

# 2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report

## Wright State University

### 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 Wright State University

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
<b>2010</b>	<10	22	68	68
<b>2011</b>	<10	11	38	32
<b>2012</b>	<10	23	50	33
<b>2013</b>	<10	19	35	22



**Board of Regents**  
University System of Ohio

**John R. Kasich**, Governor  
**John Carey**, Chancellor

**2014 Ohio Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) Results for Individuals Completing  
Principal Preparation Programs at Wright State University**

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	4	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 25	N = 2 % = 50	N = 1 % = 25
2011	4	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 25	N = 3 % = 75
2012	2	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 100	N = 0 % = 0
2013	2	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 100

**edTPA™ Assessment Results for Individuals Completing  
Teacher Preparation Programs at Wright State University**

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	40.8	41.9	43.7



**Board of Regents**  
University System of Ohio

**John R. Kasich**, Governor  
**John Carey**, Chancellor

**2014**  
**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 9/1/2012 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.

<b>Summary Rating: Effective</b>		
	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>All Teacher Licensure Tests</b>	254	98%

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

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

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

**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.

	<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate Percentage</b>
<b>Principal Licensure Data</b>	14	64%

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Value-Added Data for Individuals Completing Educator Preparation Programs at**  
**Wright State University**  
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 Wright State University-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
492	113	N = 10 % = 9	N = 9 % = 8	N = 59 % = 52	N = 8 % = 7	N = 27 % = 24

# 2014 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 = 42 % = 37	N = 42 % = 37	N = 12 % = 11	N = 14 % = 12	N = 3 % = 3	
	<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 = 13 % = 12	N = 98 % = 88	N = 2 % = 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 = 35 % = 31	N = 10 % = 9	N = 26 % = 23	N = 9 % = 8	N = 32 % = 28	N = 1 % = <1
	<b>High Minority</b>		<b>Middle Minority</b>		<b>Low Minority</b>	
<b>Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Tertiles</b>	N = 26 % = 23		N = 67 % = 59		N = 20 % = 18	
	<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 = 22 % = 19	N = 35 % = 31	N = 21 % = 19	N = 35 % = 31		

\* 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**  
**Wright State University**

**Value-Added Data for Wright State University-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
9	8	N = 4 % = 50	N = 0 % = 0	N = 0 % = 0	N = 1 % = 13	N = 3 % = 38	N = 0 % = 0

**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 % = 50	N = 3 % = 38	N = 1 % = 13	N = 0 % = 0	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 = 8 % = 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 = 0 % = 0		N = 6 % = 75		N = 2 % = 25	
	<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 = 0 % = 0	N = 2 % = 25	N = 2 % = 25		N = 4 % = 50	



**2014**  
**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
<b>MAT</b>	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	84 / NA / NA	176.2 / NA / NA	272 / NA / NA	177 / NA / NA	103 / NA / NA	180.2 / NA / NA
Praxis I Reading	172 / NA / NA	84 / NA / NA	175 / NA / NA	272 / NA / NA	176 / NA / NA	103 / NA / NA	177.2 / NA / NA
Praxis I Writing	172 / NA / NA	84 / NA / NA	173.9 / NA / NA	272 / NA / NA	174 / NA / NA	103 / NA / NA	174.2 / 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	84 / NA / NA	1000 / NA / NA	272 / NA / NA	1017.2 / NA / NA	103 / NA / NA	1017.5 / 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
<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		NA		NA		NA	
Interview		Y		N		Y	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		N	
Letter of Recommendation		Y		N		Y	

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

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

**2014**  
**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
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	3	64	3.15	33	3.16	10	3.92
GPA - High School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - Undergraduate	2.7	64	3.11	115	3.8	10	3.35
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**  
**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
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
<b>Other Criteria</b>							
Dispositional Assessment						Y	
Letter of Commitment						N	
Interview						N	
Prerequisite Courses						N	
SRI Teacher Perceiver						N	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator						N	
Teacher Insight						N	
Essay						N	
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship						N	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview						N	
None of the Above						N	
Letter of Recommendation						N	
Portfolio						N	

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

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

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

(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: 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	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	96.71%

**Principal Preparation Programs**

Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	14
Number of candidates admitted to internship	14
Number of candidates completing internship	14
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**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.

**Wright State University Survey Response Rate = 69.63%**

**Total Survey Responses = 133**

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.	3.44	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.	3.27	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.31	3.33
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.43	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.44	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.	3.60	3.57
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.45	3.43
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.38	3.46
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.44	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.	3.39	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.28	3.32
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.49	3.50

**2014**  
**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
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.29	3.28
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.45	3.48
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.63	3.45
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.	3.45	3.45
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.51	3.56
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.41	3.40
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.63	3.64
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.35	3.30
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.51	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.38	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).	3.13	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.	2.95	2.93
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	2.95	2.85
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.17	3.18
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.06	3.06
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.50	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.	3.20	2.91

**2014**  
**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
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.65	3.58
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.47	3.33
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.64	3.60
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.63	3.59
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.53	3.55
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.56	3.43
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.56	3.40
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.41	3.23
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.41	3.24
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.35	3.26
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.44	3.56
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.34	3.42
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.51	3.53
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.29	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.50	3.40
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.51	3.59
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.24	3.31
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.16	3.12
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate	3.32	3.31

**2014**  
**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
	progression to program completion.		

**2014**  
**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. 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.	3.35	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.	3.06	3.24
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.41	3.30
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.59	3.40
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.24	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.	2.88	3.26
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	2.88	3.26
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	2.88	3.26
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	2.88	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.	2.88	3.26
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.	3.29	3.38
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.24	3.26
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.47	3.44
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the	3.29	3.40

**2014**  
**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
	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.	3.47	3.55
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.12	3.34
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.12	3.30
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.53	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.00	3.21
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.29	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).	2.76	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.	1.94	2.41
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	1.94	2.41
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	2.88	3.09
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	2.47	2.88
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	2.47	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.	2.12	2.51
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.65	3.59
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.35	3.34
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.71	3.59

**2014**  
**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
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.76	3.58
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.35	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.	3.35	3.31
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.29	3.22
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.35	3.21
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.18	3.25
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.29	3.49
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.41	3.39
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.29	3.49
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.35	3.38
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.29	3.29
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.41	3.54
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.18	3.27
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.06	3.11
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.12	3.28
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	2.88	3.13

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**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.	N<10	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.	N<10	3.44
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.46
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	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.	N<10	3.32
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.41
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	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.	N<10	3.43
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.43
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	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.	N<10	3.53
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.46
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.31
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics;	N<10	3.58

**2014**  
**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
	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.	N<10	3.68
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	N<10	3.60
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N<10	3.65
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.53
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N<10	3.62
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.39
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.48
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.38
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.43

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**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.

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

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**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 Wright State University**

Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Residency Year 3			Residency Year 4		
Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting		Entering	Persisting	
205	200	98%	102	101	99%	43	43	100%			

# 2014 Educator Preparation Performance Report Wright State University

---

## Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

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

(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>	Universal Prevention and Pre-service Teachers
<b>Purpose:</b>	To increase teachers' efficacy in instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management.
<b>Goal:</b>	To increase students' academic and lifetime outcomes.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	250
<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>	In a randomized control trial (Journal of Drug Education - In Press), Wright State University teacher candidates who learned the Universal Preventive Intervention performed significantly higher in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management than those who had not.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Wright State's work in this area can be found in Reading Improvement, Journal of Instructional Psychology, and Journal of Drug Education. While the treatment has been recognized by SAMHSA, the Institute of Medicine, and the Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
<b>Programs:</b>	Early Childhood Education, Intervention Specialist, Middle Childhood Education.
<b>Initiative:</b>	ESL Partnership with Dayton Public Schools
<b>Purpose:</b>	To create nurturing and academically-responsive programming for ESL students while simultaneously offering teacher candidates dynamic faculty co-teaching experiences.
<b>Goal:</b>	To provide ongoing support for both ESL students in DPS and teacher candidates preparing for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse classrooms.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	400
<b>Strategy:</b>	This program is based upon the concept of continual renewal. The program began with the modest goal of pairing every ESL student with a tutor or mentor. Through that initial project, we assessed needs through triangulated methods of data collection that included: Candidate projects, student success rates socially, emotionally, culturally, linguistically, and academically (observed and tracked through Ohio Graduation Test [OGT] and Ohio Test of English Language Acquisition [OTELA] scores and student grades), teacher feedback and classroom collaborations, and administrative needs. We also evaluated new problems that emerged and continue to emerge yearly. We then build from the current foundation to address these needs.

**2014**  
**Educator Preparation Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Since 2011, the partnership has grown in response to the simultaneous needs of the district and university. Currently, the program has several school-based initiatives, serves over 200 CLD students, works in multiple capacities with DPS content area and ESL teachers, and interfaces with administrators and community members across the city. Data is currently being collected on the implementation of the tutoring initiative, professional development initiatives, and the new International Partnership Program.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Shirley E. Schwartz Urban Education Impact Award Nominee (2014)
<b>Programs:</b>	Integrated Language Arts
<b>Initiative:</b>	Youth and Community Engagement Minor
<b>Purpose:</b>	The purpose is to prepare Wright State University students in various majors, including education, to work with urban youth.
<b>Goal:</b>	The goal of the minor is to encourage students to learn about and learn how to work with urban youth.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	10
<b>Strategy:</b>	Students in the minor actively engage in service-learning experiences with K-12 schools and community organizations in diverse urban contexts. Through their own service-learning experiences, students learn about the potential and challenges of the pedagogy of civic engagement while they develop the organizational and leadership skills to address issues facing urban youth, schools, and communities. Students seeking the minor must successfully complete 9 hours of elective courses selected with the approval of an advisor, along with 9 semester hours of core courses.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	In fall 2013, there were 10 students enrolled in the minor.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Wright State University was one of five universities receiving a Learn and Serve America grant to establish the minor.
<b>Programs:</b>	Open to all programs at Wright State University.