2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Institution Profile

(Data Source: Kent State University)

Kent State University's eight-campus system, among the largest regional systems in the country, serves both the development of a true living/learning approach at the Kent Campus and the regional needs on seven other campuses throughout Northeast Ohio. Kent State is ranked among the nation's 77 public research universities demonstrating high-research activity by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

College of Education, Health, and Human Services

The mission of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services (EHHS) is to create and advance knowledge as it educates professionals who enhance health and well-being and enable learning across the lifespan. We offer associate (regional campuses), baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees to prepare professionals for the 21st century with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be leaders in their worlds of work and engaged citizens.

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Kent State University

Reporting period for 9/1/2011 through 8/31/2012

(Data Source: Kent State University)

Description of Data:

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that teacher candidates pass Praxis II® examinations by scoring at or above the state's established required score to be recommended for licensure and receive endorsements in specific fields. The reporting for Teacher Licensure Test Scores is based on Federal Title II data and therefore reflects only initial licensure for 2011-2012. Data are not provided for additional licenses that an educator earns after her/his initial license. Individual candidates often take more than one licensure examination; the number of licensure program completers reported reflects the unduplicated number of individuals taking examinations. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals, only the N is reported.

Summary Rating: Effective		
	Completers Tested	**Pass Rate Percentage**
All Teacher Licensure Tests	369	93%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs
at
Kent State University

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013
(Data Source: Kent State University)

Description of Data:

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that principal candidates pass the Praxis II® examination (0411) by scoring at or above the state's established required score to be recommended for licensure. The scores are self-reported by each institution for 2012-2013.

	Completers Tested	Pass Rate Percentage
Principal Licensure Data	20	100%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Kent State University

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

Description of Data:

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

Limitations of the Value-Added Data:
1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012.
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. The number of teachers and principals (N) with associated value-added data remains small at this point. For institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals with value-added data, only the N is reported.

Value-Added Data for Kent State University-Prepared Teachers

Teachers with Effective Licensure Dates 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
336	66	N = 14 % = 21	N = 6 % = 9	N = 30 % = 45	N = 9 % = 14	N = 7 % = 11

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Demographic Information for Schools where Kent State University-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve

Characteristic					
	Elementary School	**Middle School**	**Junior High School**	**High School**	**Ungraded**
Teachers Serving by School Level	N = 28 % = 42	N = 26 % = 39	N = 5 % = 8	N = 7 % = 11	N = 0 % = 0

	Community School	**Public School**	**STEM School**	**Educational Service Center**
Teachers Serving by School Type	N = 11 % = 17	N = 55 % = 83	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added	N = 26 % = 39	N = 3 % = 5	N = 13 % = 20	N = 6 % = 9	N = 18 % = 27	N = 0 % = 0

	High Minority	**Middle Minority**	**Low Minority**
Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 16 % = 24	N = 39 % = 59	N = 11 % = 17

	High Poverty	**Medium-High Poverty**	**Medium-Low Poverty**	**Low Poverty**
Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 21 % = 32	N = 16 % = 24	N = 14 % = 21	N = 15 % = 23

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

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Value-Added Data for Kent State University-Prepared Principals

Principals with Effective Licensure Dates 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	**Principals with Value-Added Data**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
5	5	N = 1 % = 20	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 40	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 20	N = 1 % = 20

Demographic Information for Schools where Kent State University-Prepared Principals with Value-Added Data Serve

Characteristic

	Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	Ungraded
Principals Serving by School Level	N = 2 % = 40	N = 3 % = 60	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
Principals Serving by School Type	N = 0 % = 0	N = 5 % = 100	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	A	B	C	D	F	NR
Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School	NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL 2015					

	High Minority	Middle Minority	Low Minority
Principals Serving by School Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 40	N = 3 % = 60

	High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 20	N = 4 % = 80	N = 0 % = 0

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Kent State University Candidate Academic Measures

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013
(Data Source: Kent State University)

Description of Data:

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

Teacher Preparation Programs

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Criterion	**Required Score**	**Number of Admissions**	**Average Score of All Admissions**	**Number Enrolled**	**Average Score of All Enrollments**	**Number of Program Completers**	**Average Score All Program Completers**
U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate							
	U/PB/G	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**
Undergraduate GPA	2.75 / NA / 3	370 / NA / 118	3.4 / NA / 3.25	1363 / NA / 271	3.45 / NA / 3.2	386 / NA / 90	3.51 / NA / 3.29
High School GPA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Transfer GPA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Graduate GPA	NA / NA / 3	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10	NA / NA / N<10
ACT Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT Math Subscore	25 / NA / NA	85 / NA / NA	26.3 / NA / NA	295 / NA / NA	26.9 / NA / NA	83 / NA / NA	26.8 / NA / NA
ACT Reading Subscore	26 / NA / NA	95 / NA / NA	29 / NA / NA	348 / NA / NA	29.1 / NA / NA	86 / NA / NA	29.1 / NA / NA
ACT English Subscore	25 / NA / NA	95 / NA / NA	27.8 / NA / NA	337 / NA / NA	27.9 / NA / NA	75 / NA / NA	27.8 / NA / NA
SAT Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	620 / NA / NA	10 / NA / NA	666 / NA / NA	29 / NA / NA	662.1 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	620 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	27 / NA / NA	661.5 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Criterion	**Required Score**	**Number of Admissions**	**Average Score of All Admissions**	**Number Enrolled**	**Average Score of All Enrollments**	**Number of Program Completers**	**Average Score All Program Completers**
U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate							
	U/PB/G	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**	**U/PB/G**
SAT Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
Praxis I Reading	174 / NA / NA	239 / NA / NA	177.7 / NA / NA	875 / NA / NA	177.6 / NA / NA	283 / NA / NA	177.8 / NA / NA
Praxis I Math	174 / NA / NA	261 / NA / NA	179.2 / NA / NA	1014 / NA / NA	179.2 / NA / NA	252 / NA / NA	179 / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	172 / NA / NA	241 / NA / NA	174.5 / NA / NA	892 / NA / NA	174.7 / NA / NA	260 / NA / NA	174.9 / NA / NA
Praxis II	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / 151	NA / NA / 39	NA / NA / 150	NA / NA / 57	NA / NA / 149.1	NA / NA / 24	NA / NA / 147.9
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / 152	NA / NA / 39	NA / NA / 147.6	NA / NA / 57	NA / NA / 147.3	NA / NA / 54	NA / NA / 146.7
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / 4	NA / NA / 39	NA / NA / 3.6	NA / NA / 56	NA / NA / 3.6	NA / NA / 23	NA / NA / 3.7
MAT	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Dispositional Assessment	Y	N	N
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N	N	N
Essay	Y	N	Y
High School Class Rank	N	NA	NA
Interview	Y	N	Y
Letter of Commitment	N	N	N
Letter of Recommendation	Y	N	Y
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	NA	N	N
Portfolio	N	N	N
Prerequisite Courses	Y	N	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	NA	NA	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	NA	NA	N

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
Teacher Insight	NA	N	N

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Principal Preparation Programs

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Criterion	**Required Score**	**Number of Admissions**	**Average Score of All Admissions**	**Number Enrolled**	**Average Score of All Enrollments**	**Number of Program Completers**	**Average Score All Program Completers**
Undergraduate GPA	3	N<10	N<10	35	3.52	15	3.54
High School GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Graduate GPA	3	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
ACT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Writing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis II	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	151	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Criterion	**Required Score**	**Number of Admissions**	**Average Score of All Admissions**	**Number Enrolled**	**Average Score of All Enrollments**	**Number of Program Completers**	**Average Score All Program Completers**
GRE Quantitative Subscore	152	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GRE Writing Subscore	4	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Other Criteria

Portfolio	N
Interview	Y
Letter of Recommendation	Y
Essay	Y
Prerequisite Courses	N
Dispositional Assessment	N
Letter of Commitment	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N
Teacher Insight	N
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Field and Clinical Experiences for Kent State University Candidates

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

(Data Source: Kent State University)

Description of Data:

Ohio requires that teacher 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 at the unit level.

Teacher Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Kent State University Requirements
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	1467
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	14
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	98.8%

Principal Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	16
Number of candidates admitted to internship	19
Number of candidates completing internship	18
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	94.74%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Teacher Pre-Service Survey Results

Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Pre-Service Teachers as a special research project. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their student teaching experiences and collected the data for the Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013. A total of 3570 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 81 percent.

Kent State University Survey Response Rate = 96.84%

Total Survey Responses = 276

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.55	3.49
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.33	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.45	3.39
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.53	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.46	3.40
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.	3.60	3.53
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.46	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.54	3.47
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.58	3.52
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.	3.42	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.45	3.35
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively,	3.61	3.51

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	and/or a whole class.		
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.36	3.33
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.57	3.50
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.55	3.44
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.71	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.46	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.63	3.57
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.49	3.41
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.71	3.63
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.42	3.33
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.50	3.42
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.48	3.43
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.13	3.15
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.	3.04	3.01
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	2.86	2.94
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.23	3.24
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.16	3.12
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core	3.54	3.43

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	State Standards.		
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.91	2.97
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.56	3.54
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.36	3.30
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.60	3.59
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.59	3.58
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.55	3.56
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.41	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.44	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.26	3.25
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.29	3.26
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.38	3.30
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.67	3.57
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.56	3.46
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.63	3.54
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.53	3.44
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.49	3.42
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted	3.65	3.60

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	themselves in a professional manner.		
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.37	3.32
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.24	3.18
49	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.38	3.33

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

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

Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Board of Regents and a committee of representatives from Ohio institutions of higher education collaborated to develop a survey of Ohio's Resident Educators as a special research project. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their Resident Educator experiences and collected the data for the Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.58	3.40
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.	3.38	3.21
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.62	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.65	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.58	3.28
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.	3.54	3.24
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.54	3.24
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.54	3.24
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.54	3.24
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.	3.54	3.24
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.38	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.50	3.36
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.42	3.27
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.62	3.40

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.50	3.39
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.65	3.56
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.54	3.29
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.27	3.28
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.65	3.55
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.23	3.23
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.54	3.36
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.62	3.31
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	2.88	2.97
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	2.54	2.40
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.54	2.40
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.19	3.07
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.04	2.93
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.27	2.98
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.73	2.61
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.54	3.58
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.50	3.31
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective	3.77	3.58

No.	Question	Institution Average 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	State Average (Mean) 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree
	educator focused on student learning.		
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.73	3.53
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.65	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.50	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.42	3.27
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.27	3.17
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.27	3.16
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.31	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.65	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.58	3.37
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.50	3.47
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.35	3.31
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.23	3.25
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.65	3.56
46	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.35	3.30
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.23	3.12
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.42	3.29
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.12	3.17

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

National Accreditation

(Data Source: Ohio Board of Regents)

Description of Data:

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

Accrediting Agency	NCATE
Date of Last Review	November 2008
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Teacher Residency Program

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

Description of Data:

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio is a broad system of support that encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system designed to improve teacher retention and increase student learning. Data are reported for those entering the Resident Educator Program in SY2011-2012 and SY2012-2013. Non-completion does not imply dismissal, but rather may be due to multiple factors.

Percent of Newly Hired Teachers Completing the State Residency Program

who were Prepared at Kent State University

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing	
257	245	95%	193	189	98%						

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives at Kent State University

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013

(Data Source: Kent State University)

Description of Data:

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

Teacher Licensure Programs

Initiative:	Early Childhood International Baccalaureate
Purpose:	Provide early childhood teacher education candidates the opportunity to earn the IB certificate in teaching in learning
Goal:	
Number of Participants:	
Strategy:	EHHS has exclusive rights to award graduate credit for the International Baccalaureate (IB) Organization professional development seminars worldwide. Beginning Spring 2015 all KSU Early Childhood undergraduates will earn the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program Certificate in Teaching and Learning and will be eligible to teach in IB World School in the US and throughout the world. KSU's program is the first in the world to achieve this recognition.
Demonstration of Impact:	Data collection in progress; no data to report yet.
External Recognition:	http://www.ibo.org/programmes/pd/award/newsitemsarchive.cfm
Programs:	Early Childhood (Baccalaureate and MAT program)
Initiative:	Master of Arts in Teaching Year-Long Co-Teaching
Purpose:	This model for student teaching is designed to improve the overall experience for both the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate and is focused on improving student learning collaboratively.
Goal:	Student teachers will collaborate with cooperating teachers to better support learning using a variety of co-teaching strategies.
Number of Participants:	9
Strategy:	9 Teacher Candidates and 11 Cooperating Teachers participated (2012-2013) Teacher educators worked with teams of cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and teacher candidates in two field sites to enact co-teaching strategies related to both planning and pedagogy. Co-teaching strategies were discussed and modeled by teacher candidates and cooperating teachers. Reflection meetings were held to debrief teaching experiences and to work to improve the process.
Demonstration of Impact:	Teacher candidates and cooperating teachers presented to teacher education faculty and university supervisors on their experiences with the co-teaching model. Positive outcomes included teacher candidates feeling better prepared to plan and enact engaging lessons. Cooperating teachers felt they remained connected to their classes as opposed to turning them over to teacher candidates as they would in a more traditional student teaching model.

External Recognition:	
Programs:	
[redacted]	

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Kent State University

Principal Licensure Programs

Initiative:	Bowman Scholars
Purpose:	Support education administration doctoral students
Goal:	
Number of Participants:	4
Strategy:	The Bowman Scholars program supports a cohort of distinguished doctoral students in Educational Administration chosen for their potential to impact educational leadership for the greater good. Bowman Scholars will advance educational and human progress through their leadership for a deepening democracy, which honors multiplicity of ideation, plurality, diversity, and social justice. These students are afforded multiple opportunities to augment their study with research, publication, and presentation activities and work closely with faculty and a network of distinguished peers.
Demonstration of Impact:	
External Recognition:	
Programs:	