

# 2015 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider 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.

---

## Report Overview

The Ohio Department of Higher Education gathers data annually from multiple sources to report the following performance metrics in the Educator Preparation Provider Performance Reports:

- Ohio Teacher Evaluation System Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider
- Ohio Principal Evaluation System Results for for Ohio Principals Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider
- Field and Clinical Experiences Required by Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Candidates
- Licensure Test Results for Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Program Completers
- Value-added Data for K-12 Students Taught by Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider
- Demographic Information for Schools in Which Ohio Educator Preparation Provider-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve
- Academic Measures Used to Inform Admissions Decisions at Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Survey Results of Pre-Service Teacher Candidates Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Survey Results of Ohio Resident Educators Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers
- Survey Results of Ohio Principal Interns Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Survey Results of Mentors Serving Principal Interns Enrolled in Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Programs
- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider National Accreditation Status
- Persistence in the Ohio Resident Educator Program of Teachers Who Were Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers
- Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an  
Ohio Educator Preparation Provider at Wright State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

February 2016 Note: Ohio Teacher Evaluation System results for the 2015 Report are not yet available. Revised Educator Preparation Performance Reports will be published when these data become available.

Ohio's system for evaluating teachers (Ohio's Teacher Evaluation System) provides educators with a 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 school 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 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.
2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education.
3. Due to Ohio law, results must be masked for institutions with fewer than 10 completers with OTES data.

<b>Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications</b>				
<b>Initial Licensure Effective Year</b>	<b># Ineffective</b>	<b># Developing</b>	<b># Skilled</b>	<b># Accomplished</b>
<b>2011</b>	N<10	12	46	39
<b>2012</b>	N<10	14	83	46
<b>2013</b>	N<10	20	73	36
<b>2014</b>	N<10	N<10	50	25

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

February 2016 Note: Ohio Principal Evaluation System results for the 2015 Report are not yet available. Revised Educator Preparation Performance Reports will be published when these data become available.

Ohio's system for evaluating principals (Ohio's Principal Evaluation System) provides building leaders with a detail view of their performance, with a focus on specific strengths and opportunities for improvement.

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 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.

<b>Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications</b>				
<b>Initial Licensure Effective Year</b>	<b># Ineffective</b>	<b># Developing</b>	<b># Skilled</b>	<b># Accomplished</b>
<b>2011</b>	NA	NA	N<10	N<10
<b>2012</b>	NA	NA	N<10	NA
<b>2013</b>	NA	NA	N<10	N<10

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Wright State University)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio requires that educator candidates complete field and clinical experiences in school settings as part of their preparation. These experiences include early and ongoing field-based opportunities and the culminating pre-service clinical experience commonly referred to as "student teaching." The specific requirements beyond the requisite statewide minimums for these placements vary by institution and by program. The information below is calculated based on data reported by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers.

<b>Teacher Preparation Programs</b>	
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Require edTPA National Scoring from candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	Y
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	97.33%

<b>Principal Preparation Programs</b>	
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	14
Number of candidates admitted to internship	44
Number of candidates completing internship	42
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	95.45%

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Wright State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2013 to Aug 31, 2014  
(Data Source: USDOE Title II Report)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio educator licensure requirements include passage of all requisite licensure examinations at the state determined cut score. The reported results reflect Title II data, and therefore represent pass rate data solely for initial licenses.

Further, because the data are gathered from the Title II reports, there is a one year lag in accessing the data. Teacher licensure pass rate data are the only reported metric for which the data do not reflect the reporting year 2014-2015.

<b>Teacher Licensure Tests</b>	
<b>Summary Rating: Effective</b>	
<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>
186	97%

**Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at Wright State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Wright State University)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio requires that principal candidates pass the requisite state examination to be recommended for licensure. The 2014-2015 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

<b>Principal Licensure Tests</b>	
<b>Completers Tested</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>
16	81%

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Value-Added Data for Students Taught by Teachers Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers at Wright State University**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**Description of Data:**

February 2016 Note: Value-Added results for the 2015 Report are not yet available. Revised Educator Preparation Performance Reports will be published when these data become available.

Ohio's value-added data system provides information on student academic gains. 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). Schools can demonstrate through value-added data that many of their students are achieving significant progress. Student growth measures also provide students and parents with evidence of the impact of their efforts. Educators and schools further use value-added data to inform instructional practices.

Limitations of the Value-Added Data:

1. The information in the report is for those individuals receiving their licenses with effective years of, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.
2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on reading and mathematics achievement tests in grades 4-8.
3. For Educator Preparation Providers with fewer than 10 linked teachers or principals with value-added data, only the number (N) is reported.

**Value-Added Data for Wright State University-Prepared Teachers**

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
469	160	N=27 17%	N=12 8%	N=48 30%	N=29 18%	N=44 28%

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

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

**Teachers Serving by School Level**

Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	No School Type
N=49	N=54	N=7	N=50	NA
31%	34%	4%	31%	NA

**Teachers Serving by School Type**

Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
N=15	N=142	N=3	NA
10%	90%	2%	NA

**Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added**

A	B	C	D	F	NR
N=40	N=15	N=13	N=5	N=61	N=26
25%	9%	8%	3%	38%	16%

**Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles**

High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N=33	N=42	N=38	N=47
21%	26%	24%	29%

**Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles**

High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N=38	N=37	N=40	N=45
24%	23%	25%	28%

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

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

**Value-Added Data for Wright State University-Prepared Principals**

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added					
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	A	B	C	D	F	NR
N<10	N<10	N<10 NA	NA NA	NA NA	NA NA	N<10 NA	N<10 NA

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

Principals Serving by School Level				
Elementary School	Middle School	Junior High School	High School	No School Type
N<10	N<10	NA	N<10	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Principals Serving by School Type			
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center
N<10	N<10	NA	NA
NA	NA	NA	NA

Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School					
A	B	C	D	F	NR
Not Available Until 2018					

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles			
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority
N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
NA	NA	NA	NA

Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles			
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty
N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
NA	NA	NA	NA





**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
Praxis CORE Reading	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis CORE Writing	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
Praxis I Math	U=172 P=NA G=NA	U=98 P=NA G=NA	U=171 P=NA G=NA	U=261 P=NA G=NA	U=173 P=NA G=NA	U=82 P=NA G=NA	U=181 P=NA G=NA
Praxis I Reading	U=172 P=NA G=NA	U=98 P=NA G=NA	U=175 P=NA G=NA	U=261 P=NA G=NA	U=175 P=NA G=NA	U=82 P=NA G=NA	U=175.4 P=NA G=NA
Praxis I Writing	U=172 P=NA G=NA	U=98 P=NA G=NA	U=176 P=NA G=NA	U=261 P=NA G=NA	U=175 P=NA G=NA	U=82 P=NA G=NA	U=175 P=NA G=NA
Praxis II	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
SAT Composite Score	U=1000 P=NA G=NA	U=98 P=NA G=NA	U=1023 P=NA G=NA	U=261 P=NA G=NA	U=1049 P=NA G=NA	U=82 P=NA G=NA	U=1034 P=NA G=NA
SAT Quantitative Subscore	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA
SAT Writing Subscore	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=NA	U=NA P=NA G=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	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		NA		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	

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

**Principal Preparation Programs**

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GPA - Graduate	3	74	3.27	104	3.69	33	3.92
GPA - Undergraduate	2.7	74	3.1	104	2.99	33	3.41
MAT	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Reading Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Math Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT Composite Score	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 Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Math	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GPA - High School	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SAT Writing Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Verbal Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
ACT English Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Quantitative Subscore	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
GRE Composite Score	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Praxis I Reading	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Other Criteria</b>							
<b>Dispositional Assessment</b>				Y			
<b>EMPATHY/Omaha Interview</b>				N			
<b>Essay</b>				N			

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

Other Criteria	
Interview	N
Letter of Commitment	N
Letter of Recommendation	N
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N
Portfolio	N
Prerequisite Courses	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N
Teacher Insight	N

# 2015 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Wright State University

## Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

### Description of Data:

To gather information on student satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio candidates receive an invitation to complete the survey during their professional internship (student teaching). The results of this survey are reflected here. A total of 4,055 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 70 percent.

**Wright State University Survey Response Rate = 82.74%**

**Total Survey Responses = 139**

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.55	3.49
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	3.43	3.34
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.42	3.36
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.54	3.47
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.58	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.	3.75	3.61
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.68	3.46
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.66	3.49
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.66	3.53
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.	3.60	3.43
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.49	3.39
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.71	3.59
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.49	3.35
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.65	3.57
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication	3.73	3.54

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
	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.	3.78	3.66
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.68	3.53
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.71	3.64
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students, diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.58	3.49
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.80	3.71
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.53	3.39
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.66	3.50
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.63	3.50
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.43	3.22
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the operation of Ohio schools as delineated in the Ohio Department of Education School Operating Standards.	3.26	3.06
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Ohio Resident Educator Program.	3.28	2.97
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.40	3.31
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.33	3.19
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.71	3.59
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.32	2.96
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.72	3.65
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.55	3.43
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.75	3.69
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.71	3.67
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.73	3.62
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.66	3.51
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.58	3.48

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.37	3.30
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.45	3.32
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.51	3.36
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.68	3.64
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.62	3.52
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.71	3.62
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.63	3.52
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.61	3.51
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.72	3.66
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.55	3.42
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.42	3.24
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.51	3.42

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**Description of Data:**

To gather information on alumni satisfaction with the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education administers a survey aligned with the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession (OSTP), Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. All Ohio Resident Educators who completed their preparation in Ohio receive an invitation to complete the survey in the fall semester as they enter Year 2 of the Resident Educator program. A total of 650 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 11 percent.

1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My teacher licensure program prepared me with knowledge of research on how students learn.	3.43	3.47
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.	3.11	3.29
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.36	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.39	3.40
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.29	3.35
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.	3.43	3.41
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.43	3.41
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.43	3.41
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.43	3.41
10	My teacher licensure program prepared me to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities, and at-risk students.	3.43	3.41
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.11	3.31
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.32	3.43
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.14	3.28
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.32	3.45



**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.32	3.42
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.36	3.55
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.39	3.43
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.36	3.36
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.43	3.59
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.43	3.31
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.39	3.43
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.32	3.41
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.14	3.10
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.	2.93	2.76
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	2.93	2.76
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.14	3.22
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.00	3.06
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including the Common Core State Standards.	3.32	3.31
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.79	2.75
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.50	3.53
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.32	3.33
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.54	3.54
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.36	3.51
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.36	3.52
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.29	3.34
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.29	3.33
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.14	3.25

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.14	3.26
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.14	3.27
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.46	3.55
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.36	3.47
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.54	3.53
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.54	3.43
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.50	3.42
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.61	3.60
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.18	3.34
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	2.96	3.22
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.18	3.38
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.18	3.27

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Principal Intern Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**Description of Data:**

To gather information the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation providers, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 255 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 29 percent.

**Wright State University Survey Response Rate = 76.19%**

**Total Survey Responses = 16**

**1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	My program prepared me to lead and facilitate continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	3.38	3.52
2	My program prepared me to lead the processes of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	3.31	3.48
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	3.44	3.51
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	3.44	3.49
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.	3.19	3.41
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	3.38	3.52
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	3.31	3.61
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.	3.38	3.53
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	3.31	3.55
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	3.38	3.56
11	My program prepared me to establish and maintain procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	3.44	3.59
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	3.44	3.56
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	3.25	3.45
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	3.31	3.63
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	3.50	3.65
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for	3.44	3.61

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
	collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.		
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	3.44	3.63
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	3.50	3.60
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	3.50	3.67
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	3.25	3.40
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	3.38	3.57
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	3.13	3.47
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	3.25	3.51

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015

**Description of Data:**

To gather information the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation programs, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to individuals who serve as mentors to Ohio principal interns. Questions on the survey are aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 63 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 21 percent.

**Wright State University Survey Response Rate = 27.78%**

**Total Survey Responses = 5**

**1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Agree 4=Strongly Agree**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand leading and facilitating continuous improvement efforts within a school building setting.	N<10	3.24
2	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand leading the process of setting, monitoring, and achieving specific and challenging goals for all students and staff.	N<10	3.35
3	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand anticipating, monitoring, and responding to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.29
4	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand ensuring the instructional content being taught is aligned with the academic standards (i.e., national, Common Core, state) and curriculum priorities of the school and district.	N<10	3.23
5	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understandEnsuring effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.23
6	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand advocating for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.	N<10	3.35
7	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.35
8	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.31
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N<10	3.27
10	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining procedures and practices supporting staff and students with a safe environment conducive to learning.	N<10	3.37
11	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing and maintaining a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.37
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.30
13	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand	N<10	3.49

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
	upholding and modeling professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct.		
14	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand connecting the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.29
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.32
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.30
17	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand establishing expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.34
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.51
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.84
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.13

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**National Accreditation Status**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education)

**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 professional preparation of job applicants.

<b>Accrediting Agency</b>	NCATE
<b>Date of Last Review</b>	November 2015
<b>Accreditation Status</b>	Accredited





# 2015

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Wright State University

---

### Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2014 to Aug 31, 2015  
(Data Source: Wright State University)

#### Description of Data:

This section reflects self-reported information from Ohio Educator Preparation Providers on a maximum of three initiatives geared to increase excellence and support innovation in the preparation of Ohio educators.

#### Teacher Preparation Programs

<b>Initiative:</b>	Dayton Boys Prep. Academy & WSU Partnership
<b>Purpose:</b>	The purpose is to allow WSU students to learn about schooling in an urban setting while providing assistance to the school.
<b>Goal:</b>	The goal is to create a mutually beneficial partnership that serves the needs of all stakeholders.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	200
<b>Strategy:</b>	The DBPA and WSU collaborate in mutually beneficial projects. Listed below are examples of the partnership. Two Early Childhood Education classes are taught at the DBPA and the ECE students tutor 2nd grade boys. Teacher candidates complete their year-long placement at the DBPA. Raider coaches tutors in grades K-8. The DBPA grades 2, 3, and 4 served as a pilot site for a grant project designed to include more physical activity into classrooms. WSU faculty worked with the school to determine the effectiveness of activity breaks and the tracking of physical activity. The grant resulted in the development of Create A Classroom That Moves, currently available on the Ohio Department of Education website.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Second grade STAR test data in 2013-14 show excellent growth in reading. Although there are many variables at play, one is the tutoring by WSU students. Research is currently underway involving a 2nd grade teacher, a WSU faculty member and a WSU student teacher. The study is tracking the reading progress of 26 second grade boys. Presentations and journal articles are planned.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	1. Image of Hope Award received by Anna Lyon in 2014 for youth advocacy work at the DBPA. 2. National Network for Educational Renewal Richard W. Clark Award 2015
<b>Programs:</b>	Early Childhood Education
<b>Initiative:</b>	Universal Prevention in Early & Middle Childhood
<b>Purpose:</b>	To increase teacher candidate efficacy in trauma-informed prevention as classroom managementTo increase teacher candidate efficacy in trauma-informed prevention as classroom management
<b>Goal:</b>	To increase teacher efficacy through increasing behavior skill sets
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	100
<b>Strategy:</b>	All early and middle childhood teacher candidates learn universal prevention strategies and trauma-informed care as part of their classroom management instruction. This increases their ability to create a nurturing environment in the classroom that also develops self-regulation in children that increases protective factors from drug, alcohol, suicide, and mental health issues.
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Published results demonstrated significant increases in early and middle childhood teacher candidates' overall efficacy as well as efficacy in instructional strategies, student engagement and classroom management.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Wright State was awarded over \$550,000 in grants to increase these strategies in local schools and the community.
<b>Programs:</b>	Early Childhood Education and Middle Childhood Education
<b>Initiative:</b>	Student Teaching in Chile
<b>Purpose:</b>	To prepare ECE candidates to work with English Language Learners; to offer an exchange of ideas and expertise.
<b>Goal:</b>	To provide ECE candidates an opportunity to learn about other cultures while supporting English language learning of the Chilean children.

# 2015

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Wright State University

---

**Number of Participants:** 8

**Strategy:** Each year, Early Childhood Education teacher candidates who elect to participate spend three weeks in Chile working along side teachers at the Thomas Jefferson School in Concepcion, Chile. While in Chile the Early Childhood teacher candidates live with host families and spend each school day assisting with English language learning. They interact with families and faculty who are interested in conversations with native speakers of English. The candidates have opportunities to explore Santiago and other Chilean sites to further develop their knowledge and cultural awareness. The candidates engage in reflection activities and assignments to identify implications for their professional practice.

**Demonstration of Impact:** Each year, the faculty mentor for the program reviews the candidates' reflections that are written after the candidates return to Ohio. The candidate reflections demonstrate that the experience of being the "other" in someone else's culture is profound. Candidates consistently report a newfound empathy for young students immigrating to the United States and report strategies for how they will address the needs of English Language Learners in their classrooms.

**2015**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Wright State University**

---

**Principal Preparation Programs**

<b>Initiative:</b>	Field Experience and Principal Reflection Analysis
<b>Purpose:</b>	Investigate Quality and characteristics of the principal preparation program
<b>Goal:</b>	To synthesize information collected from principal candidates about their candidates program and internship reflections
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	33
<b>Strategy:</b>	Faculty researched the following questions in reference to the WSU Principal Program: What are the patterns of learned content evident in student reflections? How can the principal program be modified? To what extent reflection content align with results of comprehensive exam of the principal program? To what extent combinations of reflections, learned content, and principal exams predict candidate performance as measured by OAE? They used the following data: Qualitative coding analysis of principal program candidate reflections & field experiences Quantitative analysis of Ohio Assessment for Educators (Educational Leadership) scores Quantitative analysis of Principal Program Exam scores Collaborative action research Pilot study ; State-wide longitudinal study among participating institutions of Ohio Council of Professors of Educational Administration (OCPEA)
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Patterns of principal candidate reflections were conceptually well balanced. More advanced courses have shown more association with cognitively higher learning. Many candidates struggle changing perspective from classroom focus to building focus.