# 2016
# 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
- Survey Results of Employer Perceptions of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider National Accreditation Status
- Persistence in the Ohio Resident Educator Program of Teachers Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers
- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# 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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

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

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

| Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Initial Licensure Effective Year | # Accomplished | # Skilled | # Developing | # Ineffective |
| 2012 | 129 | 114 | 11 | N<10 |
| 2013 | 113 | 125 | N<10 | N<10 |
| 2014 | 79 | 119 | 10 | N<10 |
| 2015 | 69 | 119 | 26 | N<10 |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

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

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

| Teacher Preparation Programs | |
| --- | --- |
| **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 | 99.19% |

| Principal Preparation Programs | |
| --- | --- |
| **Field/Clinical Experience Element** | **Requirements** |
| Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship | 28 |
| Number of candidates admitted to internship | 20 |
| Number of candidates completing internship | 20 |
| Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship | 100% |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

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

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

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

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

| Teacher Licensure Tests | |
|---|---|
| **Summary Rating: Effective** | |
| **Completers Tested** | **Pass Rate** |
| 391 | 99% |

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

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

**Description of Data:**
Ohio requires that principal candidates pass the requisite state examination to be recommended for licensure. The 2015-2016 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

| Principal Licensure Tests | |
|---|---|
| **Completers Tested** | **Pass Rate** |
| 16 | 88% |

# 2016
# 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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

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

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

### Value-Added Data for Ohio State University-Prepared Teachers

| Initial Licensure Effective Years 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 | | Associated Value-Added Classifications | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employed as Teachers | Teachers with Value-Added Data | Most Effective | Above Average | Average | Approaching Average | Least Effective |
| 973 | 341 | N=85 | N=35 | N=90 | N=50 | N=81 |
| | | 25% | 10% | 26% | 15% | 24% |

# 2016
# 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=96 | N=115 | N=10 | N=120 | N/A |
| 28% | 34% | 3% | 35% | N/A |

| Teachers Serving by School Type | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Community School** | **Public School** | **STEM School** | **Educational Service Center** |
| N=14 | N=325 | N=2 | N/A |
| 4% | 95% | <1% | N/A |

| Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | **B** | **C** | **D** | **F** | **NR** |
| N=131 | N=19 | N=35 | N=20 | N=135 | N=1 |
| 38% | 6% | 10% | 6% | 40% | <1% |

| Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **High Minority** | **Medium-High Minority** | **Medium-Low Minority** | **Low Minority** |
| N=77 | N=117 | N=89 | N=58 |
| 23% | 34% | 26% | 17% |

| Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **High Poverty** | **Medium-High Poverty** | **Medium-Low Poverty** | **Low Poverty** |
| N=53 | N=98 | N=91 | N=99 |
| 16% | 29% | 27% | 29% |

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

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

## Ohio State University Candidate Academic Measures

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

### Undergraduate Admission Requirements

EPP UG requirements are 1) application with letter of recommendation, GPA, and disposition form (BCII/FBI checks and fingerprinting) and 2) coursework. All applications are screened using unit and program rubrics/criteria. Applicants include a piece of writing with criteria established by each program/campus. Some programs interview and/or require content-specific GPA, portfolios or specific grades in courses. SAT and ACT scores may be considered.

### Post-Baccalaureate Admission Requirements

EPP PB requirements are 1) application with letter of recommendation, GPA, and disposition form (BCII/FBI checks and fingerprinting) and 2) coursework. All applications are screened using unit and program rubrics/criteria. Applicants include a piece of writing with criteria established by each program/campus. Some programs interview and/or require content-specific GPA, portfolios or specific grades in courses. SAT, ACT and GRE scores may be considered.

### Graduate Admission Requirements

EPP graduate requirements are 1) application with letter of recommendation, GPA, and disposition form (BCII/FBI checks and fingerprinting) and 2) coursework. All applications are screened using unit and program rubrics/criteria. Applicants include a piece of writing with criteria established by each program/campus. Some programs interview and/or require content-specific GPA, portfolios or specific grades in courses. SAT, ACT and GRE scores may be considered.

**Description of Data:**

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

## Teacher Preparation Programs

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

| Academic Measure | Required Score | Candidates Admitted | | Candidates Enrolled | | Candidates Completing | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number Admitted | Average Score | Number Enrolled | Average Score | Number Completed | Average Score |
| ACT Composite Score | U=1 P=1 G=1 | U=262 P=N<10 G=80 | U=24.3 P=N<10 G=26.1 | U=588 P=N<10 G=88 | U=24.6 P=N<10 G=25.5 | U=204 P=N<10 G=62 | U=25 P=N<10 G=26.5 |
| ACT English Subscore | U=1 P=1 G=1 | U=262 P=N<10 G=80 | U=24.4 P=N<10 G=26.8 | U=588 P=N<10 G=88 | U=24.9 P=N<10 G=26.2 | U=204 P=N<10 G=62 | U=25.2 P=N<10 G=27.1 |
| ACT Math Subscore | U=1 P=1 G=1 | U=262 P=N<10 G=80 | U=24.1 P=N<10 G=25.6 | U=588 P=N<10 G=88 | U=24.3 P=N<10 G=25.1 | U=204 P=N<10 G=62 | U=24.8 P=N<10 G=26.2 |
| ACT Reading Subscore | U=1 P=1 G=1 | U=260 P=N<10 G=79 | U=25.2 P=N<10 G=27.6 | U=584 P=N<10 G=85 | U=25.6 P=N<10 G=27.2 | U=202 P=N<10 G=62 | U=25.8 P=N<10 G=27.8 |
| GPA - Graduate | U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.00 | U=N/A P=N/A G=31 | U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.81 | U=N/A P=N/A G=47 | U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.72 | U=N/A P=N/A G=14 | U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.64 |
| GPA - High School | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| GPA - Transfer | U=N/A P=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

| Academic Measure | Required Score | Candidates Admitted | | Candidates Enrolled | | Candidates Completing | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number Admitted | Average Score | Number Enrolled | Average Score | Number Completed | Average Score |
| | G=N/A | G=N/A | G=N/A | G=N/A | G=N/A | G=N/A | G=N/A |
| GPA - Undergraduate | U= 2.75 P= 3.00 G= 3.00 | U=350 P=10 G=104 | U= 3.44 P= 3.42 G= 3.52 | U=734 P=14 G=107 | U= 3.59 P= 3.42 G= 3.50 | U=283 P=N<10 G=95 | U= 3.67 P=N<10 G= 3.21 |
| GRE Composite Score | U=N/A P=200 G=200 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=40 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=304.8 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=51 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=289.7 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=29 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=306.7 |
| GRE Quantitative Subscore | U=N/A P=130 G=130 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=40 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=151.8 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=51 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=142.1 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=29 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=153.2 |
| GRE Verbal Subscore | U=N/A P=130 G=130 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=40 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=153.8 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=51 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=149.6 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=29 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=153.6 |
| GRE Writing Subscore | U=N/A P=1 G=1 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=37 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=4.1 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=45 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=3.9 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=27 | U=N/A P=N<10 G=4.2 |
| MAT | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis CORE Math | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis CORE Reading | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis CORE Writing | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis I Math | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis I Reading | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis I Writing | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| Praxis II | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A | U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A |
| SAT Composite Score | U=600 P=N/A G=600 | U=39 P=N/A G=32 | U=1728 P=N/A G=1796.8 | U=113 P=N/A G=34 | U=1753.6 P=N/A G=1792.9 | U=47 P=N/A G=27 | U=1764 P=N/A G=1836 |
| SAT Quantitative Subscore | U=200 P=200 G=200 | U=39 P=N<10 G=32 | U=559.5 P=N<10 G=504.7 | U=113 P=N<10 G=34 | U=603.4 P=N<10 G=601.2 | U=47 P=N<10 G=27 | U=604 P=N<10 G=620.4 |
| SAT Verbal Subscore | U=200 P=200 G=200 | U=39 P=N<10 G=32 | U=573.1 P=N<10 G=591.3 | U=113 P=N<10 G=34 | U=576.3 P=N<10 G=589.4 | U=47 P=N<10 G=27 | U=576.2 P=N<10 G=604.8 |
| SAT Writing Subscore | U=200 P=N/A G=200 | U=36 P=N/A G=30 | U=555.3 P=N/A G=602.3 | U=110 P=N/A G=30 | U=573.9 P=N/A G=602.3 | U=47 P=N/A G=26 | U=583.8 P=N/A G=610.8 |

| 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 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Interview | Y | Y | Y |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

| Other Criteria | Undergraduate | Post-Baccalaureate | Graduate |
|---|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| Letter of Commitment | N | N | Y |
| Letter of Recommendation | Y | Y | Y |
| Myers-Briggs Type Indicator | N/A | N | N |
| OAE Content Assessment | N/A | N/A | N |
| Portfolio | Y | Y | N |
| Prerequisite Courses | Y | Y | Y |
| SRI Teacher Perceiver | N/A | N/A | N |
| Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship | N/A | N/A | N |
| Teacher Insight | N | N | N |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

## Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

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

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

**Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 58.2%**

**Total Survey Responses = 213**

**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. | 3.60 | 3.50 |
| 2 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction. | 3.33 | 3.31 |
| 3 | My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach. | 3.37 | 3.33 |
| 4 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area. | 3.61 | 3.46 |
| 5 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences. | 3.42 | 3.38 |
| 6 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including the Common Core State Standards. | 3.73 | 3.61 |
| 7 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction. | 3.53 | 3.44 |
| 8 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students. | 3.56 | 3.46 |
| 9 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction. | 3.60 | 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. | 3.49 | 3.42 |
| 11 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study. | 3.40 | 3.37 |
| 12 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class. | 3.56 | 3.57 |
| 13 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management. | 3.45 | 3.30 |
| 14 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively. | 3.58 | 3.53 |
| 15 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication | 3.61 | 3.51 |

| 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. | 3.72 | 3.67 |
| 17 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. | 3.52 | 3.52 |
| 18 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students. | 3.67 | 3.63 |
| 19 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences. | 3.53 | 3.46 |
| 20 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring. | 3.79 | 3.71 |
| 21 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning. | 3.32 | 3.37 |
| 22 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate. | 3.57 | 3.49 |
| 23 | My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress. | 3.61 | 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). | 3.17 | 3.21 |
| 25 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards. | 3.11 | 3.07 |
| 26 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program. | 3.18 | 2.96 |
| 27 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. | 3.38 | 3.31 |
| 28 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. | 3.21 | 3.17 |
| 29 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards. | 3.64 | 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. | 2.94 | 2.94 |
| 31 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.72 | 3.64 |
| 32 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural). | 3.33 | 3.41 |
| 33 | My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.71 | 3.68 |
| 34 | My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.69 | 3.65 |
| 35 | My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.65 | 3.62 |
| 36 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students). | 3.56 | 3.49 |
| 37 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences. | 3.55 | 3.46 |

# 2016
# 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. | 3.38 | 3.29 |
| 39 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty. | 3.38 | 3.32 |
| 40 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers. | 3.32 | 3.34 |
| 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. | 3.63 | 3.52 |
| 43 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations. | 3.74 | 3.64 |
| 44 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework. | 3.63 | 3.51 |
| 45 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning. | 3.57 | 3.51 |
| 46 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner. | 3.75 | 3.67 |
| 47 | My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.49 | 3.42 |
| 48 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program. | 3.29 | 3.19 |
| 49 | My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.52 | 3.42 |

# 2016
# 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, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016

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

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

| No. | Question | Institution Average | State Average |
|-----|----------|--------------------|--------------| 
| 1 | My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn. | 3.46 | 3.42 |
| 2 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction. | 3.15 | 3.20 |
| 3 | My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach. | 3.33 | 3.34 |
| 4 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area. | 3.44 | 3.38 |
| 5 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences. | 3.38 | 3.29 |
| 6 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including the Common Core State Standards. | 3.43 | 3.44 |
| 7 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction. | 3.42 | 3.34 |
| 8 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students. | 3.48 | 3.36 |
| 9 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction. | 3.55 | 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. | 3.34 | 3.28 |
| 11 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study. | 3.34 | 3.25 |
| 12 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class. | 3.44 | 3.38 |
| 13 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management. | 3.24 | 3.21 |
| 14 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively. | 3.50 | 3.43 |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# 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. | 3.47 | 3.38 |
| 16 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct. | 3.67 | 3.57 |
| 17 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. | 3.46 | 3.39 |
| 18 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences. | 3.36 | 3.30 |
| 19 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring. | 3.66 | 3.58 |
| 20 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning. | 3.25 | 3.28 |
| 21 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate. | 3.53 | 3.40 |
| 22 | My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress. | 3.41 | 3.35 |
| 23 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM). | 3.07 | 3.11 |
| 24 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards. | 3.04 | 2.89 |
| 25 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License. | 3.04 | 2.89 |
| 26 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. | 3.27 | 3.22 |
| 27 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. | 3.08 | 3.07 |
| 28 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards. | 3.37 | 3.33 |
| 29 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education. | 2.76 | 2.79 |
| 30 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.58 | 3.55 |
| 31 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural). | 3.28 | 3.37 |
| 32 | My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.56 | 3.56 |
| 33 | My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.49 | 3.53 |
| 34 | My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.52 | 3.50 |
| 35 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students). | 3.32 | 3.30 |
| 36 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences. | 3.36 | 3.31 |
| 37 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers. | 3.20 | 3.21 |

# 2016
# 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. | 3.22 | 3.22 |
| 39 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers. | 3.24 | 3.28 |
| 40 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field. | 3.54 | 3.53 |
| 41 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning. | 3.46 | 3.45 |
| 42 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations. | 3.56 | 3.52 |
| 43 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework. | 3.47 | 3.42 |
| 44 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning. | 3.43 | 3.39 |
| 45 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner. | 3.56 | 3.57 |
| 46 | My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.36 | 3.35 |
| 47 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program. | 3.08 | 3.19 |
| 48 | My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.30 | 3.34 |
| 49 | My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator. | 3.28 | 3.27 |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

## Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results

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

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

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

| No. | Question | Institution Average | State Average |
|-----|----------|---------------------|---------------|
| 1 | The institution prepares its graduates to understand student learning and development. | 3.34 | 3.30 |
| 2 | The institution prepares its graduates to respect the diversity of the students they teach. | 3.44 | 3.34 |
| 3 | The institution prepares its graduates to know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility. | 3.31 | 3.35 |
| 4 | The institution prepares its graduates to understand and use content-specific instructional strategies to effectively teach the central concepts and skills of the discipline. | 3.22 | 3.24 |
| 5 | The institution prepares its graduates to be knowledgeable about assessment types, their purposes, and the data they generate. | 3.00 | 3.04 |
| 6 | The institution prepares its graduates to analyze data to monitor student progress and learning. | 2.88 | 2.99 |
| 7 | The institution prepares its graduates to use data to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction. | 2.88 | 2.97 |
| 8 | The institution prepares its graduates to align their instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities. | 3.00 | 3.16 |
| 9 | The institution prepares its graduates to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students. | 2.91 | 3.02 |
| 10 | The institution prepares its graduates to treat students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring. | 3.31 | 3.36 |
| 11 | The institution prepares its graduates to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students. | 3.19 | 3.30 |
| 12 | The institution prepares its graduates to communicate clearly and effectively. | 3.31 | 3.25 |
| 13 | The institution prepares its graduates to collaborate effectively with other teachers, administrators, and district staff. | 3.31 | 3.26 |
| 14 | The institution prepares its graduates to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct. | 3.25 | 3.33 |
| 15 | The institution prepares its graduates to assume responsibility for professional growth. | 3.22 | 3.29 |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

## National Accreditation Status

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Accrediting Agency** | NCATE |
| **Date of Last Review** | Apr-15 |
| **Accreditation Status** | Accredited |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

## Teacher Residency Program

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

**Description of Data:**
The Resident Educator Program in Ohio encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system. The data below show the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program. Of note, a Resident Educator entering a program year may fail to complete all the program year requirements within the same academic year. Within set parameters, the individual may re-attempt the program year requirements in the subsequent academic year. These rare instances may affect the reported data, for example, showing persistence rates greater than 100 percent for a particular program year.

**Ohio EPP Program Completers Persisting in the State Resident Educator Program who were Prepared at Ohio State University**

| Initial Licensure Effective Year | Residency Year 1 | | | Residency Year 2 | | | Residency Year 3 | | | Residency Year 4 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Entering | Persisting | | Entering | Persisting | | Entering | Persisting | | Entering | Completing | |
| **2012** | 38 | 33 | 86.8% | 50 | 49 | 98% | 133 | 131 | 98.5% | 158 | 156 | 98.7% |
| **2013** | 35 | 35 | 100% | 108 | 108 | 100% | 190 | 187 | 98.4% | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **2014** | 109 | 109 | 100% | 181 | 180 | 99.4% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **2015** | 238 | 236 | 99.2% | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

## Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

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

| Initiative: | Valid and Reliable Instruments for EPPs |
|---|---|
| **Purpose:** | To develop freely available valid and reliable assessment instruments for Ohio-based educator preparation programs (EPPs). |
| **Goal:** | Address the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) call for EPPs to develop instruments that are valid and reliable for use in accreditation. |
| **Number of Participants:** | 450 |
| **Strategy:** | Prompted by the new CAEP Standards, this initiative is developing valid and reliable instruments for use by any college or university that licenses teachers. Additionally, the funds (provided by OBR's Race to the Top funding) are being used to develop valid and reliable instruments for particular content areas. At present, the Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST) Form has been developed and implemented at 26 Ohio institutions (both public/private, large/small), including Ohio State. It is a formative and summative assessment used during the student teaching practicum. The rubric has 21 rows containing two subscales (Pedagogy and Dispositions). Validity (content, construct, concurrent) and reliability (internal consistency) analyses met standards for instrument development. In addition, a team of math education specialists developed an assessment and rubric to address NCTM SPA Assessment #3 (Lesson Planning). The assessment is currently being implemented at four institutions in Ohio (including Ohio State). It is anticipated that an additional four institutions will participate in spring 2017, and validity and reliability analyses will be performed. |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | In 2015-2016, data was collected from approximately 1400 teacher candidates in Ohio (approximately 450 from Ohio State) using the CPAST Form. The following data were distributed to each participating institution and included (in both an aggregated/disaggregated by licensure program area format): (1) the overall state mean of the midterm and final individual row scores for both subscales each semester and each full academic year; and (2) the institution's mean of the overall row scores for both subscales each semester and each academic year. This data allows institutions to address the CAEP Standards' call for the use of valid and reliable assessment instruments that provide comparable means (i.e., means collected external to an institution) for each row on the assessment (CAEP, 2012). |
| **External Recognition:** | The project received Race to the Top Funding and a grant from OACTE, and there is a publication about the multi-university collaborative process currently in press at "Issues in Educator Accreditation: Just in Time Topics for EPPs in the United States." |
| **Programs:** | All initial licensure programs at Ohio State use the CPAST Form. |

| Initiative: | Redesigned Reflective Seminars for World Language |
|---|---|
| **Purpose:** | To develop candidates' ability to reflect on teaching in a variety of ways |
| **Goal:** | Improve candidates' ability to reflect on teaching in the genre required by performance assessments of the field (e.g., edTPA). |
| **Number of Participants:** | 5 |
| **Strategy:** | Beginning in 2013-2014, we redesigned our reflective seminars for teacher candidates to explicitly address the genre of critical reflection on practice and differentiate it from the type of reflection that is more personal (and therefore relatively more subjective) in nature (Troyan & Kaplan, 2015). This work on reflective writing informs not only the candidates' work for edTPA, but across the reflective tasks in the program (edTPA, reflective work on the development of core practices for world language teaching, etc.). Beyond the program, this work on reflective writing will prepare candidates for successful analysis of their practice in the Ohio Resident Educator Assessment (RESA). |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | Since the program's implementation of this approach to develop candidates' reflective writing, we have noted an improvement in their reflective writing across a variety of tasks, including the reflective writing |

valued in the performance assessments in the program and in the profession, such as edTPA. For example, 92% of completers since AY 2013-2014 and 100% from AY 2015-2016 have earned edTPA scores above 32 (where 32-36 is the recommended professional performance standard range, according to edTPA).

**External Recognition:** Peer reviewed publication in The Foreign Language Annals (Troyan & Kaplan, 2015)

**Programs:** World Language Education

| Initiative: | Central Asia in World History Summer Institute |
|---|---|
| **Purpose:** | To educate U.S. middle school and high school teachers about the Silk Road |
| **Goal:** | Participants will integrate the knowledge into their lesson plans for 7-12 students |
| **Number of Participants:** | 25 |
| **Strategy:** | In summer 2016, a group of 25 social science/history middle school and high school teachers from across the U.S. explored Central Asia's Silk Road during a 3-week institute. The teachers then incorporated their knowledge about the region into lesson plans for their students in the fall. The institute was led by Ohio State Associate Professor of History, Scott Levi. |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | The participants' lesson plans, infused with the knowledge of the Central Asia region, have the potential to reach thousands of students. |
| **External Recognition:** | Funded by the NEH Summer Institute for Teachers grant |
| **Programs:** | Practicing K-12 History teachers |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

---

## Principal Preparation Programs

| Initiative: | Curricular Enhancements |
|---|---|
| **Purpose:** | To provide candidates with opportunities to integrate content knowledge and professional skill in the context of field placement experiences and course assignments. |
| **Goal:** | To improve candidates' professional learning |
| **Number of Participants:** | 72 |
| **Strategy:** | The program has completed curricular enhancements to continuously improve candidates' professional learning. Curricular enhancements include providing candidates' additional opportunities to integrate content knowledge and professional skills in the context of field experiences and course assignments, offering increased number of courses through hybrid online and face-to-face delivery, and redesigning content knowledge and professional skills assessments. Notably, program faculty have worked to ensure that candidates are provided ample opportunities prior to beginning their field experience to practice and demonstrate skills to align school and district improvement plans. Program faculty have also worked to provide candidates additional examples of strategies principals employ to monitor and ensure equitable practices and to influence positive changes in teaching practice, school climate, and student learning. |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | Program faculty have collected and reviewed evidence from multiple data sources to inform and assess curricular enhancements. Data sources include candidates' Ohio Educator Assessment results, candidates' performance on content knowledge and professional skills assessments, and program exit surveys. |

| Initiative: | Accelerated Principal Program |
|---|---|
| **Purpose:** | Implement cutting edge approaches to the preparation of building leaders |
| **Goal:** | Improve the preparation of principals through effective and focused curriculum and experiences |
| **Number of Participants:** | 20 |
| **Strategy:** | 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 9-month (9-12 hours per week) time period, which gives candidates exposure to the work that principals engage in from the beginning to the end of the school year. 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 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. |

| Initiative: | Mobilizing National Educator Talent project |
|---|---|
| **Purpose:** | Utilize Transition to Teaching funds to implement a professional development program for high needs communities |
| **Goal:** | Provide effective leadership preparation in twelve states |
| **Number of Participants:** | 1500 |
| **Strategy:** | 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. |

# 2016
# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
# Ohio State University

---

**Demonstration of Impact:**   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.

**External Recognition:**   US DOE funding, various publications and presentations, expansion of the original grant