2017
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 five 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

2017
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, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.
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**
2013	143	100	N<10	N<10
2014	104	97	N<10	N<10
2015	93	137	14	N<10
2016	55	92	20	N<10

2017
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, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

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

The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) data reported here are limited in that the information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.

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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at Ohio State University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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	99.75%

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	21
Number of candidates completing internship	21
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Ohio State University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2015 to Aug 31, 2016
(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 2016-2017.

Teacher Licensure Tests	
Summary Rating: Effective	
Completers Tested	**Pass Rate**
374	99%

Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Ohio State University

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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**
31	90%

2017
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, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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, 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016.
2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on Elementary and Middle School Tests (Grades 4-8) and End-of-Course Tests for high school credit.
3. For Educator Preparation Providers with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals with value-added data, only the number (N) is reported.
4. Due to system parameters excluding records with missing demographic data, some records have not been reported.

Value-Added Data for Ohio State University-Prepared Teachers

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
901	329	N=82	N=34	N=103	N=42	N=68
		25%	10%	31%	13%	21%

2017
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=94	N=105	N=6	N=124	N/A
29%	32%	2%	38%	N/A

Teachers Serving by School Type			
Community School	**Public School**	**STEM School**	**Educational Service Center**
N=15	N=313	N=1	N/A
5%	95%	<1%	N/A

Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added					
A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
N=137	N=12	N=32	N=20	N=127	N=1
42%	4%	10%	6%	39%	<1%

Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles			
High Minority	**Medium-High Minority**	**Medium-Low Minority**	**Low Minority**
N=59	N=86	N=90	N=94
18%	26%	27%	29%

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles			
High Poverty	**Medium-High Poverty**	**Medium-Low Poverty**	**Low Poverty**
N=95	N=98	N=71	N=65
29%	30%	22%	20%

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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Value-Added Data for Ohio State University-Prepared Principals

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016		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	N<10	N/A	N<10	N<10	N/A
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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	N/A	N<10	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School					
A	B	C	D	F	NR
Not Available Until 2018					

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles			
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N<10	N<10	N<10	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2017
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, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

Undergraduate Admission Requirements
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
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. 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=326 P=N<10 G=72	U=24.9 P=N<10 G=26.1	U=667 P=N<10 G=86	U=24.9 P=N<10 G=25.5	U=248 P=N<10 G=66	U=24.9 P=N<10 G=26.3
ACT English Subscore	U=1 P=1 G=1	U=326 P=N<10 G=72	U=25 P=N<10 G=26.6	U=667 P=N<10 G=86	U=25 P=N<10 G=26	U=248 P=N<10 G=66	U=25.3 P=N<10 G=26.7
ACT Math Subscore	U=1 P=1 G=1	U=326 P=N<10 G=72	U=24.8 P=N<10 G=25.4	U=667 P=N<10 G=86	U=24.7 P=N<10 G=24.8	U=248 P=N<10 G=66	U=24.4 P=N<10 G=25.5
ACT Reading Subscore	U=1 P=1 G=1	U=326 P=N<10 G=72	U=25.6 P=N<10 G=27.6	U=666 P=N<10 G=82	U=25.7 P=N<10 G=27.4	U=248 P=N<10 G=66	U=26 P=N<10 G=27.8
GPA - Graduate	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.00	U=N/A P=N/A G=21	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.72	U=N/A P=N/A G=38	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.79	U=N/A P=N/A G=16	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.68
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

2017
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=389 P=N<10 G=122	U= 3.44 P=N<10 G= 3.49	U=808 P=22 G=174	U= 3.41 P= 3.35 G= 3.46	U=314 P=N<10 G=106	U= 3.43 P=N<10 G= 3.47
GRE Composite Score	U=N/A P=300 G=300	U=N/A P=N<10 G=37	U=N/A P=N<10 G=303.67	U=N/A P=N<10 G=52	U=N/A P=N<10 G=302.02	U=N/A P=N<10 G=32	U=N/A P=N<10 G=303.28
GRE Quantitative Subscore	U=N/A P=150 G=150	U=N/A P=N<10 G=37	U=N/A P=N<10 G=150.05	U=N/A P=N<10 G=52	U=N/A P=N<10 G=149.52	U=N/A P=N<10 G=32	U=N/A P=N<10 G=149.84
GRE Verbal Subscore	U=N/A P=150 G=150	U=N/A P=N<10 G=37	U=N/A P=N<10 G=153.62	U=N/A P=N<10 G=52	U=N/A P=N<10 G=152.5	U=N/A P=N<10 G=32	U=N/A P=N<10 G=153.44
GRE Writing Subscore	U=N/A P=4 G=4	U=N/A P=N<10 G=34	U=N/A P=N<10 G=4.2	U=N/A P=N<10 G=45	U=N/A P=N<10 G=4.1	U=N/A P=N<10 G=30	U=N/A P=N<10 G=4.1
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=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 Quantitative Subscore	U=200 P=200 G=200	U=60 P=N<10 G=28	U=599 P=N<10 G=572.9	U=122 P=N<10 G=31	U=601.6 P=N<10 G=564.8	U=43 P=N<10 G=22	U=607.4 P=N<10 G=570.9
SAT Verbal Subscore	U=200 P=200 G=200	U=60 P=N<10 G=28	U=586.7 P=N<10 G=566.8	U=122 P=N<10 G=31	U=584.8 P=N<10 G=558.7	U=43 P=N<10 G=22	U=581.6 P=N<10 G=570.9
SAT Writing Subscore	U=200 P=200 G=200	U=57 P=N<10 G=24	U=570 P=N<10 G=588.3	U=116 P=N<10 G=26	U=572.1 P=N<10 G=582.3	U=43 P=N<10 G=20	U=578.4 P=N<10 G=575

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Dispositional Assessment	Y	N	N
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N	N	N
Essay	Y	Y	Y
High School Class Rank	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interview	Y	N	N

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Principal Preparation Programs

Academic Measure	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GPA - Undergraduate	3.00	32	3.45	85	3.42	21	3.43
GPA - High School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - Graduate	3.00	19	3.85	37	3.87	13	3.85
ACT Composite Score	1	N<10	N<10	18	23	N<10	N<10
ACT Math Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	18	21.9	N<10	N<10
ACT Reading Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	14	26.6	N<10	N<10
ACT English Subscore	1	N<10	N<10	18	23.9	N<10	N<10
SAT Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Quantitative Subscore	200	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
SAT Verbal Subscore	200	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
SAT Writing Subscore	200	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
Praxis I Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Composite Score	300	11	295.18	24	296.75	N<10	N<10
GRE Verbal Subscore	150	11	149.72	24	149.66	N<10	N<10
GRE Quantitative Subscore	150	11	145.45	24	147.1	N<10	N<10
GRE Writing Subscore	4	N<10	N<10	17	4.03	N<10	N<10
MAT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Other Criteria	
Dispositional Assessment	N
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

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

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 3,342 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 69 percent.

Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 56.68%

Total Survey Responses = 225

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	3.51
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.21	3.32
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.35	3.36
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.56	3.48
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.48	3.43
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.	3.71	3.62
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.54	3.48
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.57	3.50
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.65	3.55
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.35	3.46
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.41	3.39
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.64	3.58
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.25	3.32
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.58	3.55
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication	3.52	3.54

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.	3.69	3.68
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.60	3.55
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.66	3.63
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.57	3.49
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.75	3.72
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.28	3.42
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.50	3.51
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.57	3.52
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.08	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.	2.96	3.08
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.04	3.03
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.33	3.34
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.16	3.21
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.62	3.58
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.88	2.95
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.68	3.67
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.19	3.40
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).	3.68	3.68
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.58	3.63
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.51	3.53
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.54	3.49

2017
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.	3.20	3.29
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.24	3.31
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.28	3.34
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.65	3.65
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.55	3.55
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.69	3.65
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.63	3.55
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.46	3.54
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.67	3.68
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.44	3.41
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.19	3.20
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.45	3.41

2017
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, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 854 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 19 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.	3.53	3.46
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.	3.09	3.19
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.31	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.53	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.33	3.31
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.	3.58	3.50
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.42	3.38
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.38	3.39
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.45	3.43
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.	3.33	3.30
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.40	3.24
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.40	3.37
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.09	3.15
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.44	3.43

2017
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.	3.38	3.37
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.60	3.58
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.55	3.41
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.42	3.33
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.62	3.59
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.35	3.28
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.40	3.40
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.36	3.34
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.04	3.12
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.	3.13	2.96
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	3.13	2.96
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.20	3.26
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.05	3.10
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.45	3.39
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.75	2.69
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.56	3.53
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.22	3.33
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.51	3.53
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.49	3.54
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.51	3.54
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.38	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.38	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.20	3.19

2017
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	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.24	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.56	3.54
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.53	3.44
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.60	3.53
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.49	3.43
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.45	3.39
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.60	3.59
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.42	3.36
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.15	3.18
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.33	3.37
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.38	3.28

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Principal Intern Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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 472 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 39 percent.

Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 75%

Total Survey Responses = 15

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	3.33	3.54
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	3.47	3.51
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	3.53	3.51
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	3.27	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.	3.20	3.47
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	3.67	3.53
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	3.67	3.57
8	My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.60	3.56
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	3.60	3.53
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	3.40	3.53
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	3.47	3.59
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	3.53	3.57
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	3.40	3.47
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	3.67	3.64
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	3.67	3.65
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for	3.60	3.61

2017
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.	3.67	3.65
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	3.60	3.60
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	3.67	3.66
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	3.53	3.49
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	3.53	3.55
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	3.47	3.47
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	3.53	3.51

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017

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

Ohio State University Survey Response Rate = 20%

Total Survey Responses = 4

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	3.30
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	3.31
3	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand anticipating, monitoring, and responding to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.28
4	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand ensuring the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (i.e., national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	N<10	3.34
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	3.34
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	3.34
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	3.36
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	3.30
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.29
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	3.41
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	3.28

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
13	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand upholding and modeling professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct.	N<10	3.46
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	3.23
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.23
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.22
17	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand etablishing expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.24
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.62
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.90
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.14

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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 94 respondents completed the survey statewide.

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.	3.39	3.34
2	The institution prepares its graduates to respect the diversity of the students they teach.	3.28	3.32
3	The institution prepares its graduates to know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.	3.39	3.39
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.	3.28	3.24
5	The institution prepares its graduates to be knowledgeable about assessment types, their purposes, and the data they generate.	3.17	3.10
6	The institution prepares its graduates to analyze data to monitor student progress and learning.	2.94	3.01
7	The institution prepares its graduates to use data to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction.	3.11	2.99
8	The institution prepares its graduates to align their instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities.	3.17	3.21
9	The institution prepares its graduates to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students.	3.06	3.05
10	The institution prepares its graduates to treat students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.28	3.39
11	The institution prepares its graduates to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.	3.33	3.36
12	The institution prepares its graduates to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.28	3.35
13	The institution prepares its graduates to collaborate effectively with other teachers, administrators, and district staff.	3.39	3.31
14	The institution prepares its graduates to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.33	3.39
15	The institution prepares its graduates to assume responsibility for professional growth.	3.39	3.29

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

National Accreditation Status

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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	15-Apr
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Teacher Residency Program

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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, corrections to prior year reporting may be captured in the current year's reporting. Examples include: 1. 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. 2. A Resident Educator is not reported for one year, but reported with a record for the previous year and a record for the current year during the current year reporting period. The teacher has completed both years and will be included in both the Entering and Persisting counts for both Residency Years.

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	
2013	9	9	100%	23	23	100%	58	61	105.2%	182	178	97.8%
2014	8	9	112.5%	71	69	97.2%	172	169	98.3%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	49	50	102%	227	225	99.1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	213	209	98.1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017
(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:	Computer Modeling & Programming in Sec. Algebra
Purpose:	Assessing the Impact of Computer Modeling and Programming in Secondary Algebra project
Goal:	To integrate the use of computation approaches in K-12 STEM teaching and learning
Number of Participants:	700
Strategy:	The Assessing the Impact of Computer Modeling and Programming in Secondary Algebra project examined the impact of modeling and computer programming opportunities on students' understanding of linear functions and their engagement in practices associated with STEM+C success. Teachers and students develop an understanding of computational thinking as a way of creatively approaching tasks using fundamental concepts from computer science. The professional development experiences at the heart of the initiative will follow a participatory approach that engages teachers as partners in research, expands their understanding of pedagogical approaches that lead to success for all students (and especially low-income and minority students), and positions them to transform their teaching of linear functions by infusing computer modeling and programming into their algebra curriculum. Project key personnel: Arnulfo Perez, Christopher Stewart, and Kathy Malone
Demonstration of Impact:	The program was piloted, refined and now is implemented in five schools, 15 classrooms, and over 700 students.
External Recognition:	Funding from NSF

Initiative:	ENABLE-STEM
Purpose:	Empowering Noyce Apprenticeships by Leadership Engagement in STEM Teaching (ENABLE-STEM). Support future STEM educators that will teach in high-needs schools
Goal:	supports the education of aspiring STEM teachers who will address the critical need for math and science educators for 7th- to 12th-graders, especially in high-needs schools
Number of Participants:	16
Strategy:	The components of the program include a strong teacher preparation experience with a prolonged field experience in CCS, close collaboration with informal science educators at COSI, and a four-year induction support system. An Urban Teaching Seminar (UTS) specifically designed for the ENABLE-STEM Fellows will provide additional background and support for teachers in the unique context of an urban, high-needs school. The ENABLE program will also continue to implement the co-planning/co-teaching model for student teaching. This model supports mentor teacher and student teacher teams by maintaining a consistent focus on the impact on student learning of pedagogical choices in the classroom. Key Personnel: Karen Irving, Patricia Brosnan, Lin Ding, Valerie Kinloch, and Larry Krissek
Demonstration of Impact:	Last year's completers all were employed in high needs districts. They continue to participate in professional growth and mentoring activities after completion.
External Recognition:	Funding from The Columbus Foundation, Service- Learning, Outreach & Engagement, and OSU Connect and Collaborate Fund
Programs:	Columbus Community Teaching and Learning Center

Initiative:	Math Literacy Initiative
Purpose:	To improve mathematics teaching skills during a math summer camp and year long professional development

2017
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report
Ohio State University

Goal: Utilize the 5 step method to improve mathematics teaching skills for early and middle childhood educators and implement during a summer math camp.

Number of Participants: 202

Strategy: Teachers developed lesson plans during an intensive professional development and then applied those lessons during a math camp program. One teacher gives the lesson and others are observing, taking notes, and meet afterwards to improve the lessons. Quotes: Chioke Bradley II, senior at Mansfield Senior High School, "It's a good way to help younger kids understand math," Bradley said. Ryan Hostetler, an early childhood education major at OSU-Mansfield, said being a camp instructor has helped him better understand younger students. "I'm teaching second graders, so I've learned that you have to have extra patience," Hostetler said. "You have to be goofy and silly, and have some kind of class management at the same time." Project key personnel: Terri Bucci, Lee McEwan, Dan Freund, and Christina Drain

Demonstration of Impact: Participants: 80 practicing teachers in five school districts, 230 children, 6 high school student volunteers, 15 preservice students. Teachers showed significant improvement, especially the content areas of Patterns, Functions, and Algebra, and Geometry After attending the year-long program, teachers reported significantly greater agreement that they had a good understanding of: ? effective questioning techniques and their use in the mathematics classroom, ? how to use technology effectively in the mathematics classroom, ? the methods necessary to teach mathematics concepts effectively, and ? how to assess student learning in mathematics in multiple ways.

External Recognition: Funding from the Ohio Board of Regents

Programs: Algebra Project

Principal Preparation Programs

Initiative:	EdD in Educational Administration
Purpose:	provide a practice-based doctorate for P-12 professionals

Strategy:	Our program offers innovative approaches to advancing your professional skills as educational practitioners, professionals and researchers in education. Ohio State's EdD is cohort-based and accommodates the needs of working professionals through very clear timelines and various course delivery models. A central element to this program is a concept called problems of practice. The uniquely designed EdD coursework helps you to focus on refining widely applicable leadership abilities that can be used to define and address these problems. Most are real issues you will encounter in your profession that you will be able to apply the knowledge and skills you learn as well as reflect in and on their practice. Fieldwork, team-based and collaborative-learning activities are hallmarks of the program. The program is a member of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate Consortium which requires a Professional Exam and a Dissertation in Practice (DIP). The DIP is a scholarly project that "frames and critically inquires in to a significant educational problem of practice." The DIP is completed in the third year of the program through a supervisory model.
External Recognition:	A member of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate Consortium

Initiative:	Social Capital in Schools
Purpose:	1. validity of measuring social capital, 2. equity of social capital distribution in schools, and 3. relationship between school social capital and academic achievement
Goal:	Determine what factors lead to improved student test scores
Number of Participants:	96
Strategy:	The study asked teachers from 96 rural, urban, and suburban high schools across Ohio to rate how their schools engaged parents, built trust with teachers and families, and encouraged community involvement in learning. Based on teacher responses, schools were given a social capital score. This score was then compared with student performance on math and reading exams. Researchers found that schools' social scores were accurate in predicting student performance on tests?regardless of the school's socio-economic makeup, size, or location. Though schools in wealthier districts did have advantages based on access to other resources, the research shows that an emphasis on building trust and strong community engagement can have a positive impact independent of wealth or socio-economic status. Key Ohio State Personnel: Roger D. Goddard
Demonstration of Impact:	Student test scores improve when principals and their teachers collaborate regularly to improve instruction. School leaders who focused intentionally on planning time for teacher collaboration to improve instructional practice had higher levels of student learning than those who did not. The more teachers collaborated, the more positive the school climate was and the greater the impact on the teachers' collective efficacy ? or the group's confidence that it had the capability to influence student learning.

Initiative:	Implement cutting edge approaches to the preparati
Goal:	Improve the preparation of principals through effective and focused curriculum and experiences
Number of Participants:	36
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.