

# 2015

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Ohio State University

---

#### Institution Profile

(Data Source: Ohio State University)

\*The\* Ohio State University

#### Educator Preparation

The Ohio State University Educator Preparation Unit is made up of four colleges, six campuses and more than 50 programs that include initial licenses and professional licenses.

---

#### Report Overview

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

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

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

February 2016 Note: Ohio Teacher Evaluation System results for the 2015 Report are not yet available. Revised Educator Preparation Performance Reports will be published when these data become available.

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 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.
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.

<b>Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications</b>				
<b>Initial Licensure Effective Year</b>	<b># Ineffective</b>	<b># Developing</b>	<b># Skilled</b>	<b># Accomplished</b>
<b>2011</b>	N<10	N<10	74	64
<b>2012</b>	N<10	N<10	138	102
<b>2013</b>	N<10	17	115	92
<b>2014</b>	N<10	18	95	50

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

February 2016 Note: Ohio Principal Evaluation System results for the 2015 Report are not yet available. Revised Educator Preparation Performance Reports will be published when these data become available.

Ohio's system for evaluating principals (Ohio's Principal Evaluation System) provides building leaders with a detail 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 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.

<b>Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications</b>				
<b>Initial Licensure Effective Year</b>	<b># Ineffective</b>	<b># Developing</b>	<b># Skilled</b>	<b># Accomplished</b>
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	N<10	N<10
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	N<10	N<10
<b>2013</b>	NA	NA	N<10	NA
<b>2014</b>	NA	NA	N<10	NA

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

**Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at Ohio State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio State 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.

<b>Teacher Preparation Programs</b>	
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Require edTPA National Scoring from candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	Y
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	100
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	510
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	98.96%

<b>Principal Preparation Programs</b>	
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	28
Number of candidates admitted to internship	27
Number of candidates completing internship	27
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

**Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Ohio State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014  
(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 2014-2015.

<b>Teacher Licensure Tests</b>	
<b>Summary Rating: Effective</b>	
<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>
365	99%

**Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Ohio State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio State University)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio requires that principal candidates pass the requisite state examination to be recommended for licensure. The 2014-2015 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

<b>Principal Licensure Tests</b>	
<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>
27	100%

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**Description of Data:**

February 2016 Note: Value-Added results for the 2015 Report are not yet available. Revised Educator Preparation Performance Reports will be published when these data become available.

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, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.
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 Ohio State University-Prepared Teachers**

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
844	264	N=77 29%	N=33 13%	N=66 25%	N=26 10%	N=62 23%

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

**Demographic Information for Schools where Ohio State 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=81	N=101	N=7	N=75	NA
31%	38%	3%	28%	NA

**Teachers Serving by School Type**

Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
N=21	N=242	N=1	NA
8%	92%	<1%	NA

**Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added**

A	B	C	D	F	NR
N=84	N=6	N=27	N=8	N=76	N=63
32%	2%	10%	3%	29%	24%

**Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles**

High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N=69	N=90	N=69	N=36
26%	34%	26%	14%

**Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles**

High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N=55	N=70	N=64	N=75
21%	27%	24%	28%

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

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

**Value-Added Data for Ohio State University-Prepared Principals**

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	A	B	C	D	F	NR
N<10	N<10	N<10 NA	N<10 NA	N<10 NA	NA NA	N<10 NA	NA NA

**Demographic Information for Schools where Ohio State 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<10	N<10	NA	N<10	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Principals Serving by School Type			
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
NA	N<10	N<10	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

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<10	N<10	N<10	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles			
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
NA	NA	NA	NA





**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
Praxis CORE Reading	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis CORE Writing	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis I Math	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis I Reading	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis I Writing	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis II	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
SAT Composite Score	U=600 P=600 G=600	U=70 P=N<10 G=30	U=1776.9 P=N<10 G=1846.3	U=87 P=N<10 G=57	U=1722.9 P=N<10 G=1729.1	U=34 P=N<10 G=45	U=1718.2 P=N<10 G=1748
SAT Quantitative Subscore	U=200 P=200 G=200	U=70 P=N<10 G=30	U=609.9 P=N<10 G=623	U=87 P=N<10 G=57	U=586.4 P=N<10 G=585.1	U=34 P=N<10 G=45	U=585.6 P=N<10 G=589.1
SAT Verbal Subscore	U=586 P=200 G=200	U=70 P=N<10 G=30	U=590.5 P=N<10 G=611.7	U=87 P=N<10 G=57	U=566.9 P=N<10 G=575.3	U=34 P=N<10 G=45	U=565 P=N<10 G=583
SAT Writing Subscore	U=200 P=200 G=200	U=70 P=N<10 G=30	U=581 P=N<10 G=611.7	U=87 P=N<10 G=57	U=571.5 P=N<10 G=568.7	U=34 P=N<10 G=45	U=592.5 P=N<10 G=575.8
Other Criteria		Undergraduate		Post-Baccalaureate		Graduate	
Dispositional Assessment		Y		Y		Y	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview		N		N		N	
Essay		Y		Y		Y	
High School Class Rank		NA		NA		NA	
Interview		Y		Y		Y	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		Y	
Letter of Recommendation		Y		Y		Y	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		NA		N		N	
Portfolio		Y		Y		N	
Prerequisite Courses		Y		Y		Y	
SRI Teacher Perceiver		NA		NA		N	
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship		NA		NA		N	
Teacher Insight		N		N		N	

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

**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
ACT Composite Score	1	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
ACT English Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GRE Quantitative Subscore	130	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
SAT Quantitative Subscore	300	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GRE Composite Score	130	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GRE Verbal Subscore	130	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
ACT Reading Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GPA - Graduate	3	N<10	N<10	14	3.95	N<10	N<10
SAT Composite Score	600	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GPA - Undergraduate	3	N<10	N<10	27	3.05	15	3.38
GRE Writing Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
SAT Verbal Subscore	300	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
ACT Math Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Writing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - High School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis II	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Other Criteria</b>							
<b>Dispositional Assessment</b>				Y			
<b>EMPATHY/Omaha Interview</b>				N			
<b>Essay</b>				Y			

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

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

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

**Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**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 4,055 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 70 percent.

**Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 58.29%**

**Total Survey Responses = 232**

**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.	3.52	3.49
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.	3.18	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.32	3.36
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.56	3.47
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.36	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.	3.64	3.61
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.50	3.46
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.51	3.49
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.52	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.	3.30	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.33	3.39
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.62	3.59
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.34	3.35
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.56	3.57
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication	3.50	3.54

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State 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.	3.71	3.66
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.56	3.53
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.66	3.64
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.44	3.49
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.71	3.71
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.36	3.39
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.54	3.50
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).	3.16	3.22
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.	2.95	3.06
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.12	2.97
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.33	3.31
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.23	3.19
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.63	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.	2.99	2.96
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.78	3.65
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.21	3.43
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.70	3.69
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.70	3.67
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.68	3.62
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.48	3.51
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.47	3.48

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.25	3.30
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.28	3.32
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.24	3.36
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.72	3.64
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.51	3.52
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.66	3.62
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.51	3.52
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.53	3.51
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.66	3.66
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.38	3.42
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.21	3.24
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.47	3.42

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**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 650 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 11 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.	3.52	3.47
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.	3.16	3.29
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.39	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.58	3.40
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.39	3.35
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.	3.55	3.41
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.55	3.41
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.55	3.41
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.55	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.	3.55	3.41
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.29	3.31
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.61	3.43
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	2.94	3.28
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.42	3.45



**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.32	3.42
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.42	3.55
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.55	3.43
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.39	3.36
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.74	3.59
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.06	3.31
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.32	3.43
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.45	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.03	3.10
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.	2.55	2.76
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.55	2.76
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.16	3.22
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	2.94	3.06
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.39	3.31
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.42	2.75
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.58	3.53
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	2.94	3.33
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.65	3.54
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.52	3.51
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.68	3.52
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.35	3.34
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.48	3.33
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.35	3.25

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.39	3.26
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.26	3.27
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.71	3.55
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.55	3.47
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.65	3.53
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.58	3.43
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.45	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.68	3.60
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.29	3.34
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.19	3.22
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.42	3.38
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.23	3.27

# 2015 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Ohio State University

## Principal Intern Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

### 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 255 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 29 percent.

**Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 33.33%**

**Total Survey Responses = 9**

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	3.52
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	3.48
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.51
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	3.49
5	My program prepared me to ensure the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	N<10	3.41
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.52
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.61
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	3.53
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.55
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	3.56
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N<10	3.59
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.56
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.45
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N<10	3.63
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N<10	3.65
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for	N<10	3.61

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State 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	3.63
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.60
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N<10	3.67
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.40
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.57
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.47
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.51

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

**Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

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

**Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 18.52%**

**Total Survey Responses = 5**

**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	3.35
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	3.29
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	3.35
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	3.35
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	3.31
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.27
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	3.37
11	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.37
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.30
13	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand	N<10	3.49

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
	upholding and modeling professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct.		
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	3.29
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.32
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.30
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	3.34
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.51
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.84
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.13

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

**National Accreditation Status**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(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.

<b>Accrediting Agency</b>	NCATE
<b>Date of Last Review</b>	April 2015
<b>Accreditation Status</b>	Accredited





# 2015

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Ohio State University

---

#### Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio State 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

<b>Initiative:</b>	Immersive Agriscience Education Experience
<b>Purpose:</b>	For the purposes of this study, "a 21st century curriculum of immersion in agriscience teacher preparation, is one that mixes non-traditional context-setting with traditional, tested teaching approach
<b>Goal:</b>	Preparing agriscience teachers to meet the needs of a changing global environment in the 21st century is critical for their career success.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	15
<b>Strategy:</b>	Ohio State's pre-service Agriscience Education teachers participate in an immersion experience the fall of their Senior year that includes innovative experiential learning opportunities, classroom instruction, reflection, and evaluation across the entire fall semester. One example of activities is time at a residential camp for learners with special needs. Another example is a trip to Nashville where pre-service teachers spend time immersed urban career tech programs including time shadowing, observing, and teaching. With the growth in urban agriscience education programs, this helps prepare OSU students for meeting the needs of a diverse student population.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	OSU preservice agriscience educators provide evidence that they feel prepared to teach in an urban context. Our candidates are from rural Ohio, so this type of cultural experience is essential for our educators to meet the needs of the next generation of students.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	publications

<b>Initiative:</b>	Assistive Technology Integration
<b>Purpose:</b>	To improve expose to and effective use of assistive technology.
<b>Goal:</b>	Improve P12 visually impaired student learning through appropriate use of assistive technology.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	10
<b>Strategy:</b>	The program in visual impairment education has increased the amount of time students in the program receive in regards to assistive technology training. In conjunction with the Ohio State School for the Blind our teachers are receiving multiple hours in hands-on assistive technology instruction lead by an instructor that is blind. Being taught assistive technology by an instructor that is blind not only allows our students to better understand how vital assistive technology can be for their future students. In addition several instructors from the Ohio State School for the Blind lend their expertise in teaching class sessions on the core curriculum and expanded core curriculum for students with visual impairments. Our pre-service teachers are learning from instructors that are in the field daily with the students they will someday serve.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	This change was made in response to candidate feedback and principal feedback. Our future educators are better prepared to seek out assistive technology to meet the needs of visually impaired learners. Additionally, they are able to effectively integrate that technology into the classroom. Our cooperating teachers report our students are better prepared during internship. Additionally, our students are excited about being exposed to cutting edge technology.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Peer reviewed publications, Collaboration with Ohio School for the Blind.
<b>Programs:</b>	Visually Impaired Intervention Specialist and Orientation and Mobility

<b>Initiative:</b>	At risk reading program
--------------------	-------------------------

# 2015

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Ohio State University

---

<b>Purpose:</b>	Improve first and second grade reading levels while providing structure for preservice teachers to utilize effective reading practices.
<b>Goal:</b>	Teach essential pedagogical skills while improving reading with at risk early readers.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	90
<b>Strategy:</b>	Special Education Reading Program: All OSU special education students work with first or second graders that are at risk for reading at an urban low performing school. Our pre-service teachers implement empirically-based literacy strategies and the children make important documented progress in reading achievement Music Education Reading Program: OSU music students have an initial exposure to the process of teaching and learning begins the slow dance in which the students begin to step outside of their all-too-familiar area of music performance and into a less-comfortable area: effective teaching and learning assessments in elementary reading. Following training, the OSU Music Education students tutor in a local urban school where the cultural and economic experiences are quite different from their own. The tutoring experience culminates with an interactive music performance in which the OSU students present a "reading in music" assembly for the children. The OSU students incorporate the knowledge and skills learned in class and from the tutoring experience in an interactive performance
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Special Education: All children that have been part of the special Education program have improved reading skills. Some have reached grade level performance by the end of the tutoring experience with an OSU special education preservice teacher. Music Education OSU students practice culturally relevant pedagogy, demonstrate improved understanding of learning, and at the end of the experience, are interested in engaging in more urban experiences.
<b>Programs:</b>	Intervention Specialists: Early, Mild/Moderate, Moderate/Intensive, and Music Education

# 2015

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Ohio State University

---

#### Principal Preparation Programs

<b>Initiative:</b>	Leadership Academy
<b>Purpose:</b>	Address the needs expressed by local principals
<b>Goal:</b>	Improve knowledge and skills of practicing principals
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	20
<b>Strategy:</b>	Address the following areas, as determined by the superintendents and principals. This was a special request to Ohio State. 1.1 vision of learning for a district 1.2 district goals 1.3 district improvement. 1.4 district progress and plans 2.1 district culture and instructional program 2.2 instructional district program 2.3 supervise district staff 2.4 technology 3.1 district management and operational systems 3.2 manage district operations 3.3 welfare and safety in the district 3.4 distributed leadership 3.5 support district instruction and student learning 4.1 collaborate to improve district environment 4.2 resources in the district community 4.3 relationships with families and caregivers 4.4 relationships with community partners 5.1 integrity and fairness 5.2 self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior 5.3 democracy, equity, and diversity within the district 5.4 moral and legal consequences 5.5 social justice 6.1 advocate for district students, etc.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Since this is just being implemented, it is too early for data.

<b>Initiative:</b>	Mobilizing National Educator Talent project
<b>Purpose:</b>	Utilize Transition to Teaching funds to implement a professional development program for high needs communities.
<b>Goal:</b>	Provide effective leadership preparation in twelve states
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	1500
<b>Strategy:</b>	Innovations refined in KNOTtT are fostering success for the m-NET consortium of state departments of education, universities, local education associations (LEAs) and educational organizations. Gimbert and her team, guided by project manager Rebecca Parker of the college's Center on Education and Training for Employment (CETE), created an innovative, virtual learning community. It ensures that teachers hired by LEAs hone their skills and attain full state certification as core academic teachers. The m-NET virtual learning community offers teachers eLearning tools and applications to access courses in their core areas. Content packages are offered on topics such as classroom management and assessment strategies, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) pedagogy, online instructional pedagogy, and equity to accelerate learning opportunities for diverse students.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	More than three-quarters of the teachers report that their understanding of instructional technology and their content and pedagogical knowledge improved through use of m-NET's online supports. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers report that as a result of the online support, they are better prepared to pass state-mandated pedagogical and content tests. School administrators worked together virtually to overcome barriers to hiring. For instance, extended hiring processes can slow offers, resulting in highly-qualified candidates accepting positions elsewhere. They overcame this challenge by conducting online selection interviews with prospective teachers. In addition, across all four years, 65 percent of the teachers/leaders were from underrepresented groups.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	US DOE funding, various publications and presentations, expansion of the original grant.

<b>Initiative:</b>	Accelerated Principal Program
<b>Purpose:</b>	Implement cutting edge approaches to the preparation of building leaders
<b>Goal:</b>	Improve the preparation of principals through effective and focused curriculum and experiences.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	20
<b>Strategy:</b>	? The accelerated licensure program for principals. Candidates begin the 36 credit hour program and internship in June and complete it by August the following year. ? Alternative course delivery (e.g., Hybrid courses that blend face-to-face and online instruction; One fully online course; Several 7-week courses during the 14-week semester) ? The principal licensure internship experience occurs over a concentrated six-month (9-12 hours per week) time period. In preparation for the internship, the University Supervisor suggests over 50 activities for candidates' potential involvement in preparation for the principalship. Examples of suggested activities for candidate's participation include master scheduling, planning a staff retreat prior to the start of the year, parent open house, teacher observations, special education process monitoring, student data analysis, enrollment projects for next

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Ohio State University**

---

year, and graduation and concluding ceremonies.

**Demonstration of Impact:** Increased interest in the Accelerated Program, even with more choices for teachers. Meeting the needs of districts as reported by superintendents.