2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

Notre Dame College

Report Overview

To continuously improve the quality of educator preparation programs in Ohio, H.B. 1 of the 128th General Assembly directed the Chancellor of the Board of Regents to develop a system for evaluating Ohio's educator preparation programs and holding institutions of higher education accountable for their graduates' success. H.B. 290 of the 128th General Assembly provided for the sharing of data between the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education to link the performance of educators to the institutions that prepared them.

The identification of metrics and the report format were developed in collaboration with representatives from the 13 public and 38 private educator preparation providers in Ohio, as well as state agencies, and organizations. The Board of Regents works with the Ohio Department of Education and educator preparation programs to collect data on the following identified preparation metrics for the annual reports:

- Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Program Completers
- Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Program Completers
- edTPATM Results for Program Completers
- Licensure Test Results for Program Completers
- Value-added Data (EVAAS) for K-12 Students Taught by Program Completers
- Candidate Academic Measures
- Field/Clinical Experiences
- Pre-Service Teacher Candidate Survey Results
- Resident Educator Survey Results
- Resident Educator Persistence Data
- Excellence and Innovation Initiatives
- National Accreditation

Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at Notre Dame College

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

Description of Data:

Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a rich and 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 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 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.
- 2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education based on the original framework of 50 percent teacher evaluation and 50 percent student growth measure.
- 3. The number of teachers (N) with associated OTES data remains small at this point, and due to Ohio Revised Code, must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers.

Effective	Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications											
Licensure Year	# Ineffective	# Developing	# Skilled	# Accomplished								
2010	<10	<10	37	29								
2011	<10	14	30	23								
2012	<10	<10	31	24								
2013	<10	12	26	15								

2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report Notre Dame College

Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs at Notre Dame College

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

Description of Data:

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

Evaluations have two components, each weighted at 50 percent:

- 1. Principal performance rating, determined from:
 - a. A professional growth plan
 - b. Two 30 minute observations
 - c. Walkthroughs of building classrooms
- 2. Student academic growth rating for the building

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 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.

Effective	Number of Principals	Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications									
Licensure Year	with OPES Data	Ineffective	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished						
2040	0	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A						
2010	0	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A						
2011	0	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A						
2011	0	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A						
2012	0	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A						
2012	0	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A						
2042	0	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A	N = N/A						
2013	0	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A	% = N/A						

edTPA[™] Assessment Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at Notre Dame College

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

Description of Data:

Ohio educator preparation programs have participated in the development of the edTPATM, a performance assessment for educator candidates. At this time, the edTPATM is not an Ohio licensure requirement or a program completion requirement. In this report, only results from the edTPATM national scoring process are reported. Results from candidates whose assessments were scored locally are not reported.

Score Range	Institution Average Score	Ohio State Average Score	National Mean Score
15 - 75	36.3	41.9	43.7



Institution Profile

(Data Source: Notre Dame College of Ohio)

Notre Dame College, a Catholic institution established by the Sisters of Notre Dame, welcomed students in 1922. Over the past 91 years, the changing needs of its students and ongoing local and national trends have shaped the institution. The Sisters transplanted to the Cleveland area a cohesive and student-centered educational heritage with the establishment of the College. The Sisters' beliefs about the value of the teacher, the worth of each student, and the transformative nature of education guide all college programs. The Sisters have a history of reaching out to diverse populations.

Division of Professional Education

The Division prepares knowledgeable, effective, and reflective teachers and school leaders at the graduate, post-baccalaureate, and undergraduate levels. Courses are offered on campus and online. We believe that education is a process and a product. The process is evident in dynamic and ongoing professional relationships inside and outside the college and clinical classrooms. The process integrates the cognitive, affective, and spiritual development of the individuals in the relationships. The product is evident in the actions, words, and artifacts that result from the educational endeavor.

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at

Notre Dame College of Ohio

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that teacher candidates pass Praxis II® examinations by scoring at or above the state's established required score to be recommended for licensure and receive endorsements in specific fields. The reporting for Teacher Licensure Test Scores is based on Federal Title II data and therefore reflects only initial licensure for 2012-2013. The data also reflect the best attempt of each test taker. Data are not provided for additional licenses that an educator earns after her/his initial license. Most licenses in Ohio require that candidates pass more than one licensure examination, therefore the number of "Completers Tested" in the first table is smaller than the sum total of all takers of all assessments in the subsequent table. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals, only the N is reported.

Summary Rating: Effective								
	Completers Tested	Pass Rate Percentage						
All Teacher Licensure Tests	143	99%						

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation	า Programs
at	

(Data Source:)

Description of Data:

	Completers Tested	Pass Rate Percentage
Principal Licensure Data		

Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Notre Dame College of Ohio

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

Description of Data:

Ohio's value-added data system provides educators a more complete picture of student growth. 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). From a state perspective, value-added data provide insights into student performance. For example, schools that do not appear to be achieving at high levels as traditionally measured can demonstrate through value-added data that many of their students are achieving significant progress. It is important to recognize these gains, as schools work to support students who have chronically struggled to perform. Student growth measures also provide students and parents with evidence of the impact of their efforts.

Limitations of the Value-Added Data:

- 1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.
- 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.

Value-Added Data for Notre Dame College of Ohio-Prepared Teachers

Licensure D	with Effective ates 2010, 2011, 12, 2013	10, 2011,						
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	fective Above Average Average Approaching Least Effecti Average					
313	61	N = 6 % = 10	N = 8 % = 13	N = 26 % = 43	N = 13 % = 21	N = 8 % = 13		

Demographic Information for Schools where Notre Dame College of Ohio-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve

				_						
Characteristic										
	Elementary Scho	ol	Middle S	School	Junior High School		High School		Ungraded	
Teachers Serving by School Level	N = 23 % = 38		N = 1 % =				N = 5 % = 8		= 4 = 7	N = 0 % = 0
	Community School	ool	Pub	olic School		;	STEM Scho	ool	Educa	itional Service Center
Teachers Serving by School Type	N = 5 % = 8			N = 56 % = 92			N = 0 % = 0			N = 0 % = 0
	Α		В	С			D		F	NR
Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added	N = 25 % = 41		= 11 = 18	N = 10 % = 16			N = 2 % = 3			N = 0 % = 0
	High Mir	ority		Middle Minority				Low Minority		
Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 13 % = 21			N = 35 % = 57		-			= 13 = 21	
	High Povert	y	Medi	um-High P	overty	^	/ledium-Lov	v Poverty		Low Poverty
Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 19 % = 31			N = 18 % = 30		N = 14 % = 23		N = 10 % = 16		

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

Value-Added Data for Notre Dame College of Ohio-Prepared Principals

•	fective Licensure Dates 11, 2012, 2013	Princi	pals Serving	by Letter Gra	de of Overall I	Building Value	e-Added
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value- Added Data	A B C D F					NR
0	0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

Demographic Information for Schools where Notre Dame College of Ohio-Prepared Principals with Value-Added Data Serve

Characteristic										
	Elementary School	ol M	iddle Sc	hool	Junio	r High School	High Scho	ol	Ungraded	
Principals Serving by School Level	N = 0 % = 0		N = 0 % = 0	-		N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0		N = 0 % = 0	
	Community Sch	ool	Publ	lic Schoo	I	STEM S	School Ed		cational Service Center	
Principals Serving by School Type	N = 0 % = 0	•		N = 0 % = 0		N = 0 % = 0			N = 0 % = 0	
	A	В		С		D	D F		NR	
Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School				NOT A	VAILAB	LE UNTIL 2015	5		1	
	High M	inority		Ŋ	Middle I	Minority		Low N	Minority	
Principals Serving b School Minority Enrollment by Tertiles			N = 0 % = 0		-			N = 0 % = 0		
	High Pov	erty/	Med	lium-High	Povert	y Medium	-Low Poverty		Low Poverty	
Principals Serving & School Poverty Lev by Quartiles				N = 0 % = 0		<u> </u>	N = 0 % = 0		N = 0 % = 0	

Notre Dame College of Ohio Candidate Academic Measures

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014 (Data Source: Notre Dame College of Ohio)

Description of Data:

Educator preparation programs (EPPs) reported academic measures for students completing their teacher and principal preparation programs. Academic measures reported include assessment results for the ACT®, SAT®, Praxis I®, GRE®, and MAT®, as well as high school, undergraduate, graduate, transfer grade point average, and program admission (GPA). The Ohio Board of Regents calculated statewide weighted mean values based on the EPP-reported data. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals, only the N is reported. Academic measures which do not apply to a specific unit or program are represented by NA.

Teacher Preparation Programs

reactier Freparation Frograms												
		Candidates	Candidates Admitted Candidates Enrolled Candidates Co			Completing						
Criterion	Required Score	Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers					
U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate												
	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G					
ACT Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
ACT English Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
ACT Math Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
ACT Reading Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
GPA - Graduate	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
GPA - High School	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
GPA - Transfer	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
GPA - Undergraduate	2.75 / 2.75 / 2.75	44 / 60 / 83	3.26 / 3.68 / 3.51	147 / 63 / 178	3.25 / 3.52 / 3.61	30 / 58 / 38	3.47 / 3.57 / 3.85					
GRE Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA					

		Candidates	s Admitted	Candidate	es Enrolled	Candidates	Completing	
Criterion	Required Score	Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers	
	U=Unc	lergraduate	PB=Post-Ba	ccalaureate	G=Graduate	•		
	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
MAT	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis CORE Math	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis CORE Reading	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis CORE Writing	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis I Math	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis I Reading	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis I Writing	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Praxis II	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
SAT Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
SAT Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	
Other Crite	eria	Underg	raduate	Post-Bac	calaureate	Grad	uate	
Disposi	tional Assessment		Υ		Υ	١	,	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview			N		N	١	ı	
	Essay		N		N	١.		
High \$	School Class Rank		NA N	NA		NA 		
1 -44	Interview		N N	Y N		N N		
	Recommendation		Υ		N			
Letter of Recommendation		Y			• •	N		

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	NA	N	N
None of the Above	N	N	N
Portfolio	N	N	N
Prerequisite Courses	Υ	N	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	NA	NA	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	NA	NA	N
Teacher Insight	N	N	N

Principal Preparation Programs

		1	es Admitted	<u> </u>			Completing
Criterion	Required Score	Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
ACT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - Graduate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - High School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - Undergraduate	3	31	3.81	26	3.83	N<10	N<10
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Writing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis II	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

	Candidates Admitted C		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates	Completing		
Criterion	Required Score	Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions		imber irolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA
			Other Crit	eria	1			l
			Inter	view			Υ	
		Le	tter of Commitr	nent			Υ	
		Dispos	sitional Assessr	nent		Y		
		Letter o	of Recommenda	ation	Y			
		P	rerequisite Cou	rses	N			
	Superint	endent Statem	ent of Sponsor	ship			N	
			Port	folio			N	
		Myers-Br	iggs Type Indic	ator			N	
Essay						N		
Teacher Insight						N		
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview						N		
None of the Above						N		
	SRI Teacher Perceiver						N	

Field and Clinical Experiences for Notre Dame College of Ohio Candidates

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: Notre Dame College of Ohio)

Description of Data:

Ohio requires that teacher candidates complete field and clinical experiences in school settings as part of their preparation. These experiences include: 1) early and ongoing field-based opportunities for candidates to engage with K-12 students in Ohio classrooms prior to their formal student teaching; and 2) the culminating clinical experience commonly referred to as student teaching. Early field/clinical experiences are reported in hours. Student teaching is reported in weeks. Beyond the requisite statewide minimums, institutional requirements for candidates can vary by institution and by program. The information below is reported at the unit level.

Teacher Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Notre Dame College of Ohio Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	105
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	175
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	15
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	96.32%

Principal Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	15
Number of candidates admitted to internship	0
Number of candidates completing internship	0
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	N/A

Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Pre-Service Teachers as a special research project. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their student teaching experiences and collected the data for the Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014. A total of 4206 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 70 percent.

Notre Dame College of Ohio Survey Response Rate = 43.55%

Total Survey Responses = 54

	,		,
No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.44	3.49
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and atrisk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.26	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.33	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.37	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.37	3.41
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.	3.46	3.57
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.41	3.43
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.31	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.44	3.51
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.	3.50	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.30	3.32
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.31	3.50

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.19	3.28
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.44	3.48
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.48	3.45
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.46	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.54	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.48	3.56
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.37	3.40
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.63	3.64
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.35	3.30
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.39	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.43	3.41
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.06	3.08
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	2.98	2.93
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	2.96	2.85
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.24	3.18
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.09	3.06
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.31	3.49
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.91	2.91

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.56	3.58
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.13	3.33
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.48	3.60
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.54	3.59
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.54	3.55
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.37	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.39	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.19	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.24	3.24
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.30	3.26
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.50	3.56
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.44	3.42
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.46	3.53
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.43	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.56	3.40
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.63	3.59
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.24	3.31
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.11	3.12
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate	3.24	3.31

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	progression to program completion.		

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

Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Resident Educators as a special research project. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 434 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 16 Percent. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their Resident Educator experiences and collected the data for the Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014.

conected	d the data for the Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31	, 2014.	
No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.38	3.44
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and atrisk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.19	3.24
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	2.94	3.30
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.00	3.40
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.19	3.30
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.	3.06	3.26
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.06	3.26
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.06	3.26
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.06	3.26
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.	3.06	3.26
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	2.94	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.13	3.38
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	2.81	3.26
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.19	3.44
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the	3.13	3.40

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	importance of communication 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.	3.31	3.55
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.06	3.34
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.00	3.30
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.44	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.06	3.21
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.00	3.37
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	2.88	3.32
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	2.88	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.	2.06	2.41
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.06	2.41
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	2.81	3.09
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	2.63	2.88
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	2.63	3.00
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.38	2.51
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.25	3.59
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	2.88	3.34
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.06	3.59

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.25	3.58
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.38	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.19	3.33
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.00	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	2.63	3.22
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	2.56	3.21
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	2.81	3.25
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.31	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.00	3.39
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.25	3.49
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.25	3.38
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.13	3.29
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.44	3.54
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	2.88	3.27
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	2.94	3.11
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	2.88	3.28
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	2.63	3.13

Principal Intern Survey Results

Description of Data:

To gather information on principal intern satisfaction with their preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Principal Interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their student teaching experiences and collected the data for the Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014. A total of 207 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 20 percent.

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	N/A	3.47
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	N/A	3.44
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N/A	3.46
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N/A	3.41
5	My program prepared me to ensure the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	N/A	3.32
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N/A	3.41
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N/A	3.49
8	My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	N/A	3.43
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N/A	3.43
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N/A	3.40
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N/A	3.53
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N/A	3.46
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N/A	3.31
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics;	N/A	3.58

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	
	local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct			
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N/A	3.68	
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	N/A	3.60	
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N/A	3.65	
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N/A	3.53	
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N/A	3.62	
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N/A	3.39	
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N/A	3.48	
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N/A	3.38	
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N/A	3.43	

National Accreditation

(Data Source: Ohio Board of Regents)

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 credential of job applicants.

Accrediting Agency	NCATE
Date of Last Review	April 2010
Accreditation Status	Accredited

Teacher Residency Program

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio is a system of support that encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system designed to improve teacher retention and increase student learning. Data are reported for those entering the Resident Educator Program in 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Non-completion does not imply dismissal, as leaving the program may be due to multiple factors.

Percent of Newly Hired Teachers Persisting in the State Residency Program who were Prepared at Notre Dame College of Ohio

	Residency Year 1		Resid	ency Year 2		Residency Year 3 Residence		ency Ye	ar 4			
	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Persi	sting
Ī	140	128	91%	89	85	96%	48	48	100%			

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014 (Data Source: Notre Dame College of Ohio)

Description of Data:

This section provides each program the opportunity to share information on a maximum of three initiatives geared to increase excellence and support innovation in the preparation of Ohio educators.

Teacher Licensure Programs

Initiative:	Quality Matters				
Purpose:	To establish a continuous improvement model for assuring the quality of online courses.				
Goal:	To establish a faculty-centered peer review process designed to certify the quality of online courses.				
Number of Participants:	46				
Strategy:	Quality Matters is a collegial review process that provides feedback on course design. The program's reviewers complete a training program in which they learn to provide substantial, constructive and specific comments and suggestions with regard to both course strengths and areas for improvement. Reviewers learn to evaluate clarity, organization and other components of a course from a student perspective. Reviewers are taught how to apply the QM Rubric to online courses. The rubric is designed to help promote student learning and continuous course improvement.				
Demonstration of Impact:	The QM Rubric is based on national standards of best practice, research findings, and instructional design principles. Scores are based on the following standards: 1. Course overview and introduction 2. Learning objectives 3. Assessment and measurement 4. Instructional materials 5. Course activities and learner interaction 6. Course technology 7. Learner support 8. Accessibility and Usability On a scale of 1-3 in which 1 is the lowest, our requirement is to score at 2.8 and above.				
External Recognition:	Quality Matters certification mark for courses that meet the QM Rubric standards				
Programs:	New initiative by the college to provide professional development for faculty in using technology to teach.				
Initiative:	Third Grade Reading Guarantee Project				
Purpose:	The purpose of this prooject is to provide assistance to the Cleveland Metropolitan School District in meeting the standards for the state of Ohio's Third Grade Reading Guarantee.				
Goal:	We intende to provide tutors and materials to 3rd grade students in order to increase their reading skills so that they pass the OAA reading test in the spring of 2015.				
Number of Participants:	50				
Strategy:	The pool of tutors will come from pre-education students who have not been admitted into the Division of Education yet; preservice teachers in field experience courses; and volunteers from the Service Learning department. The 3rd grade students will be identified by the Cleveland Metro School District as being at risk for failing the OAA reading test and thereby staying back in the 3rd grade for another year. We are seeking a grant that will cover the costs of transportation and purchase books for the 3rd grade students and teaching materials for the tutors. Tutors will be trained by a reading				

	specialist before they begin their service. Tutors will be assigned schools and classrooms, and will be transported by college vehicles. Once at the designated schools, tutors will work with children in a pull-out program for approximately 30-45 minutes one-two times per week. They may teach individuals or work with small groups as needed. A pretest and post test, along with formative assessment, will be administered to determine the progress of the children's reading skills. We will follow up with an analysis of their OAA scores when they are made available.
Demonstration of Impact:	We are now in the process of implementing this project so no data has been collected. Data samples will include pre and post tests, OAA scores, and formative assessments.
External Recognition:	This project was coordinated by Notre Dame faculty members and Cleveland Metro School District. School officials stated that increasing children's reading skills is a pressing need.
Programs:	None
Initiative:	Are You a Ten?
Purpose:	To provide student teachers with authentic feedback from loacl principals in Northeast Ohio regarding the cndidate's ability to secure a teaching position.
Goal:	To prepare candidates for the professional interviews that will lead to a job offer.
Number of Participants:	25
Strategy:	Five-six principals from different districts meet with groups of Notre Dame College's student teachers for 20 minute interviews. The principals brings to the interview session a clear understanding of the position, grade level and/or subject matter expertise s/he is seeking to fill in his or her respective school. The interview format is approved of and edited prior to the interviews by the principals.
Demonstration of Impact:	Candidates are rated on a scale from 1-3 in which 1 is the lowest. The 10 targeted skills are: 1. Professional demeanor and dress 2. Communication skills 3. Knowledge of Ohio academic content standards 4. Example of effective planning and instruction 5. Knowledge of differentiating instruction 6. Examples of effective assessment 7. Understanding of value-added data 8. Example of effective collaboration with two school stakeholders 9. Knowledge of OTES 10. Knowledge of professional ethics
External Recognition:	None
Programs:	Complemented by 25 interviews by Notre Dame College faculty.

Principal Licensure Programs

Principalship Cohort with a Local Diocese
To provide guidance and support of teachers who wish to become principals in a Catholic diocese.
To work collaboratively with the diocese in order to teach prospective principals the knowledge base needed to oversee a Catholic learning institution.
10
Notre Dame College sought the cooperation of a local diocese to work together to prepare teachers to become principals of diocese schools. Courses are taught online with the diocese participants. Participants also complete an internship program that is overseen by diocese administrators and Notre Dame College faculty.
Course completion, completion of internship and successful accomplishment of the state licensure assessment for principals
None