

# 2018

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Kent State University

---

#### Institution Profile

(Data Source: Kent State University)

Kent State University's eight-campus system, among the largest regional systems in the country, serves both the development of a true living/learning approach at the Kent Campus and the regional needs on seven other campuses throughout Northeast Ohio.

Kent State is ranked among the nation's 77 public research universities demonstrating high-research activity by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

#### College of Education, Health, and Human Services

The mission of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services (EHHS) is to create and advance knowledge as it educates professionals who enhance health and well-being and enable learning across the lifespan. We offer associate (regional campuses), baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees to prepare professionals for the 21st century with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be leaders in their worlds of work and engaged citizens.

---

#### 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
- Survey Results of Employer Perceptions of 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

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

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.

An apparent dip in evaluations for the most recent "Initial License Effective Year" cohort comes from the perception that any given year's evaluation results is actually a chronological view of evaluations. Rather, it's a view of the evaluations from that school year, showing four different cohorts of licensed educators. The most recently licensed cohort will eventually have more evaluation results in its second year as more educators find employment as teachers or principals.

**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 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017.
2. The teacher evaluation data in this report are provided by the Ohio Department of Education.
3. Due to ORC 3333.041(B), annual 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># Accomplished</b>	<b># Skilled</b>	<b># Developing</b>	<b># Ineffective</b>
<b>2014</b>	110	82	18	N<10
<b>2015</b>	70	115	12	N<10
<b>2016</b>	43	76	16	N<10
<b>2017</b>	20	52	13	N<10

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018  
(Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio's system for evaluating principals (Ohio's Principal Evaluation System) provides building leaders with a detailed 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 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017.

An apparent dip in evaluations for the most recent "Initial License Effective Year" cohort comes from the perception that any given year's evaluation results is actually a chronological view of evaluations. Rather, it's a view of the evaluations from that school year, showing four different cohorts of licensed educators. The most recently licensed cohort will eventually have more evaluation results in its second year as more educators find employment as teachers or principals.

<b>Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications</b>				
<b>Initial Licensure Effective Year</b>	<b># Accomplished</b>	<b># Skilled</b>	<b># Developing</b>	<b># Ineffective</b>
<b>2014</b>	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

(Data Source: Kent 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	667
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	15
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	98.62%

<b>Principal Preparation Programs</b>	
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	15
Number of candidates who started internship	8
Number of candidates who completed internship	8
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2016 to Aug 31, 2017  
(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 2017-2018.

As of 2013, the Ohio Assessments for Educators replaced the Praxis subject assessments for initial licensure. Some Praxis II assessments are still being reported because recent program completers took those tests in or before 2013.

Teacher Licensure Tests	
Summary Rating: Effective	
Completers Tested	Pass Rate
301	94%

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018  
(Data Source: Kent State University)

**Description of Data:**

Ohio requires that principal candidates pass the requisite state examination to be recommended for licensure. The 2017-2018 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

Principal Licensure Tests	
Completers Tested	Pass Rate
11	91%

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

**Description of Data:**

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, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017.
2. The value-added data in this report are those reported by Ohio's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) based on Elementary and Middle School Tests (Grades 4-8) and End-of-Course Tests for high school credit.
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 Kent State University-Prepared Teachers**

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017		Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value-Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
664	228	N=37 16%	N=22 10%	N=83 36%	N=29 13%	N=57 25%

# 2018

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Kent State University

#### Demographic Information for Schools where Kent 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 Level
N=55	N=71	N=6	N=96	N/A
24%	31%	3%	42%	N/A

##### Teachers Serving by School Type

Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center	Career-Tech	No School Type
N=26	N=201	N=1	N/A	N/A	N/A
11%	88%	<1%	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

A	B	C	D	F	NR
N=74	N=8	N=27	N=11	N=108	N/A
32%	4%	12%	5%	47%	N/A

##### Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles

High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority	No Minority Quartile
N=55	N=67	N=66	N=40	N/A
24%	29%	29%	18%	N/A

##### Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles

High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty	No Poverty Quartile
N=64	N=47	N=60	N=57	N/A
28%	21%	26%	25%	N/A

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

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

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

Initial Licensure Effective Years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017		Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added				
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value-Added Data	A	B	C	D	F
N<10	N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N<10
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**Demographic Information for Schools where Kent 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 Level
N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Principals Serving by School Type					
Community School	Public School	STEM School	Educational Service Center	Career-Tech	No School Type
N/A	N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Principals Serving by Overall Letter Grade of School					
A	B	C	D	F	NR
N/A	N/A	N/A	N<10	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Principals Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles				
High Minority	Medium-High Minority	Medium-Low Minority	Low Minority	No Minority Quartile
N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

---

**Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles**

<b>High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-High Poverty</b>	<b>Medium-Low Poverty</b>	<b>Low Poverty</b>	<b>No Poverty Quartile</b>
N<10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# 2018 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Kent State University

## Kent State University Candidate Academic Measures

(Data Source: Kent State University)  
Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

### Undergraduate Admission Requirements

Admission decisions at the undergraduate level are made through a process called "Application to Advanced Study." Candidates must meet certain GPA and testing requirements as well as submit evidence of non-academic dimensions that vary by program. For more information, please see website (<https://www.kent.edu/ehhs>) for further details.

### Graduate Admission Requirements

Program admission requirements vary by content area and age band. Please see website (<https://www.kent.edu/ehhs>) for further details. Programs may require some or all of the following: disposition assessment, prerequisite courses, essay, letter of recommendation, interview, or writing sample.

### Description of Data:

The data in this section are the average scores of candidates on academic measures reported by the provider. If a measure is not applicable to a level of delivery (undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, graduate) the table reflects "N/A". In the "Dispositional Assessments and Other Measures" portion, if the provider did not indicate using a measure, OR if the institution does not offer a program at the designated level of delivery, the table reflects "N".

### Teacher Preparation Programs

U=Undergraduate P=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate

Academic Measure	Required Score	Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
		Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
ACT Composite Score	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
ACT English Subscore	U=25 P=N/A G=N/A	U=103 P=N/A G=N/A	U=27.92 P=N/A G=N/A	U=310 P=N/A G=N/A	U=27.83 P=N/A G=N/A	U=81 P=N/A G=N/A	U=27.99 P=N/A G=N/A
ACT Math Subscore	U=25 P=N/A G=N/A	U=84 P=N/A G=N/A	U=26.83 P=N/A G=N/A	U=301 P=N/A G=N/A	U=26.99 P=N/A G=N/A	U=82 P=N/A G=N/A	U=26.9 P=N/A G=N/A
ACT Reading Subscore	U=26 P=N/A G=N/A	U=106 P=N/A G=N/A	U=29.41 P=N/A G=N/A	U=334 P=N/A G=N/A	U=29.23 P=N/A G=N/A	U=81 P=N/A G=N/A	U=29.14 P=N/A G=N/A
GPA - Graduate	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.00	U=N/A P=N/A G=11	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.47	U=N/A P=N/A G=24	U=N/A P=N/A G= 3.50	U=N/A P=N/A G=N<10	U=N/A P=N/A G=N<10
GPA - High School	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
GPA - Transfer	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
GPA - Undergraduate	U= 2.75 P=N/A G= 3.00	U=317 P=N/A G=45	U= 3.38 P=N/A G= 3.39	U=995 P=N/A G=110	U= 3.40 P=N/A G= 3.31	U=267 P=N/A G=38	U= 3.39 P=N/A G= 3.20
GRE Composite Score	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
GRE Quantitative Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=152	U=N/A P=N/A G=29	U=N/A P=N/A G=150.24	U=N/A P=N/A G=70	U=N/A P=N/A G=148.97	U=N/A P=N/A G=29	U=N/A P=N/A G=149.17

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

		Candidates Admitted		Candidates Enrolled		Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GRE Verbal Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=151	U=N/A P=N/A G=29	U=N/A P=N/A G=155.1	U=N/A P=N/A G=70	U=N/A P=N/A G=153.83	U=N/A P=N/A G=29	U=N/A P=N/A G=153.28
GRE Writing Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=3	U=N/A P=N/A G=29	U=N/A P=N/A G=3.95	U=N/A P=N/A G=70	U=N/A P=N/A G=3.76	U=N/A P=N/A G=29	U=N/A P=N/A G=3.59
MAT	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis CORE Math	U=150 P=N/A G=150	U=252 P=N/A G=N<10	U=166.39 P=N/A G=N<10	U=714 P=N/A G=15	U=166.01 P=N/A G=177	U=171 P=N/A G=N<10	U=166.19 P=N/A G=N<10
Praxis CORE Reading	U=156 P=N/A G=N/A	U=235 P=N/A G=N/A	U=176.41 P=N/A G=N/A	U=712 P=N/A G=N/A	U=175.94 P=N/A G=N/A	U=183 P=N/A G=N/A	U=175.1 P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis CORE Writing	U=162 P=N/A G=N/A	U=244 P=N/A G=N/A	U=167.58 P=N/A G=N/A	U=713 P=N/A G=N/A	U=168.1 P=N/A G=N/A	U=162 P=N/A G=N/A	U=168.59 P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis I Math	U=174 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=47 P=N/A G=N/A	U=178.26 P=N/A G=N/A	U=37 P=N/A G=N/A	U=177.62 P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis I Reading	U=174 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=36 P=N/A G=N/A	U=177.36 P=N/A G=N/A	U=31 P=N/A G=N/A	U=177.68 P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis I Writing	U=172 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=37 P=N/A G=N/A	U=173.43 P=N/A G=N/A	U=29 P=N/A G=N/A	U=173.52 P=N/A G=N/A
Praxis II	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Composite Score	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Quantitative Subscore	U=620 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Verbal Subscore	U=620 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A	U=N<10 P=N/A G=N/A
SAT Writing Subscore	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A	U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A
<b>Other Criteria</b>		<b>Undergraduate</b>		<b>Post-Baccalaureate</b>		<b>Graduate</b>	
Dispositional Assessment		Y		N		Y	
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview		N		N		N	
Essay		Y		N		Y	
High School Class Rank		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Interview		Y		N		Y	
Letter of Commitment		N		N		N	
Letter of Recommendation		Y		N		Y	
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator		N/A		N		N	

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

<b>Other Criteria</b>	<b>Undergraduate</b>	<b>Post-Baccalaureate</b>	<b>Graduate</b>
<b>OAE Content Assessment</b>	N/A	N/A	N
<b>Portfolio</b>	N	N	N
<b>Prerequisite Courses</b>	Y	N	Y
<b>SRI Teacher Perceiver</b>	N/A	N/A	N
<b>Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship</b>	N/A	N/A	N
<b>Teacher Insight</b>	N	N	N

# 2018

## Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report

### Kent State University

#### Principal Program Admission Requirements

Please see website (<https://www.kent.edu/ehhs>) for further details. Programs may require some or all of the following: disposition assessment, prerequisite courses, essay, letter of recommendation, interview, or writing sample.

#### 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 - Undergraduate	3.00	N<10	N<10	23	3.41	N<10	N<10
GPA - High School	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - Graduate	3.00	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10
ACT Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Math Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Reading Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT English Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Verbal Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SAT Writing Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis I Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Praxis II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Verbal Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GRE Writing Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MAT	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Other Criteria</b>							
<b>Dispositional Assessment</b>				Y			

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

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

# 2018 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Kent State University

## Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

### 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 3,451 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 74 percent.

**Kent State University Survey Response Rate = 78.31%**

**Total Survey Responses = 278**

**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.	3.60	3.50
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.	3.34	3.32
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.44	3.34
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.56	3.46
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.57	3.41
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.61	3.64
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.53	3.46
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.59	3.48
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.60	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.	3.52	3.44
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.46	3.37
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.69	3.59
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.36	3.31
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.64	3.54

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent 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.	3.61	3.55
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.77	3.67
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.58	3.54
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.69	3.62
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.62	3.51
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.82	3.73
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.46	3.42
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.63	3.51
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.60	3.52
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.22	3.23
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.	3.19	3.08
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	3.04	3.00
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.39	3.35
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.29	3.21
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.58	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.	2.96	2.93
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.71	3.67
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.55	3.42
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.74	3.68
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.72	3.65
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.70	3.62
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.59	3.52



**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.60	3.50
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.36	3.26
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.44	3.31
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.45	3.34
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.74	3.63
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.62	3.51
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.79	3.63
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.70	3.53
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.65	3.54
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.75	3.63
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.54	3.42
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.42	3.20
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.56	3.41

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

**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 305 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of eight 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.	3.63	3.48
2	My teacher licensure program prepared me to recognize characteristics of gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students in order to plan and deliver appropriate instruction.	2.94	3.18
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.56	3.32
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.63	3.37
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.38	3.32
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.56	3.53
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.25	3.40
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.38	3.41
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.69	3.47
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.	3.19	3.28
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.50	3.24
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.63	3.43
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.25	3.06

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.56	3.46
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.44	3.41
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.75	3.58
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.56	3.42
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.31	3.34
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.75	3.59
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.25	3.28
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.56	3.41
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.56	3.36
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.06	3.14
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.	3.13	3.03
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	3.13	3.03
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.19	3.24
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.13	3.11
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.44	3.44
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	2.69	2.73
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.50	3.55
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.31	3.30
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.56	3.53
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.50	3.51
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.56	3.51
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.06	3.31

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Institution Average</b>	<b>State Average</b>
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.31	3.38
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.19	3.18
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.13	3.22
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	3.25	3.29
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.75	3.55
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.69	3.46
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.75	3.55
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	3.56	3.41
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.38	3.40
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.63	3.59
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.38	3.33
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.25	3.13
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.31	3.31
49	My teacher licensure program provided prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	3.13	3.27

# 2018 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Kent State University

## Principal Intern Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

### 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 450 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 44 percent.

**Kent State University Survey Response Rate = 25%**

**Total Survey Responses = 3**

**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.	N<10	3.55
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	3.54
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.53
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	3.47
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	3.48
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N<10	3.50
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.56
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	3.57
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.50
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	3.51
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	3.57
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.	N<10	3.49
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.44
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N<10	3.60
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N<10	3.64

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	N<10	3.59
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N<10	3.64
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.59
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N<10	3.64
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.42
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.50
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.45
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.50

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

**Description of Data:**

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/A	3.33
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/A	3.33
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/A	3.32
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/A	3.39
5	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand Ensuring effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.	N/A	3.39
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/A	3.39
7	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of data by self and staff.	N/A	3.46
8	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand encouraging and facilitating effective use of research by self and staff.	N/A	3.35
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.	N/A	3.33
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/A	3.45
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/A	3.45
12	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand allocating resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N/A	3.39

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
13	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand upholding and modeling professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct.	N/A	3.53
14	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand connecting the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N/A	3.30
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N/A	3.35
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N/A	3.28
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/A	3.33
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N/A	2.74
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N/A	2.88
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N/A	2.14



# 2018 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Kent State University

## Employer Perceptions of Ohio EPP Programs Survey Results

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018

(Data Source: Ohio Department of Higher Education administered survey of Employers of Ohio Educators)

### Description of Data:

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by their educator preparation providers, the Ohio Department of Higher Education distributes a survey to employers of Ohio educators. Questions on the survey are aligned with Ohio's Learning Standards, Ohio licensure requirements, and elements of national accreditation. A total of 141 respondents completed the survey statewide.

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

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
1	The institution prepares its graduates to understand student learning and development.	3.26	3.39
2	The institution prepares its graduates to respect the diversity of the students they teach.	3.32	3.43
3	The institution prepares its graduates to know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.	3.11	3.45
4	The institution prepares its graduates to understand and use content-specific instructional strategies to effectively teach the central concepts and skills of the discipline.	3.00	3.35
5	The institution prepares its graduates to be knowledgeable about assessment types, their purposes, and the data they generate.	3.00	3.22
6	The institution prepares its graduates to analyze data to monitor student progress and learning.	2.95	3.12
7	The institution prepares its graduates to use data to plan, differentiate, and modify instruction.	2.89	3.13
8	The institution prepares its graduates to align their instructional goals and activities with school and district priorities.	3.00	3.23
9	The institution prepares its graduates to differentiate instruction to support the learning needs of all students.	2.89	3.20
10	The institution prepares its graduates to treat students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.32	3.47
11	The institution prepares its graduates to maintain an environment that is conducive to learning for all students.	3.32	3.42
12	The institution prepares its graduates to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.16	3.38
13	The institution prepares its graduates to collaborate effectively with other teachers, administrators, and district staff.	3.16	3.38
14	The institution prepares its graduates to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.16	3.45
15	The institution prepares its graduates to assume responsibility for professional growth.	3.21	3.34

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

**National Accreditation Status**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018  
(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>	May 2016
<b>Accreditation Status</b>	Accredited



# 2018 Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report Kent State University

---

## Excellence and Innovation Initiatives

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2017 to Aug 31, 2018  
(Data Source: Kent 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>	College Today Program (Akron - Ellet/Firestone)
<b>Purpose:</b>	Helping students on the cusp make the transition from high school to college by helping them become effective readers, writers, and mathematicians.
<b>Goal:</b>	Raise students' ACT scores to remediation-free levels (Reading 18, Math 22), score well enough on the CLEP test to secure college credit, and become familiar with the related "soft skills" which ease the transition to college.
<b>Number of Participants:</b>	70
<b>Strategy:</b>	The grant provides college curricula in English and math, delivered by adjunct faculty during the school day, for mid-performing students--those who with some support, through differentiated and leveled instruction, can successfully transition to the university. KSU instructors and high school students are assisted by Academic Intervention Directors, one each in English and math, who are on-site to provide scaffolding and interventions as needed. KSU pre-service teachers provide additional assistance during their fieldwork. The grant also provides for wrap-around services that include team/relationship building, financial literacy, college transition and preparation, writing scholarship essays, career exploration, and organizational skills.
<b>External Recognition:</b>	This project has been awarded one of the Great Lakes College Ready Grant totaling \$480,000 which will be used during both the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 school years.
<b>Programs:</b>	Adolescent to Young Adult Education (ADED) program are involved in the project, providing small group, one-on-one and co-teaching assistance onsite at Firestone High and Ellet High.
<b>Initiative:</b>	Int'l Baccalaureate - Early and Middle Childhood
<b>Purpose:</b>	Provide early and middle childhood teacher education candidates the opportunity to earn the IB certificate in teaching and learning.
<b>Strategy:</b>	Kent State University's College of EHHS has been approved to award graduate credit for the International Baccalaureate (IB) Organization's professional development seminars worldwide. Additionally, all KSU Early and Middle Childhood undergraduate completers, as well as graduate students who complete initial licensure in ECED or MCED) are eligible for an International Baccalaureate Certificate in Teaching and Learning, which is awarded by the IB Organization. Early Childhood students are eligible for the Primary Years Program Certificate, while Middle Childhood students are eligible for the Middle Years Program Certificate. With this certificate, students are eligible to teach in IB World Schools in the US and throughout the world. KSU's Early Childhood program was the first in the world to achieve this recognition and the Middle Childhood program was the first in Ohio to achieve this recognition, and like ECED, is only one of a few programs in the world to offer this credential.
<b>Programs:</b>	Early Childhood, Middle Childhood

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

<b>Initiative:</b>	Adapted Physical Education Graduate Endorsement
<b>Purpose:</b>	Prepare KSU candidates to work with students with disabilities
<b>Goal:</b>	Better meet the needs of the disabled community in physical education contexts
<b>Strategy:</b>	<p>The purpose of the adapted physical education (APE) endorsement is to train and allow in-service physical educators to determine placement (inclusion or one-on-one settings), offer effective instruction, and conduct assessment and evaluation for students with disabilities. Kent State University is one of only two programs actively providing this endorsement in the state of Ohio. This program, offered at the graduate level, is provided through two online courses (Introduction of APE and Practicum in APE). The nine required assessments are evaluated by the APE online course instructor and used by the State Department of Education to issue the APE endorsement. This program is making a significant impact as former students in Physical Education are now currently serving in leadership roles as APE coordinators and/or APE teachers within school districts. They also support community services as well (e.g., Special Olympics or other disability sport).</p>
<b>Programs:</b>	Physical Education

**2018**  
**Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report**  
**Kent State University**

---

**Principal Preparation Programs**

<b>Initiative:</b>	Leading for Social Justice and Equity Scholars
<b>Purpose:</b>	To support candidates in an effort to promote their inquiry-based projects in K-12 schools, share their research findings regionally in Northeast Ohio, and provide them with opportunities to present a
<b>Strategy:</b>	Candidates completed essays regarding their vision/mission/actions taken to promote social justice and equity in schools; collected letters of recommendations from K-12 students, teachers, families, school leaders, and community members regarding their work in K-12 schools; candidates are afforded opportunities throughout their courses to collaborate with K-12 school communities, implement their research-based solutions from inquiry-based projects, share their research findings with regional school communities, and engage in evaluating the impact of their work in K-12 schools
<b>Demonstration of Impact:</b>	Candidates are provided opportunities to demonstrate their impact in several courses throughout their studies (i.e., Leading for Social Justice, Fundamentals of Educational Administration, School Community Relations, Instructional Leadership, Administrator's Role in Curriculum Development, Principalship, and/or Administrative Internship)
<b>External Recognition:</b>	Candidates are evaluated on their ability to impact their school communities through rubrics scored by school community members who serve on their leadership teams throughout their inquiry-based work in schools.