# 2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

# University of Cincinnati

## Report Overview

To continuously improve the quality of educator preparation programs in Ohio, H.B. 1 of the 128th General Assembly directed the Chancellor of the Board of Regents to develop a system for evaluating Ohio's educator preparation programs and holding institutions of higher education accountable for their graduates' success. H.B. 290 of the 128th General Assembly provided for the sharing of data between the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio Department of Education to link the performance of educators to the institutions that prepared them.

The identification of metrics and the report format were developed in collaboration with representatives from the 13 public and 38 private educator preparation providers in Ohio, as well as state agencies, and organizations. The Board of Regents works with the Ohio Department of Education and educator preparation programs to collect data on the following identified preparation metrics for the annual reports:

- Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Program Completers
- Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Program Completers
- edTPA™ Results for Program Completers
- Licensure Test Results for Program Completers
- Value-added Data (EVAAS) for K-12 Students Taught by Program Completers
- Candidate Academic Measures
- Field/Clinical Experiences
- Pre-Service Teacher Candidate Survey Results
- Resident Educator Survey Results
- Resident Educator Persistence Data
- Excellence and Innovation Initiatives
- National Accreditation

## Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at University of Cincinnati

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

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

Limitations of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Data:
1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.
2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education based on the original framework of 50 percent teacher evaluation and 50 percent student growth measure.
3. The number of teachers (N) with associated OTES data remains small at this point, and due to Ohio Revised Code, must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 linked teachers.

| Effective Licensure Year | Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # Ineffective | # Developing | # Skilled | # Accomplished |
| **2010** | <10 | 20 | 74 | 59 |
| **2011** | <10 | <10 | 16 | <10 |
| **2012** | <10 | 14 | 50 | 31 |
| **2013** | <10 | 16 | 40 | 27 |

# 2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

# University of Cincinnati

## Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs at University of Cincinnati

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

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

Evaluations have two components, each weighted at 50 percent:

1. Principal performance rating, determined from:
    a. A professional growth plan
    b. Two 30 minute observations
    c. Walkthroughs of building classrooms
2. Student academic growth rating for the building

The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) data reported here are limited in that the information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.

| Effective Licensure Year | Number of Principals with OPES Data | Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Ineffective | Developing | Skilled | Accomplished |
| **2010** | 8 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 5<br>% = 63 | N = 3<br>% = 37 |
| **2011** | 10 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 2<br>% = 20 | N = 3<br>% = 30 | N = 5<br>% = 50 |
| **2012** | 6 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 6<br>% = 100 | N = 0<br>% = 0 |
| **2013** | 7 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 1<br>% = 14 | N = 3<br>% = 43 | N = 3<br>% = 43 |

## edTPA™ Assessment Results for Individuals Completing Teacher Preparation Programs at University of Cincinnati

Reporting Period: September 1, 2013 through August 31, 2014

**Description of Data:**
Ohio educator preparation programs have participated in the development of the edTPA™, a performance assessment for educator candidates. At this time, the edTPA™ is not an Ohio licensure requirement or a program completion requirement. In this report, only results from the edTPA™ national scoring process are reported. Results from candidates whose assessments were scored locally are not reported.

| Score Range | Institution Average Score | Ohio State Average Score | National Mean Score |
|---|---|---|---|
| **15 - 75** | 42.0 | 41.9 | 43.7 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

---

## Institution Profile

(Data Source: University of Cincinnati)

The University of Cincinnati is a large, public, urban, research-intensive university. Urban schools provide the context for educator preparation. Most candidates are undergraduates, with fewer graduate students pursuing licensure, including Woodrow Wilson fellows. We are working as a faculty to align experiences related to racial identity and culturally responsive teaching, as well as early and imbedded field experiences.

---

## Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at University of Cincinnati

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

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

### 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 2012-2013. The data also reflect the best attempt of each test taker. Data are not provided for additional licenses that an educator earns after her/his initial license. Most licenses in Ohio require that candidates pass more than one licensure examination, therefore the number of "Completers Tested" in the first table is smaller than the sum total of all takers of all assessments in the subsequent table. 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** | 226 | 98% |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

---

## Licensure Test Scores for Individuals Completing Principal Preparation Programs
## at
## University of Cincinnati

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014
(Data Source: University of Cincinnati)

### Description of Data:

For the period reflected on this report, Ohio required that principal candidates pass the Ohio Assessment for Educators (015 Educational Leadership) 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 2013-2014.

| | Completers Tested | Pass Rate Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| **Principal Licensure Data** | 40 | 83% |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

---

## Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at University of Cincinnati

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

### 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, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.
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.

**Value-Added Data for University of Cincinnati-Prepared Teachers**

| Teachers with Effective Licensure Dates 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 | | Associated Value-Added Classifications | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employed as Teachers | Teachers with Value-Added Data | Most Effective | Above Average | Average | Approaching Average | Least Effective |
| 428 | 94 | N = 17<br>% = 18 | N = 6<br>% = 6 | N = 35<br>% = 37 | N = 15<br>% = 16 | N = 21<br>% = 22 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

**Demographic Information for Schools where University of Cincinnati-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve**

**Characteristic**

| | Elementary School | Middle School | Junior High School | High School | Ungraded |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teachers Serving by School Level** | N = 31<br>% = 33 | N = 31<br>% = 33 | N = 8<br>% = 9 | N = 23<br>% = 24 | N = 1<br>% = 1 |

| | Community School | Public School | STEM School | Educational Service Center |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teachers Serving by School Type** | N = 12<br>% = 13 | N = 81<br>% = 87 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 0<br>% = 0 |

| | A | B | C | D | F | NR |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added** | N = 27<br>% = 29 | N = 5<br>% = 5 | N = 13<br>% = 14 | N = 7<br>% = 7 | N = 42<br>% = 45 | N = 0<br>% = 0 |

| | High Minority | Middle Minority | Low Minority |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles** | N = 25<br>% = 27 | N = 50<br>% = 53 | N = 19<br>% = 20 |

| | High Poverty | Medium-High Poverty | Medium-Low Poverty | Low Poverty |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles** | N = 40<br>% = 43 | N = 25<br>% = 27 | N = 20<br>% = 21 | N = 9<br>% = 10 |

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

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## Value-Added Data for University of Cincinnati-Prepared Principals

| Principals with Effective Licensure Dates 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 | | Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employed as Principals | Principals with Value-Added Data | A | B | C | D | F | NR |
| 23 | 16 | N = 6<br>% = 38 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 2<br>% = 13 | N = 1<br>% = 6 | N = 7<br>% = 44 | N = 0<br>% = 0 |

**Demographic Information for Schools where University of Cincinnati-Prepared Principals with Value-Added Data Serve**

**Characteristic**

| | Elementary School | Middle School | Junior High School | High School | Ungraded |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principals Serving by School Level | N = 5<br>% = 31 | N = 3<br>% = 19 | N = 1<br>% = 6 | N = 7<br>% = 44 | N = 0<br>% = 0 |

| | Community School | Public School | STEM School | Educational Service Center |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principals Serving by School Type | N = 3<br>% = 19 | N = 13<br>% = 81 | N = 0<br>% = 0 | N = 0<br>% = 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 = 5<br>% = 31 | N = 9<br>% = 56 | N = 2<br>% = 13 |

| | High Poverty | Medium-High Poverty | Medium-Low Poverty | Low Poverty |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principals Serving by School Poverty Level by Quartiles | N = 3<br>% = 19 | N = 4<br>% = 25 | N = 3<br>% = 19 | N = 6<br>% = 38 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## University of Cincinnati Candidate Academic Measures

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014
(Data Source: University of Cincinnati)

### 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** |
| **ACT Composite Score** | 22 / NA / NA | 130 / NA / NA | 24.95 / NA / NA | 324 / NA / NA | 25.37 / NA / NA | 138 / NA / NA | 25.37 / 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 |
| **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 |
| **GPA - Graduate** | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA |
| **GPA - High School** | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA |
| **GPA - Transfer** | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA |
| **GPA - Undergraduate** | 2.8 / 3 / 3 | 213 / N<10 / 41 | 3.37 / N<10 / 3.58 | 496 / N<10 / 90 | 3.38 / N<10 / 3.56 | 211 / N<10 / 19 | 3.43 / N<10 / 3.52 |
| **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 Quantitative Subscore** | 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 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| | | 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** |
| **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 |
| **Praxis CORE Math** | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA |
| **Praxis CORE Reading** | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA |
| **Praxis CORE Writing** | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA | NA / NA / NA |
| **Praxis I Math** | 172 / NA / NA | 62 / NA / NA | 176.85 / NA / NA | 120 / NA / NA | 177.12 / NA / NA | 54 / NA / NA | 177.65 / NA / NA |
| **Praxis I Reading** | 173 / NA / NA | 62 / NA / NA | 177.26 / NA / NA | 120 / NA / NA | 177.62 / NA / NA | 54 / NA / NA | 178.04 / NA / NA |
| **Praxis I Writing** | 172 / NA / NA | 62 / NA / NA | 174.56 / NA / NA | 120 / NA / NA | 174.79 / NA / NA | 54 / NA / NA | 175.09 / 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 |
| **SAT Composite Score** | 1000 / NA / NA | 38 / NA / NA | 1137.9 / NA / NA | 133 / NA / NA | 1143.4 / NA / NA | 64 / NA / NA | 1134.7 / 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 |
| **SAT Writing Subscore** | 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** | NA | NA | NA |
| **Interview** | N | N | N |
| **Letter of Commitment** | N | N | N |
| **Letter of Recommendation** | N | N | N |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| Other Criteria | Undergraduate | Post-Baccalaureate | Graduate |
|---|---|---|---|
| Myers-Briggs Type Indicator | NA | N | N |
| None of the Above | Y | Y | Y |
| Portfolio | N | N | N |
| Prerequisite Courses | N | N | N |
| SRI Teacher Perceiver | NA | NA | N |
| Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship | NA | NA | N |
| Teacher Insight | N | N | N |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## 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** |
| **ACT Composite Score** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **ACT English Subscore** | 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 |
| **GPA - Graduate** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **GPA - High School** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **GPA - Undergraduate** | 3 | 23 | 3.48 | 122 | 3.87 | 59 | 3.91 |
| **GRE Composite Score** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **GRE Quantitative Subscore** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **GRE Verbal Subscore** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **GRE Writing Subscore** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **MAT** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Praxis I Math** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| **Praxis I Reading** | 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 |
| **SAT Composite Score** | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| | | 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** |
| **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 |

## Other Criteria

| | |
|---|---|
| **Letter of Recommendation** | Y |
| **Portfolio** | N |
| **Letter of Commitment** | N |
| **Dispositional Assessment** | N |
| **Myers-Briggs Type Indicator** | N |
| **Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship** | N |
| **Prerequisite Courses** | N |
| **SRI Teacher Perceiver** | N |
| **Teacher Insight** | N |
| **None of the Above** | N |
| **Essay** | N |
| **EMPATHY/Omaha Interview** | N |
| **Interview** | N |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

---

## Field and Clinical Experiences for University of Cincinnati Candidates

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: University of Cincinnati)

### Description of Data:

Ohio requires that teacher candidates complete field and clinical experiences in school settings as part of their preparation. These experiences include: 1) early and ongoing field-based opportunities for candidates to engage with K-12 students in Ohio classrooms prior to their formal student teaching; and 2) the culminating clinical experience commonly referred to as student teaching. Early field/clinical experiences are reported in hours. Student teaching is reported in weeks. Beyond the requisite statewide minimums, institutional requirements for candidates can vary by institution and by program. The information below is reported at the unit level.

**Teacher Preparation Programs**

| Field/Clinical Experience Element | University of Cincinnati Requirements |
|---|---|
| Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution | 30 |
| Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution | 730 |
| Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution | 18 |
| Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching | 98.26% |

**Principal Preparation Programs**

| Field/Clinical Experience Element | Requirements |
|---|---|
| Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship | 28 |
| Number of candidates admitted to internship | 70 |
| Number of candidates completing internship | 60 |
| Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship | 85.71% |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

---

## Pre-Service Teacher 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 from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014. A total of 4206 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 70 percent.

**University of Cincinnati Survey Response Rate = 48.11%**

**Total Survey Responses = 89**

| 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. | 3.53 | 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. | 3.30 | 3.34 |
| 3 | My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach. | 3.33 | 3.33 |
| 4 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area. | 3.56 | 3.46 |
| 5 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences. | 3.57 | 3.41 |
| 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. | 3.63 | 3.57 |
| 7 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction. | 3.52 | 3.43 |
| 8 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students. | 3.61 | 3.46 |
| 9 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction. | 3.62 | 3.51 |
| 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. | 3.40 | 3.32 |
| 12 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class. | 3.60 | 3.50 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management. | 3.46 | 3.28 |
| 14 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively. | 3.58 | 3.48 |
| 15 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers. | 3.54 | 3.45 |
| 16 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct. | 3.65 | 3.59 |
| 17 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. | 3.47 | 3.45 |
| 18 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students. | 3.64 | 3.56 |
| 19 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences. | 3.57 | 3.40 |
| 20 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring. | 3.73 | 3.64 |
| 21 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning. | 3.45 | 3.30 |
| 22 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate. | 3.61 | 3.41 |
| 23 | My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress. | 3.58 | 3.41 |
| 24 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM). | 3.17 | 3.08 |
| 25 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards. | 2.98 | 2.93 |
| 26 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program. | 2.98 | 2.85 |
| 27 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. | 3.19 | 3.18 |
| 28 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. | 3.11 | 3.06 |
| 29 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards. | 3.55 | 3.49 |
| 30 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education. | 2.79 | 2.91 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.69 | 3.58 |
| 32 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural). | 3.46 | 3.33 |
| 33 | My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.69 | 3.60 |
| 34 | My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.58 | 3.59 |
| 35 | My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.61 | 3.55 |
| 36 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students). | 3.53 | 3.43 |
| 37 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences. | 3.63 | 3.40 |
| 38 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers. | 3.35 | 3.23 |
| 39 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty. | 3.40 | 3.24 |
| 40 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers. | 3.39 | 3.26 |
| 41 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field. | 3.75 | 3.56 |
| 42 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning. | 3.54 | 3.42 |
| 43 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations. | 3.69 | 3.53 |
| 44 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework. | 3.61 | 3.42 |
| 45 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning. | 3.54 | 3.40 |
| 46 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner. | 3.73 | 3.59 |
| 47 | My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.51 | 3.31 |
| 48 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program. | 3.42 | 3.12 |
| 49 | My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate | 3.62 | 3.31 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | progression to program completion. | | |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## 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. A total of 434 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 16 Percent. The Ohio Board of Regents distributed the online survey to candidates completing their Resident Educator experiences and collected the data for the Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014.

| 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 | 3.44 |
| 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 | 3.24 |
| 3 | My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach. | 3.29 | 3.30 |
| 4 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area. | 3.38 | 3.40 |
| 5 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences. | 3.29 | 3.30 |
| 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 | 3.26 |
| 7 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction. | 3.48 | 3.26 |
| 8 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students. | 3.48 | 3.26 |
| 9 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction. | 3.48 | 3.26 |
| 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 | 3.26 |
| 11 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study. | 3.19 | 3.23 |
| 12 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class. | 3.38 | 3.38 |
| 13 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management. | 3.38 | 3.26 |
| 14 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively. | 3.38 | 3.44 |
| 15 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the | 3.43 | 3.40 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | importance of communication with families and caregivers. | | |
| 16 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct. | 3.43 | 3.55 |
| 17 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments. | 3.43 | 3.34 |
| 18 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences. | 3.33 | 3.30 |
| 19 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring. | 3.67 | 3.58 |
| 20 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning. | 3.29 | 3.21 |
| 21 | My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate. | 3.33 | 3.37 |
| 22 | My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress. | 3.29 | 3.32 |
| 23 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM). | 2.90 | 3.02 |
| 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. | 2.38 | 2.41 |
| 25 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License. | 2.38 | 2.41 |
| 26 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession. | 3.33 | 3.09 |
| 27 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development. | 2.76 | 2.88 |
| 28 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards. | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| 29 | My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education. | 2.19 | 2.51 |
| 30 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning. | 3.76 | 3.59 |
| 31 | My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural). | 3.24 | 3.34 |
| 32 | 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 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 33 | 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 |
| 34 | My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media). | 3.57 | 3.51 |
| 35 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students). | 3.24 | 3.33 |
| 36 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences. | 3.33 | 3.31 |
| 37 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers. | 3.10 | 3.22 |
| 38 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty. | 3.19 | 3.21 |
| 39 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers. | 3.33 | 3.25 |
| 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. | 3.38 | 3.39 |
| 42 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations. | 3.57 | 3.49 |
| 43 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework. | 3.38 | 3.38 |
| 44 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning. | 3.38 | 3.29 |
| 45 | Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner. | 3.57 | 3.54 |
| 46 | My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.14 | 3.27 |
| 47 | My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program. | 3.14 | 3.11 |
| 48 | My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion. | 3.14 | 3.28 |
| 49 | My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator. | 3.24 | 3.13 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## Principal Intern Survey Results

### Description of Data:

To gather information on principal intern satisfaction with their 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 Principal Interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, 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 from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014. A total of 207 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 20 percent.

| 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 program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting. | 3.55 | 3.47 |
| 2 | My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff. | 3.60 | 3.44 |
| 3 | My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment. | 3.65 | 3.46 |
| 4 | My program prepared me to lead instruction. | 3.50 | 3.41 |
| 5 | My program prepared me to ensure the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (e.g. national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district. | 3.45 | 3.32 |
| 6 | My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning. | 3.55 | 3.41 |
| 7 | My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff. | 3.55 | 3.49 |
| 8 | My program prepared me to advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students. | 3.45 | 3.43 |
| 9 | My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff. | 3.30 | 3.43 |
| 10 | My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices. | 3.50 | 3.40 |
| 11 | My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning. | 3.55 | 3.53 |
| 12 | My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all. | 3.55 | 3.46 |
| 13 | My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning. | 3.40 | 3.31 |
| 14 | My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; | 3.75 | 3.58 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct | | |
| 15 | My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members. | 3.80 | 3.68 |
| 16 | My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel. | 3.70 | 3.60 |
| 17 | My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff. | 3.75 | 3.65 |
| 18 | My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators. | 3.70 | 3.53 |
| 19 | My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences. | 3.70 | 3.62 |
| 20 | My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media. | 3.50 | 3.39 |
| 21 | My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning. | 3.60 | 3.48 |
| 22 | My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning. | 3.50 | 3.38 |
| 23 | My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity. | 3.50 | 3.43 |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## National Accreditation

(Data Source: Ohio Board of Regents)

### Description of Data:

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Accrediting Agency** | NCATE |
| **Date of Last Review** | November 2012 |
| **Accreditation Status** | Accredited |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## Teacher Residency Program

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

### Description of Data:

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio is a 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 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Non-completion does not imply dismissal, as leaving the program may be due to multiple factors.

**Percent of Newly Hired Teachers Persisting in the State Residency Program**

**who were Prepared at University of Cincinnati**

| **Residency Year 1** | | | **Residency Year 2** | | | **Residency Year 3** | | | **Residency Year 4** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entering | Persisting | | Entering | Persisting | | Entering | Persisting | | Entering | Persisting | |
| 179 | 178 | 99% | 97 | 96 | 99% | 4 | 4 | 100% | | | |

# 2014
# Educator Preparation Performance Report
# University of Cincinnati

## Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014

(Data Source: University of Cincinnati)

### 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:** | Design Based Info Technology Learning Experience |
| **Purpose:** | This program works with partner high schools to offer on-campus Information Communication Technologies (ICT) summer program for high school students and pre-service secondary education teachers. |
| **Goal:** | To prepare STEM teachers so they can support ICT instruction as part of their content teaching and high school students interested in and prepared for university courses. To increase the number and diversity of students interested in and prepared for college and careers in ICT. |
| **Number of Participants:** | 180 |
| **Strategy:** | This program is funded through the National Science Foundation and works with partner high schools to prepare STEM teachers so they can support ICT instruction as part of their content teaching and high school students interested in and prepared for university courses. To increase the number and diversity of students interested in and prepared for college and careers in ICT. The grant provides scholarship funds for 50 high school 10th and 11th graders from 5 Cincinnati Public Schools and funds to support school-based ICT clubs hosted at 5 partner schools. The pre-service teachers who participate in the program will increase their knowledge of ICT practices, careers and courses so they can integrate this into their instruction. 1. Summer institute for high school students and pre-service teachers with instruction and hands-on experience in ICT. 2. Development and implementation of ICT clubs at partner schools 3. Mentorships from ICT students, faculty and industry experts. 4. Potential internship and dual credit courses for a select group of highly motivated high school students. 10 pre-service teachers/yr for 3 yrs-total 30; 50 high school students/yr for 3 yrs-total 150 |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | Currently in start-up phase. |
| **External Recognition:** | Noyce Scholars program, funded by National Science Foundation |
| **Programs:** | |
| | |
| **Initiative:** | UC's Copmprehensive PhysTEC Project |
| **Purpose:** | Increase the quantity and quality of physics teachers licensed through the University of Cincinnati. |
| **Goal:** | To recruit, provide support, and prepare undergraduates to complete a secondary physics teaching license and to become a national model of teacher preparation and best teaching practices. |
| **Number of Participants:** | 77 |
| **Strategy:** | •Increase UC's number of physics teacher graduates in the field to five or more per year, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | both during and beyond the length of the grant, through specialized recruitment strategies and programming which includes the development of a learning assistant program; 5 learning assistants in program. •Improve the quality of physics instruction, including the development of new physics courses, to provide models of best teaching practices for future teachers; 72 early childhood students enrolled in 3 sections of the new physics course this term. •Create a community of local high school physics and physical science teachers that can work with the university in providing early field experiences for UC students and mentoring for recent teacher graduates; 75 physics and physical science teachers from the region involved in a Tri-State Physics Teachers group (about 1/3 meet each quarter to discuss strategies for improving our physics instruction, but all are part of our listserv). |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | Track number of students enrolling in learning assistant program, a licensure program, or completing a license |
| **External Recognition:** | National recognition from American Physical Society (APS) and American Association of Physics Teachers (AAPT) – see www.phystec.org as UC is now one of the national grant funded PhysTEC sites. |
| **Programs:** | |
| | |
| **Initiative:** | New Teacher Professional Development Seminars |
| **Purpose:** | To provide on-going support to new teachers (years 1-3) working in high needs schools to enhance their professional and pedagogical knowledge. |
| **Goal:** | Design and conduct eight 90-minute professional development seminars for recent UC secondary education graduates to enhance confidence and ability to work in high needs schools. |
| **Number of Participants:** | 78 |
| **Strategy:** | We are working in collaboration with Hughes STEM innovation lab to develop and deliver the professional development seminars. 1. Seminar topic identification 2. Selection of expert teacher or teacher educators to lead seminars 3. Recruitment of new teachers 4. Hosting and implementing seminars Create a web-supported teacher development site to expand access to the professional development seminars to students outside of the immediate area. |
| **Demonstration of Impact:** | 68 new teacher participants in the 6 seminars conducted thus far, observations of teacher using modeling based instruction in their classrooms. |
| **External Recognition:** | |
| **Programs:** | Woodrow Wilson Ohio Teaching Fellowship program, Hughes STEM Innovation Lab |
| | |