

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Institution Profile**

(Data Source: Wright State University)

Named after the inventors of powered flight-Orville and Wilbur Wright-Wright State University continues their tradition of innovation. A rich and dynamic community of over 18,000 students, Wright State offers more than 118 undergraduate degrees and nearly 78 Ph.D., master's, and professional degrees. In addition, the Lake Campus, a branch campus located between St. Marys and Celina, Ohio, offers associate degrees plus several baccalaureate and master's programs. The main campus' state-of-the-art facilities are located in a beautiful 557-acre wooded setting 12 miles northeast of Dayton, Ohio.

---

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

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

(Data Source: Wright 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.

<b>Summary Rating: Effective</b>		
	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>All Teacher Licensure Tests</b>	256	96%

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

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

Reporting period for 9/1/2012 through 8/31/2013  
(Data Source: Wright 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.

	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>Principal Licensure Data</b>	40	95%

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at**  
**Wright 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 Wright 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
274	56	N = 5 % = 9	N = 9 % = 16	N = 22 % = 39	N = 9 % = 16	N = 11 % = 20

## 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Wright State University

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

<b>Characteristic</b>						
	<b>Elementary School</b>	<b>Middle School</b>	<b>Junior High School</b>	<b>High School</b>	<b>Ungraded</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by School Level</b>	N = 26 % = 46	N = 16 % = 29	N = 5 % = 9	N = 8 % = 14	N = 1 % = 2	
	<b>Community School</b>	<b>Public School</b>	<b>STEM School</b>	<b>Educational Service Center</b>		
<b>Teachers Serving by School Type</b>	N = 11 % = 20	N = 44 % = 80	N = 1 % = 2	N = 0 % = 0		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>NR</b>
<b>Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added</b>	N = 23 % = 41	N = 4 % = 7	N = 8 % = 14	N = 1 % = 2	N = 20 % = 36	N = 0 % = 0
	<b>High Minority</b>		<b>Middle Minority</b>		<b>Low Minority</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles</b>	N = 18 % = 32		N = 31 % = 55		N = 7 % = 13	
	<b>High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-Low Poverty</b>	<b>Low Poverty</b>		
<b>Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles</b>	N = 24 % = 43	N = 13 % = 23	N = 9 % = 16	N = 10 % = 18		

\* 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**  
**Wright State University**

**Value-Added Data for Wright 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
10	9	N = 2 % = 22	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 11	N = 1 % = 11	N = 2 % = 22	N = 3 % = 33

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

<b>Characteristic</b>						
	<b>Elementary School</b>	<b>Middle School</b>	<b>Junior High School</b>	<b>High School</b>	<b>Ungraded</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Level</b>	N = 4 % = 44	N = 1 % = 11	N = 1 % = 11	N = 3 % = 33	N = 0 % = 0	
	<b>Community School</b>	<b>Public School</b>	<b>STEM School</b>		<b>Educational Service Center</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Type</b>	N = 0 % = 0	N = 9 % = 100	N = 0 % = 0		N = 0 % = 0	
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>NR</b>
<b>Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School</b>	<b>NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL 2015</b>					
	<b>High Minority</b>		<b>Middle Minority</b>		<b>Low Minority</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Minority Enrollment by Tertiles</b>	N = 3 % = 33		N = 1 % = 11		N = 5 % = 56	
	<b>High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-Low Poverty</b>		<b>Low Poverty</b>	
<b>Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles</b>	N = 2 % = 22	N = 2 % = 22	N = 3 % = 33		N = 2 % = 22	

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

**Wright State University Candidate Academic Measures**

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

(Data Source: Wright 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**

Criterion	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
<b>U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate</b>							
	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G	U/PB/G
Praxis I Reading	172 / NA / NA	39 / NA / NA	176.5 / NA / NA	57 / NA / NA	176.6 / NA / NA	16 / NA / NA	175.7 / NA / NA
ACT Composite Score	22 / NA / NA	48 / NA / NA	21.5 / NA / NA	224 / NA / NA	21 / NA / NA	61 / NA / NA	20 / NA / NA
Transfer GPA	2.5 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	172 / NA / NA	39 / NA / NA	174.8 / NA / NA	57 / NA / NA	174 / NA / NA	16 / NA / NA	174 / NA / NA
Undergraduate GPA	2.5 / NA / 2.75	82 / NA / 135	3.37 / NA / 3.13	328 / NA / 449	3.27 / NA / 3.34	86 / NA / 189	3.27 / NA / 3.3
Praxis I Math	172 / NA / NA	39 / NA / NA	178 / NA / NA	57 / NA / NA	178.8 / NA / NA	16 / NA / NA	177.8 / NA / NA
SAT Composite Score	1000 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	N<10 / NA / NA	54 / NA / NA	966 / NA / NA	18 / NA / NA	872 / 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 Composite Score	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / 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
ACT Reading 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**  
**Wright State University**

Criterion	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number of Admissions	Average Score of All Admissions	Number Enrolled	Average Score of All Enrollments	Number of Program Completers	Average Score All Program Completers
<b>U=Undergraduate PB=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate</b>							
	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>	<b>U/PB/G</b>
GRE Writing Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / 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
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 Verbal Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
SAT 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
GRE Quantitative Subscore	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 Math Subscore	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
High School GPA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA	NA / NA / NA
<b>Other Criteria</b>		<b>Undergraduate</b>		<b>Post-Baccalaureate</b>		<b>Graduate</b>	
Dispositional Assessment		Y		N		Y	
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		Y	
SRI Teacher Perceiver		NA		NA		N	
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship		NA		NA		N	

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

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

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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	2.75	46	3.17	56	3.16	16	3.35
Graduate GPA	3	46	3.89	56	3.92	16	3.94
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis II	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English 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 Writing	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
High School GPA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Other Criteria</b>							
<b>Portfolio</b>						N	
<b>Interview</b>						N	
<b>Letter of Recommendation</b>						N	
<b>Essay</b>						N	
<b>Prerequisite Courses</b>						N	
<b>Dispositional Assessment</b>						N	
<b>Letter of Commitment</b>						N	
<b>Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship</b>						N	
<b>Myers-Briggs Type Indicator</b>						N	
<b>SRI Teacher Perceiver</b>						N	
<b>Teacher Insight</b>						N	
<b>EMPATHY/Omaha Interview</b>						N	

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Field and Clinical Experiences for Wright State University Candidates**

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

(Data Source: Wright 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	Wright 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	999
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	98.92%

**Principal Preparation Programs**

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	7
Number of candidates admitted to internship	23
Number of candidates completing internship	23
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

# 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Wright 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.

**Wright State University Survey Response Rate = 75.47%**

**Total Survey Responses = 120**

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.	3.29	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.37	3.39
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.46	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.	3.60	3.53
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.59	3.44
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.47	3.47
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.53	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.	3.43	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.37	3.35
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively,	3.51	3.51

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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
	and/or a whole class.		
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.32	3.33
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.47	3.50
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.51	3.44
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.58	3.59
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.58	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.59	3.57
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.36	3.41
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.58	3.63
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.28	3.33
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.46	3.42
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.49	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).	3.20	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.	3.03	3.01
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	2.99	2.94
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.24	3.24
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.13	3.12
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core	3.49	3.43

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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.	3.25	2.97
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.60	3.54
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.59	3.30
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.67	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).	3.57	3.56
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.46	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.41	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.35	3.25
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.36	3.26
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.37	3.30
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.58	3.57
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.43	3.46
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.51	3.54
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.40	3.44
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.51	3.42
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted	3.58	3.60

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b> 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree	<b>State Average (Mean)</b> 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.	3.28	3.32
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.14	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**  
**Wright 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.	3.14	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.	2.86	3.21
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.36	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.36	3.38
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.21	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.	3.00	3.24
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.00	3.24
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.00	3.24
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.00	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.	3.00	3.24
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.00	3.23
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.21	3.36
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	2.86	3.27
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.29	3.40

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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.	3.36	3.39
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.64	3.56
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.29	3.29
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.07	3.28
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.43	3.55
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.00	3.23
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.29	3.36
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.14	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).	2.79	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.	2.07	2.40
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.07	2.40
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	2.93	3.07
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	2.86	2.93
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	2.86	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.	2.57	2.61
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.50	3.58
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.43	3.31
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective	3.29	3.58

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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
	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).	3.43	3.53
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.14	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.07	3.29
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.21	3.27
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.07	3.17
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.07	3.16
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.21	3.24
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.43	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.43	3.37
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.43	3.47
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.14	3.31
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.29	3.25
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.50	3.56
46	My teacher licensure program provided provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.29	3.30
47	My teacher licensure program provided provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.29	3.12
48	My teacher licensure program provided provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.21	3.29
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.14	3.17

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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.

<b>Accrediting Agency</b>	NCATE
<b>Date of Last Review</b>	November 2008
<b>Accreditation Status</b>	Accredited

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright 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 Wright State University**

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing		Entering	Completing	
196	190	97%	99	98	99%						

# 2013 Educator Preparation Performance Report Wright State University

---

## Excellence and Innovation Initiatives at Wright State University

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

(Data Source: Wright 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

<b>Initiative:</b>	Excellence in STEM Education
<b>Purpose:</b>	To produce better math and science educators through partnership and collaboration
<b>Goal:</b>	To cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries and promote innovative instructional practices such as project-based learning and more reflective practitioners relative to STEM
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	125
<b>Strategy:</b>	WSU's educator preparation model includes seven faculty who hold joint appointments in the Department of Teacher Education and the College of Science and Math (math, chemistry, biology, earth and environmental science) and nine other math and science education-focused faculty with appointments in math and sciences. The joint appointment model breaks down traditional disciplinary boundaries and allows for stronger collaboration and shared responsibility for educator preparation. In addition, WSU maintains a very strong connection to the Dayton Regional STEM School, which is a hub and training center supported by the Ohio STEM Learning Network. WSU leverages the connection to the DRSS to provide pre-service teachers experiences in STEM education, including understanding the common practices of the school such as project-based learning. Another strategy employed by WSU faculty is the use of interactive notebooks to enable candidates to be creative, independent thinkers, and writers. Through the use of these strategies, WSU aims to develop math and science educators who are innovative and able to make meaningful connections between school, community, work, and global issues.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Wright State University was the recipient of four Improving Teacher Quality Grants in 2012-2013, more than any other institution.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Wright State University was the recipient of four Improving Teacher Quality Grants in 2012-2013, more than any other institution.
<b>Programs:</b>	Adolescent to Young Adult programs, Multi-Age Programs, Early Childhood Education, Middle Childhood Education
<b>Initiative:</b>	Graduate Level Licensure
<b>Purpose:</b>	To ensure that pre-service teacher candidates have in-depth knowledge of the content that they plan to teach as well as a thorough understanding of the relationship of content and content-specific ped
<b>Goal:</b>	To develop candidate's in-depth understanding of the content that they plan to teach and ensure they are able to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	449

**2013**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

<b>Strategy:</b>	Wright State University's initial licensure in adolescent to young adult, middle childhood, intervention specialist, and most multi-age programs is available only at the graduate level. Candidates earn a baccalaureate degree in the academic discipline(s) associated with the area of content specialization prior to admission to the graduate-level licensure program. In this model, candidates have more credit hours in their academic content area, providing an opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of the content as well as focused understanding based on the Academic Content Standards. Candidates also have the opportunity to develop the pedagogical content knowledge including strategies and processes necessary to address misconceptions and assess and differentiate according to diverse student needs, as many content courses focus on developing pedagogical content knowledge as well as disciplinary knowledge. A hallmark of the model is the culminating year long placement in the same classroom, which provides candidates more time with the teachers and students to develop skill in focusing instruction on the standards.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Wright State University Educator Preparation Advisory Board members--comprised of local school districts and representatives from the local Educational Service Center--have consistently reported that WSU graduates are exceptional in their knowledge of the academic content standards. Assessments of student teachers conducted by cooperating teachers and university supervisors consistently demonstrate that candidates perform very well on Standard 2 of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. For example, in 2012-2013, 93% of candidates were ranked as "meeting or exceeding expectations" on Standard 2.3, "candidate aligns instruction with school and district curriculum priorities and the state academic content standards."
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	Adolescent to Young Adult programs, Middle Childhood Education, Visual Arts, World Languages, Intervention Specialist
<b>Initiative:</b>	Universal Prevention and Pre-Service Teachers
<b>Purpose:</b>	To increase teacher candidates' sense of self-efficacy and performance in classroom management
<b>Goal:</b>	To prepare pre-service teachers with specific strategies and increase the health and achievement of K-12 students.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	240
<b>Strategy:</b>	A research based universal prevention strategy, The PAX Good Behavior Game, is taught to pre-service teachers who work with early childhood students. PAX GBG has been shown to increase self-regulation, instructional time, and student performance while decreasing anxiety and behavior disorders and drug dependence. Teacher candidates then practice these strategies in local field experiences in classrooms already using the PAX Good Behavior Game.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	The impact of PAX training for our pre-service teachers is currently being studied. Other research has shown that PAX classrooms have 60 minutes more instructional time each day, 75 fewer disruptions per hour, 20% drop in students identified for special education services, and 60% reduction in office referrals compared to traditional classrooms. Students from PAX classrooms in grade schools have also been shown to experience a 50% drop in drug dependence among males, a 68% drop in smoking among males, a 50% drop in suicidal thoughts among females, and a 35% drop in alcohol dependence among all students.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	Early Childhood Education, Intervention Specialist Programs

**2013  
Educator Preparation Performance Report  
Wright State University**

---

**Principal Licensure Programs**

<b>Initiative:</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	
<b>Goal:</b>	
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	
<b>Strategy:</b>	
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	
<b>External Recognition:</b>	
<b>Programs:</b>	