops on co-teaching, SIOP strategies, multicultural literature in the classroom, and mentoring English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers.
Demonstration of Impact:	Both strategies of educator faculty members responding to local, regional and statewide requests for professional development have yielded evidence of improved confidence in working with mathematics instruction as well as supporting an increasingly diverse student population. Local districts have requested support in these two specific areas (mathematics and ELL student learning strategies)

2016

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

External Recognition:	2016 Award from National Association for Multi-Cultural Education (NAME); Educational Service Centers; Local Educational Agencies (school districts); and invitations to speak and present at regional conferences.
Programs:	Teacher Preparation Programs at undergraduate and graduate level
Initiative:	Embedded School-based Clinical Experiences
Purpose:	The purpose of embedded clinical experiences is to promote school partnerships and expand teacher candidate learning beyond the on-campus course instruction.
Goal:	The goal is through a partnership to improve the knowledge and skills of experienced classroom teachers/mentors and the Muskingum University teacher candidates. With courses specifically aligned to a school building/teachers it can enable more clarity for the structure and learning in which the can
Number of Participants:	90
Strategy:	In partnership with local schools, MU, Dr. Linda Rogness, Ed. Prof. w/ a doctorate in chemistry, forged positive relationships that are mutually beneficial. The focus, integrated within the science method courses, is to promote inquiry-based instruction and best practices in the field of science. MU candidates teach science units, aligned to the Ohio Learning Standards, that are highly interactive, hands-on and inquiry based. Candidates also use innovative technology in the classroom and lead after school exploration in special science projects such as robot-building and programming. MU redesigned Phonics and the Process of Reading to be an embedded course with on campus classes & integrated school-based application at Roseville Elem K-6. Utilizing instructional time within the school day for candidates to work with small groups/1:1 phonics instruction promotes student reading success and an authentic experience for candidates. Two additional partnerships designed for embedded learning: Assessment in Education with Ridgewood LSD for benchmark assessments; Integrating Language Arts & Social Studies in ECE @ local elementary schools to develop/present integrated LA & SS units.
Demonstration of Impact:	Interviews with teachers and students who participated/partnered; local news reports and articles that highlighted the positive initiative focused on science at Zanesville City Schools and the National Road Elementary; undergraduate and graduate student assessment data from Key Licensure and Program Assessments aligned to the National Science Standards and the MU Shared Values/Beliefs; and Scores on the OAE content tests for licensure.
External Recognition:	Positive feedback from school district partners; Zanesville media print, radio and television and district/principal letters of appreciation for the participation of Muskingum University teacher candidates
Programs:	Science teaching during the school day; Enrichment After School Program at National Road Elementary; Multiple embedded field experiences coordinated through instructors and school districts

2016

Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Muskingum University

Principal Preparation Programs

Initiative:	CO-TEACHING with principal leadership courses
Purpose:	The purpose of the co-teaching approach was to demonstrate collaboration with leaders and to offer two approaches or view points on each topic within a course.
Goal:	The goal is to incorporate co-teaching within at least one course in the principal preparation program.
Number of Participants:	15
Strategy:	An introductory level leadership course is one of the first courses in which principal candidates participate. Course content is related to the foundational tasks of leadership as well as the examination of exemplars of effective leadership. The course is jointly taught by two instructors who are former principals and superintendents. While modeling co-teaching, they share the presentation based upon each other's strengths and experiences. The tenets of co-teaching are explored as they instruct and involve the candidates in the learning activities. The candidates observe examples of one-teach, one-observe, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, teaming, one teach and one assist, as well as other models.
Demonstration of Impact:	End of course evaluations of this introductory course are exemplary and written feedback confirms that principal candidates appreciate the co-teaching model and what each of these leaders brings to the class discussions. Formative feedback is offered which candidates then can use to improve upon their developing leadership skills.
External Recognition:	Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) national accreditation was approved on February 1, 2016 feedback posted on the AIMS site including the highest level of mastery on the content knowledge, pedagogical skills and skill in affecting student learning.

Initiative:	NON-NARRATIVE ASSESSMENT
Purpose:	The purpose of the non-narrative assessment is to challenge emerging leaders to find ways of communicating understanding through non-traditional approaches.
Goal:	Courses and assessments for the principal licensure program are based upon the ELCC standards for professional and content knowledge. Since assessments are based upon the finite wording of the appropriate standards for a particular course, assessment tasks are crafted to build communication skills.
Number of Participants:	14
Strategy:	In a recent revision to our program assessments, we introduced one assessment that is divergent in nature. The goal was to solicit confirmation of knowledge and skills outline by the ELCC standards. This non-narrative assessment approach required a different way of thinking and responding to the prescribed tasks in a more synergistic style. We chose Standard 2 which holistically addresses the course content. Candidates are asked to present the content of the course (based upon the discrete and finite standard and elements) in a non-narrative manner.
Demonstration of Impact:	At first, principal candidates were puzzled by the assignment, in part because of its contrast with the other traditional assessments. They have come to enjoy the freedom and flexibility of the assessment and are creating products we could not have envisioned, a sampling of which includes creating children's books, writing songs and singing them, storytelling and many more. Data have been gathered to document the unique non-narrative approaches that the principal candidates have presented. These data have been used as exemplars for subsequent candidates consideration.
External Recognition:	Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) national accreditation was approved on February 1, 2016 feedback posted on the AIMS site including the highest level of mastery on the content knowledge, pedagogical skills and skill in affecting student learning.

Initiative:	Integration of Regional Leaders
Purpose:	By engaging practioners Muskingum enhances our Principal Program and deepens practical understanding of leadership.
Goal:	To enrich the principal preparation by incorporating practicing, licensed administrators who are aware of the daily responsibilities. Candidates are immersed in authentic and relevant examples of the challenges faced across buildings and districts.
Number of Participants:	19
Strategy:	Local administrators participate in curriculum development, review course syllabi and conduct mock interviews. The process for securing course instructors and linking with regional educational leaders is through CORAS, educational service centers and various professional organizations. Recommendations are solicited and interviews with potential instructors are conducted by the Graduate and Continuing Studies Office and the Chair of the Education Department. The Dave Longaberger

2016
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Muskingum University

Demonstration of Impact: Endowed Chair and Distinguished Professor of Education also coordinates mock interviews each semester for licensure candidates. In this way multiple perspectives are considered when selecting course instructors. Quarterly meetings of the Advisory Team helps to analyze data (including OAE and survey results) to make recommendations for the EPP. End of Course surveys indicate an appreciation for the actual leadership experience of instructors and the practical guidance on relevant topics. Additional testimonials from candidates confirms their knowledge, skills and dispositions as a direct result of the role models they have during the principal preparation program.

External Recognition: Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) national accreditation was approved on February 1, 2016 feedback posted on the AIMS site including the highest level of mastery on the content knowledge, pedagogical skills and skill in affecting student learning.