2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Institution Profile

(Data Source: Ohio University)

The Patton College prepares educators, practitioners and human service professionals. The College employs more than 100 faculty members and serves approximately 1,700 undergraduate and 930 graduate students.

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Ohio University

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

(Data Source: Ohio 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	477	91%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs
at
Ohio University

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013
(Data Source: Ohio 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	10	70%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at Ohio 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 Ohio 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**
412	107	N = 22 % = 21	N = 13 % = 12	N = 34 % = 32	N = 26 % = 24	N = 12 % = 11

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Demographic Information for Schools where Ohio 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 = 47 % = 44	N = 31 % = 29	N = 19 % = 18	N = 7 % = 7	N = 3 % = 3

	Community School	**Public School**	**STEM School**	**Educational Service Center**
Teachers Serving by School Type	N = 11 % = 10	N = 96 % = 90	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0

	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**	**NR**
Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added	N = 34 % = 32	N = 7 % = 7	N = 16 % = 15	N = 19 % = 18	N = 31 % = 29	N = 0 % = 0

	High Minority	**Middle Minority**	**Low Minority**
Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles	N = 14 % = 13	N = 46 % = 43	N = 47 % = 44

	High Poverty	**Medium-High Poverty**	**Medium-Low Poverty**	**Low Poverty**
Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 14 % = 13	N = 59 % = 55	N = 25 % = 23	N = 9 % = 8

*** 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
Ohio University

Value-Added Data for Ohio 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**
8	7	N = 1 % = 14	N = 2 % = 29	N = 1 % = 14	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 14	N = 2 % = 29

Demographic Information for Schools where Ohio 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 = 3 % = 43	N = 2 % = 29	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 29	N = 0 % = 0

	Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
Principals Serving by School Type	N = 0 % = 0	N = 7 % = 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 = 2 % = 29	N = 2 % = 29	N = 3 % = 43

	High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles	N = 0 % = 0	N = 6 % = 86	N = 1 % = 14	N = 0 % = 0

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Ohio University Candidate Academic Measures

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013
(Data Source: Ohio 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	354 / NA / 92	3.4 / NA / 3.3	2074 / NA / 213	3.26 / NA / 3.2	414 / NA / 37	3.5 / NA / 3.8
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 / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT Composite Score	21 / NA / NA	238 / NA / NA	23.9 / NA / NA	1247 / NA / NA	24 / NA / NA	366 / NA / NA	22.9 / NA / NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
ACT English Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT Composite Score	990 / NA / NA	15 / NA / NA	1620.7 / NA / NA	55 / NA / NA	1572.7 / NA / NA	11 / NA / NA	1537.3 / NA / NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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	173 / NA / NA	27 / NA / NA	178.4 / NA / NA	126 / NA / NA	179.3 / NA / NA	37 / NA / NA	178.6 / NA / NA
Praxis I Math	172 / NA / NA	27 / NA / NA	177.8 / NA / NA	126 / NA / NA	178.2 / NA / NA	37 / NA / NA	177.8 / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	172 / NA / NA	27 / NA / NA	174.4 / NA / NA	126 / NA / NA	175 / NA / NA	37 / NA / NA	175.1 / 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 / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
MAT	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA

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

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

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

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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	26	3.4	73	3.2	N<10	N<10
High School GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Graduate GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
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	150	26	152	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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	150	26	147.9	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
GRE Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Other Criteria

Portfolio	N
Interview	N
Letter of Recommendation	N
Essay	N
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
Ohio University

Field and Clinical Experiences for Ohio University Candidates

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

(Data Source: Ohio 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	Ohio University Requirements
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	120
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	562
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	15
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	98.33%

Principal Preparation Programs

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	36
Number of candidates admitted to internship	54
Number of candidates completing internship	50
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	92.59%

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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.

Ohio University Survey Response Rate = 100%

Total Survey Responses = 315

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.	3.49	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.	3.46	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.42	3.39
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.48	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.43	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.	3.49	3.53
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.43	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.51	3.47
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.55	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.	3.52	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.41	3.35
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively,	3.57	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.	3.41	3.33
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.55	3.50
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.49	3.44
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.63	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.51	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.60	3.57
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.44	3.41
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.66	3.63
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.35	3.33
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.49	3.42
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.45	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).	3.19	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.	3.07	3.01
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.00	2.94
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.31	3.24
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.24	3.12
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core	3.42	3.43

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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.	2.98	2.97
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.53	3.54
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	2.94	3.30
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.57	3.59
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.57	3.58
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.50	3.56
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.43	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.32	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.20	3.25
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.26	3.26
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.31	3.30
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.55	3.57
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.48	3.46
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.56	3.54
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.47	3.44
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.44	3.42
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted	3.59	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.	3.31	3.32
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.19	3.18
49	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.32	3.33

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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.	3.52	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.	3.22	3.21
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.57	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.39	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.39	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.	3.48	3.24
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.48	3.24
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.48	3.24
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.48	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.	3.48	3.24
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.52	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.65	3.36
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.35	3.27
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.48	3.40

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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.	3.43	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.	3.30	3.29
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.39	3.28
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.61	3.55
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.35	3.23
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.43	3.36
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.52	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).	3.22	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.	2.74	2.40
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.74	2.40
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.30	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.	3.13	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.	2.91	2.61
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.83	3.58
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.30	3.31
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective	3.74	3.58

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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
	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).	3.74	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).	3.43	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.30	3.27
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.30	3.17
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.22	3.16
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.30	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.52	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.39	3.37
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.48	3.47
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.43	3.31
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.30	3.25
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.52	3.56
46	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.30	3.30
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.04	3.12
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.35	3.29
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.39	3.17

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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	October 2009
Accreditation Status	Accredited

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio 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 Ohio University

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing	
405	386	95%	232	228	98%						

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Excellence and Innovation Initiatives at Ohio University

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

(Data Source: Ohio 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:	Yearlong Clinical Experiences
Purpose:	The purpose is to provide teacher candidates with a yearlong clinical experience in a single school usually with one mentor teacher.
Goal:	The goal of the program is to increase student learning in schools.
Number of Participants:	70
Strategy:	The Woodrow Wilson and the Clinical Master's are two 15-month graduate programs that require teacher candidates to spend a year with a mentor teacher. During fall semester, teacher candidates spent three full days in the classroom, and in the spring semester, teacher candidates completed their professional internship (student teaching) in the same classroom. Coursework is completed during the summer, fall, and following summer semesters. The Senior Clinical Experience provides a similar extended opportunity for undergraduate students. During fall semester 2011, this program was initiated with 15 undergraduate and graduate secondary majors who volunteered to spend an entire year in a clinical setting, following a similar design as the graduate programs. The following year, this program was expanded to include 45 teacher candidates from secondary, middle school, and special education majors. For the academic year 2013-14, another 45 students began a yearlong experience in the schools. In this program, participants typically spend 10-15 hours per week in a school setting in the fall semester before completing their professional internship during the spring semester.
Demonstration of Impact:	The evidence supporting yearlong clinical experiences comes from an interview study of 10 pre-service teachers, who were interviewed seven times during the yearlong experience. They described their experience as contributing substantially to their development as teachers. They also expressed appreciation for the opportunity and noted the increase in confidence their time in a clinical setting brought. The teacher candidates also described how they evolved in their perceptions, emotions, behavior, and cognition. One of their primary goals was to achieve a stable and predictable view of the classroom. Their conception of themselves as a successful teacher was dependent on their own perceptions and the students and colleagues' affirmation of their ability to function well in the classroom.
External Recognition:	Sickel, A., & Henning, J.E. (2014, March). Preservice teacher development: Experiential learning in clinical settings. Paper to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. Indianapolis, IN.
Programs:	All teacher licensure areas offered at the graduate level.
Initiative:	Design Teams
Purpose:	To establish an aligned, agile, regional system of professional learning that meets the unique educational needs of children and the broader demands of a global society.

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Goal:	To collaboratively design and analyze clinically based teacher preparation, school based innovation, teacher residency, technology, and health and wellness.
Number of Participants:	55
Strategy:	The Design Teams (DT) involve university and P12 partners. While each DT has a specific focus (I- Innovative Teacher Preparation; II- School Based Innovation; III- Teacher Residency; IV- Technology; V- Health & Wellness), there is significant collaboration across the DTs with the goal of meeting the needs of schools in our region. DT I is working with DT II and III to coordinate the curricula of three mentoring workshops to provide professional development in mentoring and support for P12 teachers. These workshops will align with the Developmental Curriculum for Clinical Experiences that DT I created several years ago. DT IV is creating a series of online clinical experiences that are modeled after the Developmental Curriculum. DT IV is also making recommendations regarding the types of support that mentor teachers will need to enhance K12 online clinical experiences for teacher candidates. These recommendations will be made to DTs I-III for incorporation into the existing workshops. DT IV is also making a recommendation concerning the need for creating a specialized workshop for K12 online mentors. DT V is working on implementing health and wellness strategies into the schools.
Demonstration of Impact:	We have had 175 teachers participate in the Mentoring Teacher Candidates Workshop and 43 participate in the Co-Teaching Workshops. Sixty-two people participated in a Mentor Quality Matters and Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession Professional Development online module that DT-III hosted.
External Recognition:	Book chapters, journal articles, state and national presentations. One example- Middleton, R.A., & Prince, B.L. (2011). Redesigning teacher education from the ground up- A collaborative model. In Wan, G., & Gut, D.M. (Eds.), Bringing Schools into the 21st Century. New York: Springer.
Programs:	All teacher licensure areas and multiple PCOE departments including Teacher Education, Educational Studies, Recreation and Sport Pedagogy, and Human and Consumer Sciences.
[redacted]	
Initiative:	Reading Interventions
Purpose:	Positively impact student learning by engaging teacher candidates in school intervention programming.
Goal:	Identify, assess, and provide early reading intervention for elementary children in the Athens City School Professional Development Partnership program.
Number of Participants:	131
Strategy:	Early Childhood candidates are engaged in Professional Development School (PDS) Partnerships and participate in reading interventions designed to meet the diverse needs of students identified as at risk in terms of reading. PDS candidates work in groups with K3 students and provide valuable experience in reading instruction, assessment, and differentiation. As students are identified candidates participate in reading interventions designed to meet the diverse needs of these students. As foundational skills are mastered, the teacher candidates then use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) to begin reading. During the year, PDS candidates use various assessments to monitor progress and differentiate instruction to fit the needs of the students. This intervention programming has not only provided a much needed service to the students in our region, but has also given teacher candidates additional experience teaching reading using a variety of different methods and strategies. Without Title I funding in the school, the candidates provide the school with a way to implement important intervention programming that would not otherwise occur.
Demonstration of Impact:	In one school, 11 children were identified as at-risk for not passing the spring Ohio Achievement Assessment (OAA) and Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing. After a year of reading intervention, 5 of the 11 moved into proficient or advanced ranges on the OAA, 7 of the 11 moved to a higher range, 8 of 11 made a year's worth of growth

	for value added. At another school, each grade level had shown a marked increase in the percentage of students" instructional reading levels as measured by LLI programming. In 2012-13, all third graders increased their instructional level by three guided reading levels Candidates reported an increased comfort level with reading instruction and differentiation.
External Recognition:	Applied for the National Association of Professional Development Schools Exemplary Award. Kennedy, C., Mullins, H., & McDowell, K.P (in press). Engaging teacher candidates in reading intervention: PDS partners reinvent clinical practice. National Association for Professional Development Schools, 9.
Programs:	Early Childhood Education
[redacted]	

2013
Educator Preparation Performance Report
Ohio University

Principal Licensure Programs

Initiative:	
Purpose:	
Goal:	
Number of Participants:	
Strategy:	
Demonstration of Impact:	
External Recognition:	
Programs:	