### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Institution Profile**

(Data Source: University of Findlay)

Findlay College was founded in 1882 by the Churches of God, General Conference and the citizens of Findlay. UF strives to preserve and honor the Judeo-Christian values of its founders. It became The University of Findlay (UF) on July 1, 1989. UF is known for its innovative programs in pre-vet, environmental and equestrian studies. It also has a reputation for its health professions programs such as pre-med, physical therapy, pharmacy and physician assistant. The University of Findlay is best known for experiential programs in each of the colleges and initiated by the College of Education.

#### **University of Findlay College of Education**

The College of Education is one of six colleges at The University of Findlay. The college offers initial licensure in Early Childhood, Intervention Specialist, AYA Science, AYA Life Science, AYA Language Arts, AYA Social Studies, AYA Math, Multi-Age (MA) Health and PE, MA Japanese, MA Spanish, MA Drama and MA Visual Art. Advanced programs are offered for principal and superintendent licensure. The COE offers a Master of Arts in Education as well as an EdD program.

#### **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

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Results for Ohio Teachers Prepared by an Ohio Educator Preparation Provider at University of Findlay

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

#### **Description of Data:**

Ohio's ordered school-building closure and subsequent emergency legislation addressing the coronavirus pandemic-related issues (House Bill 197 of the 133rd General Assembly) had substantial impacts on state testing during the 2019-2020 school year. As a result, the OTES/OPES and Value-Added sections of this report will include limited or no 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 are 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 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019.
- 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.

Associated Teacher Evaluation Classifications						
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Developing	# Ineffective			
2016	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2017	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2018	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		
2019	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10		

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

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

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (Data Source: Ohio Department of Education)

#### **Description of Data:**

Ohio's ordered school-building closure and subsequent emergency legislation addressing the coronavirus pandemic-related issues (House Bill 197 of the 133rd General Assembly) had substantial impacts on state testing during the 2019-2020 school year. As a result, the OTES/OPES and Value-Added sections of this report will include limited or no 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 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019.

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 are 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.

Associated Principal Evaluation Classifications							
Initial Licensure Effective Year	# Accomplished	# Skilled	# Developing	# Ineffective			
2016	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10			
2017	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10			
2018	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10			
2019	N<10	N<10	N<10	N<10			

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### Field and Clinical Experiences for Candidates at University of Findlay

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (Data Source: University of Findlay)

#### **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.

Teacher Preparation Programs					
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements				
Require edTPA National Scoring from candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	N				
Minimum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	250				
Maximum number of field/clinical hours required of candidates in teacher preparation programs at the institution	420				
Average number of weeks required to teach full-time within the student teaching experience at the institution	16				
Percentage of teacher candidates who satisfactorily completed student teaching	100%				

Principal Preparation Programs				
Field/Clinical Experience Element	Requirements			
Total number of field/clinical weeks required of principal candidates in internship	16			
Number of candidates who started internship	15			
Number of candidates who completed internship	15			
Percentage of principal candidates who satisfactorily completed internship	100%			

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### Ohio Educator Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Findlay

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2018 to Aug 31, 2019 (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 2019-2020.

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					
49 98%					

#### Ohio Principal Licensure Examination Pass Rates at University of Findlay

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (Data Source: University of Findlay)

#### **Description of Data:**

Ohio requires that principal candidates pass the requisite state examination to be recommended for licensure. The 2019-2020 program completer pass rates are reported by each Ohio educator preparation provider.

Principal Licensure Tests				
Completers Tested Pass Rate				
22	91%			

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

# Value-Added Data for Students Taught by Teachers Prepared by Ohio Educator Preparation Providers at University of Findlay

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020

#### **Description of Data:**

Ohio's ordered school-building closure and subsequent emergency legislation addressing the coronavirus pandemic-related issues (House Bill 197 of the 133rd General Assembly) had substantial impacts on state testing during the 2019-2020 school year. As a result, the OTES/OPES and Value-Added sections of this report will include limited or no 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 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019.
- 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 University of Findlay-Prepared Teachers

	ure Effective 17, 2018, 2019	Associated Value-Added Classifications				
Employed as Teachers	Teachers with Value- Added Data	Most Effective	Above Average	Average	Approaching Average	Least Effective
N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A

# Demographic Information for Schools where University of Findlay-Prepared Teachers with Value-Added Data Serve

Teachers Serving by School Level							
Elementary School Middle School Junior High School High School No School Le							
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

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

Teachers Serving by Overall Letter Grade of Building Value-Added						
A	B C D F NR					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

	Teachers Serving by Minority Enrollment by Quartiles							
High Minority Medium-High Minority Medium-Low Minority Low Minority No Minority C								
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				

Teachers Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles						
High Poverty	gh Poverty Medium-High Poverty Medium-Low Poverty Low Poverty No Poverty					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
N/A	NA	N/A	N/A	N/A		

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

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

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

	ure Effective 17, 2018, 2019	Principals Serving by Letter Grade of Overall Building Value-Added				
Employed as Principals	Principals with Value- Added Data	Α	В	С	D	F
12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# Demographic Information for Schools where University of Findlay-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/A	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/A	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	В	С	D	F	NR				
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				

	Principals Serving by Poverty Level by Quartiles								
High Poverty	Medium-High Poverty	Medium-Low Poverty	Low Poverty	No Poverty Quartile					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A					

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **University of Findlay Candidate Academic Measures**

(Data Source:University of Findlay) Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020

#### **Undergraduate Admission Requirements**

Students are admitted to the University of Findlay College of Education at the start of their sophomore year. To get accepted they must have a GPA of 2.75 and have successfully completed pre-requisite courses (EDUC 161, SPED 134, ENGL 106, 107 or 206, COMM 110 or 211, CSCI 148, 149, 150, or 190). If a student has not met, but is close to the GPA requirement the may be admitted. They sign a contract stating that they must bring up their GPA the next semester to continue in the program.

#### **Post-Baccalaureate Admission Requirements**

Candidates must: 1. Have a minimum undergrad GPA of 2.75 or a GPA of 3.0 in the last 60 semester hrs of undergrad work or a graduate GPA of at least 3.0 in at least nine hours of graduate work. If criteria for full admission is not met conditional admission may be possible with 3 letters of recommendation. 2. Supply copies of any professional licenses/certificates. 3. Possess a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution. 4. Submit official transcripts of all college-level work.

#### **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."

Candidates Admitted is the number admitted (for fall or spring) during the academic year.

Candidates Enrolled is the total number of candidates admitted and enrolled (including program completers) during the academic year.

Candidates Completing is the number meeting all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program during the academic year.

#### **Teacher Preparation Programs**

#### U=Undergraduate P=Post-Baccalaureate G=Graduate

		Candidate	s Admitted	Candidate	s Enrolled	Candidates	Completing
Academic	Required	Number	Average	Number	Average	Number	Average
Measure	Score	Admitted	Score	Enrolled	Score	Completed	Score
ACT Composite	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Score	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT English	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT Essay	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
(Optional)	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT Math	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT Reading	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A
ACT Science	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A
Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A
	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A

Measure         Score         Admitted         Score         Enrolled         Score         Completed         Score           GPA - Graduate         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA           GPA - High School         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA           GPA - Transfer         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA           GPA - Transfer         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA           GPA - Transfer         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA         U-NIA           GPA - Transfer         U-NIA         U-NIA <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>Candidate</th><th>s Admitted</th><th>Candidate</th><th>es Enrolled</th><th colspan="3">Candidates Completing</th></td<>			Candidate	s Admitted	Candidate	es Enrolled	Candidates Completing		
GPA - Graduate   U=NNA	I							Average Score	
P=N/A   P=N/A   P=N/A   P=N/A   P=N/A   P=N/A   P=N/A   C=N/A   C=N									
PA - High School   U-NNA		P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	
P=NNA   P=N		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N	PA - High School	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
GPA - Transfer         U=N/A								P=N/A	
P-NNA   P-N			G=N/A						
G=NVA   G=N	GPA - Transfer				l .				
GPA         U=2.755         U=28         U=3.52         U=9.57         P=3.56         P=57         P=3.26         P=14         P=3.50           GeN/A         G=N/A									
Undergraduate   P= 2.75									
G=NVA   G=N	-								
GRE Composite   U=N/A	Undergraduate				l .				
Score									
G=N/A					l .				
SEC Quantitative   U-N/A   U-N/A   D-N/A   D-N/A   D-N/A   P-N/A   P	Score				l .				
Subscore									
G=NVA	I						- '		
GRE Verbal   U=N/A	Subscore				l .				
Subscore									
G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N/							- '		
GRE Writing   U=N/A	Subscore								
Subscore									
G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N/									
MAT         U=N/A         P=N/A	Subscore								
P=N/A   P=N/		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A		G=N/A			
G=N/A   U=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N/	MAT	U=N/A		U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
Paris   Core   Math   U=N/A   U=N/A   P=N/A			P=N/A				P=N/A		
P=NI/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   U=N/A   G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N	raxis CORE Math	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
Praxis CORE         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         U=N/A         P=N/A		P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	
Reading         P=N/A G=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N/	Praxis CORE	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
Praxis CORE Writing         U=N/A P=N/A	Reading	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	
Writing         P=N/A G=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   U=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/	Praxis CORE	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
Praxis I Math         U=N/A P=N/A	Writing		P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A		P=N/A		
P=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   U=N/A   C=N/A   G=N/A   G=N/	Praxis I Math								
Praxis I Reading         U=N/A P=N/A P=					l .				
P=N/A   P=N/		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   U=N/A   U=N/	Praxis I Reading						- '		
Praxis   Writing									
P=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A	Praxis I Writing	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
Praxis II         U=N/A P=N/A P=N		P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	
P=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   G=N/	Praxis II								
SAT Composite   U=N/A		P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	
Score         P=N/A G=N/A         P=N/A D=N/A         P=N/A D=N/A <th< td=""><td></td><td>G=N/A</td><td>G=N/A</td><td>G=N/A</td><td>G=N/A</td><td>G=N/A</td><td>G=N/A</td><td>G=N/A</td></th<>		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   G=N/	SAT Composite					U=N/A		U=N/A	
SAT Essay	Score				l .				
(Optional)         P=N/A G=N/A G=N/A         P=N/A G=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   G=N/	SAT Essay	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
SAT Math Subscore         U=N/A P=N/A G=N/A         U=N/A P=N/A P=N	(Optional)	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	P=N/A	
Subscore         P=N/A G=N/A		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
G=N/A   G=N/	SAT Math	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
G=N/A   G=N/	Subscore	P=N/A	P=N/A		l .		P=N/A		
Vriting Subscore     P=N/A G=N/A       Other Criteria     Undergraduate     Post-Baccalaureate     Graduate		G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	G=N/A	
Viriting Subscore     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A     P=N/A G=N/A       Other Criteria     Undergraduate     Post-Baccalaureate     Graduate	SAT Reading/	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	U=N/A	
G=N/A G=N/A G=N/A G=N/A G=N/A G=N/A G=N/A G=N/A  Other Criteria Undergraduate Post-Baccalaureate Graduate									
Other Criteria Undergraduate Post-Baccalaureate Graduate	-								
Dispositional Assessment V	Other Cri				Post-Bac		Grad		
CONDUCTION ASSESSMENT TO THE INTERPRETATION OF THE INTERPRETATION	Disposition	al Assessment		Y	NI NI		N	1	

Other Criteria	Undergraduate	Post-Baccalaureate	Graduate
EMPATHY/Omaha Interview	N	N	N
Essay	N	N	N
High School Class Rank	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interview	N	N	N
Letter of Commitment	N	N	N
Letter of Recommendation	N	Y	N
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	N/A	N	N
OAE Content Assessment	N/A	N/A	N
Portfolio	N	N	N
Prerequisite Courses	Y	N	N
SRI Teacher Perceiver	N/A	N/A	N
Superintendent Statement of Sponsorship	N/A	N/A	N
Teacher Insight	N	N	N

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Principal Program Admission Requirements**

Candidates must: 1. Have a minimum undergrad GPA of 2.75 or a GPA of 3.0 in the last 60 semester hrs of undergrad work or a graduate GPA of at least 3.0 in at least nine hours of graduate work. If criteria for full admission is not met conditional admission may be possible with 3 letters of recommendation. 2. Supply copies of any professional licenses/certificates. 3. Possess a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution. 4. Submit official transcripts of all college-level work.

#### **Principal Preparation Programs**

		Candidate	Candidates Admitted		s Enrolled	Candidates Completing	
Academic Measure	Required Score	Number Admitted	Average Score	Number Enrolled	Average Score	Number Completed	Average Score
GPA - Undergraduate	2.75	21	3.65	70	3.61	17	3.48
ACT Reading 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
ACT English 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
ACT Science Subscore	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
GRE Composite Score	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACT Composite Score	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
SAT Math 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
GRE Quantitative Subscore	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PA - High School	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
GRE Verbal 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 Reading/ Writing Subscore	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
SAT Essay (Optional)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPA - Graduate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

		Candidate	s Admitted	Candidate	s Enrolled	Candidates	Completing
Academic Measure ACT Essay	Required Score N/A	Number Admitted N/A	Average Score N/A	Number Enrolled N/A	Average Score	Number Completed N/A	Average Score N/A
(Optional)					.,	1,7.1	
			Other C	Criteria			
		Dispositi	onal Assessment			N	
		EMPATHY	/Omaha Interview		ı	N	
			Essay			N	
			Interview		I	N	
		Lette	er of Commitment			N	
		Letter of	Recommendation			Y	
		Myers-Brig	gs Type Indicator		1	N	
			Portfolio		I	N	
		Pre	requisite Courses			N	
		SRIT	eacher Perceiver			N	
	Superir	ntendent Statemer	nt of Sponsorship			N	
			Teacher Insight			N	

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Pre-Service Teacher Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020

#### **Description of Data:**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic-related issues, including school closures and staff transitions in Ohio during the 2019-2020 school year, the distributions of some surveys were delayed, contributing to lower response rates.

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 2,903 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 68 percent.

#### University of Findlay Survey Response Rate = 50% Total Survey Responses = 19

#### 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.	3.68	3.56
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.	3.58	3.38
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	3.32	3.42
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	3.53	3.53
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	3.47	3.49
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.89	3.69
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.	3.74	3.52
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students.	3.58	3.55
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	3.74	3.61
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 atrisk students.	3.68	3.52
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	3.74	3.47
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	3.74	3.66

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	3.58	3.38
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	3.58	3.62
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	3.68	3.61
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	3.89	3.74
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	3.74	3.60
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate high expectations for all students.	3.79	3.68
19	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	3.68	3.58
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to treat all students fairly and establish an environment that is respectful, supportive, and caring.	3.84	3.78
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.	3.63	3.49
22	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	3.68	3.59
23	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	3.63	3.59
24	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	3.37	3.27
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	3.16
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	3.21	3.06
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.	3.47	3.40
28	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	3.42	3.29
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Academic Content Standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	3.79	3.70
30	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	3.42	2.99
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.84	3.73
32	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	3.63	3.50
33	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	3.79	3.73
34	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.68	3.73

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average		
35	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	3.89	3.71		
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	3.79	3.60		
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	3.68	3.58		
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	3.58	3.36		
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	3.53	3.40		
40	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers. 3.74				
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	3.79	3.71		
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	3.74	3.61		
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	3.79	3.70		
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.  3.74				
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	3.74	3.61		
46	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	3.84	3.71		
47	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.  3.79				
48	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	3.58	3.32		
49	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	3.79	3.54		

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

# Statewide Survey of Ohio Resident Educators' Reflections on their Educator Preparation Program

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020

#### **Description of Data:**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic-related issues, including school closures and staff transitions in Ohio during the 2019-2020 school year, the distributions of some surveys were delayed, contributing to lower response rates.

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 453 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 12 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.	N<10	3.43	
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.	N<10	3.19	
3	My teacher licensure program prepared me with high levels of knowledge and the academic content I plan to teach.	N<10	3.27	
4	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify instructional strategies appropriate to my content area.	N<10	3.37	
5	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of linking interdisciplinary experiences.	N<10	3.26	
6	My teacher licensure program prepared me to align instructional goals and activities with Ohio's academic content standards, including Ohio's Learning Standards.	N<10	3.53	
7	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use assessment data to inform instruction.		3.40	
8	My teacher licensure program prepared me to clearly communicate learning goals to students. N<10			
9	My teacher licensure program prepared me to apply knowledge of how students learn, to inform instruction.	N<10	3.42	
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 atrisk students.			
11	My teacher licensure program prepared me to identify strategies to increase student motivation and interest in topics of study.	N<10	3.23	

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average			
12	My teacher licensure program prepared me to create learning situations in which students work independently, collaboratively, and/or a whole class.	N<10	3.39			
13	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use strategies for effective classroom management.	N<10	3.12			
14	My teacher licensure program prepared me to communicate clearly and effectively.	N<10	3.42			
15	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand the importance of communication with families and caregivers.	N<10	3.35			
16	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of professional conduct.	N<10	3.56			
17	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	N<10	3.42			
18	My teacher licensure program prepared me to understand students' diverse cultures, language skills, and experiences.	N<10	3.31			
19						
20	My teacher licensure program prepared me to use technology to enhance teaching and student learning.					
21	My teacher licensure program prepared me to collaborate with colleagues and members of the community when and where appropriate.	N<10	3.39			
22	My teacher licensure program collected evidence of my performance on multiple measures to monitor my progress.	N<10	3.34			
23	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Licensure Program standards for my discipline (e.g. NAEYC, CEC, NCTM).	N<10	3.15			
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.	N<10	3.04			
25	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the requirements for the Resident Educator License.	N<10	3.04			
26	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession.					
27	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Ohio Standards for Professional Development.	N<10	3.15			
28	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
29	My teacher licensure program provided me with knowledge of the Value-added Growth Measure as defined by the Ohio State Board of Education.	N<10	2.85			
30	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.					
31	My teacher licensure program provided field experiences in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, and rural).	N<10	3.33			
32	My teacher licensure program provided student teaching experience(s) that supported my development as an effective educator focused on student learning.	N<10	3.52			
33	My teacher licensure program provided cooperating teachers who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.52			

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
34	My teacher licensure program provided university supervisors who supported me through observation and conferences (face-to-face or via electronic media).	N<10	3.50
35	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse students (including gifted students, students with disabilities, and at-risk students).	N<10	3.33
36	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to understand students' diverse cultures, languages, and experiences.	N<10	3.34
37	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work with diverse teachers.	N<10	3.13
38	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to interact with diverse faculty.	N<10	3.17
39	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to work and study with diverse peers.	N<10	3.20
40	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program demonstrated in-depth knowledge of their field.	N<10	3.52
41	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used effective teaching methods that helped promote learning.	N<10	3.43
42	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program modeled respect for diverse populations.	N<10	3.49
43	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program integrated diversity-related subject matter within coursework.	N<10	3.37
44	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program used technology to facilitate teaching and learning.	N<10	3.35
45	Overall, the faculty in my teacher licensure program conducted themselves in a professional manner.	N<10	3.54
46	My teacher licensure program provided clearly articulated policies published to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.35
47	My teacher licensure program provided opportunities to voice concerns about the program.	N<10	3.12
48	My teacher licensure program provided advising to facilitate progression to program completion.	N<10	3.34
49	My teacher licensure program prepared me with the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the classroom as a Resident Educator.	N<10	3.28

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Principal Intern Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020

#### **Description of Data:**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic-related issues, including school closures and staff transitions in Ohio during the 2019-2020 school year, the distributions of some surveys were delayed, contributing to lower response rates.

To gather information on 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 204 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 26 percent.

# University of Findlay Survey Response Rate = 28.57% Total Survey Responses = 4

#### 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	3.60			
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	3.59			
3	My program prepared me to anticipate, monitor, and respond to educational developments affecting the school and its environment.	N<10	3.60			
4	My program prepared me to lead instruction.	N<10	3.60			
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	3.61			
6	My program prepared me to ensure effective instructional practices meet the needs of all students at high levels of learning.					
7	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of data by self and staff.	N<10	3.62			
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.					
9	My program prepared me to encourage and facilitate effective use of research by self and staff.	N<10	3.60			
10	My program prepared me to support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development and instructional practices.	N<10	3.61			
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	3.73			
12	My program prepared me to establish and maintain a nurturing school environment N<10 3.71 addressing the physical and mental health needs of all.					
13	My program prepared me to allocate resources, including technology, to support student and staff learning.	N<10	3.58			

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
14	My program prepared me to uphold and model professional ethics; local, state, and national policies; and, legal codes of conduct	N<10	3.74
15	My program prepared me to share leadership with staff, students, parents, and community members.	N<10	3.73
16	My program prepared me to establish effective working teams and developing structures for collaboration between teachers and educational support personnel.	N<10	3.71
17	My program prepared me to foster positive professional relationships among staff.	N<10	3.73
18	My program prepared me to support and advance the leadership capacity of educators.	N<10	3.68
19	My program prepared me to utilize good communication skills, both verbal and written, with all stakeholder audiences.	N<10	3.72
20	My program prepared me to connect the school with the community through print and electronic media.	N<10	3.58
21	My program prepared me to involve parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.67
22	My program prepared me to use community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.58
23	My program prepared me to establish expectations for using culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	N<10	3.65

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Principal Internship Mentor Survey Results**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020

#### **Description of Data:**

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic-related issues, including school closures and staff transitions in Ohio during the 2019-2020 school year, the distributions of some surveys were delayed, contributing to lower response rates.

To gather information on the quality of preparation provided by 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 70 respondents completed the survey statewide for a response rate of 12 percent.

# University of Findlay Survey Response Rate = 10% Total Survey Responses = 1

#### 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	3.36			
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	3.30			
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	3.34			
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	3.40			
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<10	3.40			
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	3.45			
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	3.41			
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	3.36			
9	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand supporting staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.					
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	3.47			

No.	Question	Institution Average	State Average
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	3.23
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<10	3.46
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	3.25
15	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand involving parents and communities in improving student learning.	N<10	3.29
16	The principal preparation program prepared the school leader candidate to understand using community resources to improve student learning.	N<10	3.25
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	3.26
18	The school leader candidate's preparation program provided me with training on how to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.67
19	I participated in and/or accessed the provided mentor training and/or materials.	N<10	2.96
20	The training by the school leader's preparation program adequately prepared me to mentor the school leader candidate.	N<10	2.09

#### **National Accreditation Status**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (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.

Accrediting Agency	NCATE
Date of Last Review	May-14
Accreditation Status	Accredited

### Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Teacher Residency Program**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (Data Source: University of Findlay)

#### **Description of Data:**

The Resident Educator Program in Ohio encompasses a robust four-year teacher development system. The data below show the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program.

Data from this table capture a year-to-year snapshot of the persistence of Ohio Educator Preparation Provider graduates through the program. Corrections to prior year reporting may be captured in the current year's reporting. Data used to create this "snapshot" table are sourced not only from the current year's resident educator completion data results, but also prior year results because a Resident Educator may fail to complete all the program year requirements within the same academic year.

Some of the scenarios addressed in the design of the table are as follows:

- 1. A normal scenario, where a student is reported each year and is listed as completed. In this case, we include them in only the Entering/Persisting counts for the current year.
- 2. A scenario where a student is reported as entering one year, but not as completed, but then reported the following year as completing the previous year and current year. In this case, we include them in the Persisting count for the previous year, but not the Entering count. We also include them in the Entering and Persisting counts for the current year.
- 3. A scenario where a student is not reported one year, but reported with records for the previous year and the current year the following year (both as completed). In this scenario, we include them in both the Entering and Persisting counts for both years.
- 4. A scenario involving a registration fluke where a student completes Year 1 of the RE program with an issued RE license, but not an effective or valid license until the following school year. For example, a teacher has all the qualifications for a full license, but completed Year 1 under a sub license (in which the work is counted) and Year 2 under a RE license.

# Ohio EPP Program Completers Persisting in the State Resident Educator Program who were Prepared at University of Findlay

Initial Licensure Effective Year	Residency Year 1			Residency Year 2			Resid	lency Ye	ear 3	Resid	ency Ye	ar 4
	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Pers	isting	Entering	Com	pleting
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	2	2	100%	5	5	100%	26	26	100%
2017	1	1	100%	2	3	150%	25	24	96%	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018	9	9	100%	12	12	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2019	29	29	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# Ohio Educator Preparation Provider Performance Report University of Findlay

#### **Excellence and Innovation Initiatives**

Reporting Period from Sept 1, 2019 to Aug 31, 2020 (Data Source: University of Findlay)

#### **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**

Initiative:	Higher Ed Interaction in PK-12 schools.
Purpose:	Collaboration
Goal:	To increase the involvement of higher education faculty in PK-12 schools.
Number of Participants:	51
Strategy:  Demonstration of Impact:	The University of Findlay faculty supervise students in the field and collaborate on projects related to literacy, assessment and methodology. Faculty work with 7th grade teachers in Findlay City Schools. Methods students are trained by Findlay City School teachers to work with parents and manage students during an overnight field trip. Teacher candidates are assigned a three day, two night session camp. During that session teacher candidates guide students through the daily camp routine and chaperone the cabins at night. Teacher candidates are also taught by adjuncts in actual classroom settings in Findlay City Schools. Intervention Specialist candidates partner with Findlay City Schools for job coaching opportunities.  Feedback from teachers and K-12 students.
External Recognition:	Recognized by Findlay City Schools and are invited back each semester.
Programs:	All programs.

Initiative:	The Clubhouse
Purpose:	To support and enhance the reading abilities and skills of struggling readers
Goal:	Increase reading ability of struggling reader K-12
Number of Participants:	172
Strategy:	Teacher candidates taking EDUC 423/EDFI 540, Assessment and diagnosis of Reading Difficulties, work with small groups of area school children throughout the semester to determine where they are struggling and plan and implement lessons to improve reading skills. The Clubhouse, established in 2008 and based within The University of Findlay's College of Education, is a free literacy outreach service provided to children of Hancock County and surrounding areas. It is the only free, after school program in the area that provides tutoring based on the individual needs of struggling readers. The Clubhouse also provides free, individualized tutoring through grants.
Demonstration of Impact:	In the individual tutoring students are given pre- and post-assessments, the 3 Minute Assessment (Rasinki & Padak). Through these assessments we can see student growth.
External Recognition:	Grant funding to support this program through The University of Findlay, The Hancock County Community Foundation and Hancock-Wood Electric
Programs:	Early Childhood, Intervention Specialist, Middle Childhood

Initiative:	iPad Initiative
Purpose:	To promote one-to-one strategies with COE students within their education courses and during their field experiences.
Goal:	To increase engagement with creativity and innovation utilizing technology.
Number of Participants:	146

#### Strategy:

The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) supports full technology integration into teacher education programs. CAEP states that technology is a cross-cutting theme and every aspect of teacher educator preparation should include technology in some way. There are three standards that specifically discuss technology integration. Through the 2016-2017 University of Findlay goal getter grant we purchased iPads for incoming freshmen. This gave us an opportunity to begin using them as a faculty and participate in some training and sharing of ideas. Once we saw the implementation of the iPads with students was beneficial we added a fee to the first undergraduate course to purchase iPads for incoming students. Currently freshmen, sophomores and juniors have iPads. We have seen huge benefits in the classroom and students are seeing more engagement during their field experiences.

#### **Demonstration of Impact:**

Teacher Candidate comments: "I used my iPad at every LAMP session and in class to teach a lesson an interactive SmartBoard PowerPoint which allowed me to work with the program on my iPad before I start using it in schools." -sophomore, Erin Shonk "The iPad has been an indispensable tool given to our class. We have used it to help plan and execute lesson plans as well as in LAMP. This is a great tool that will come in handy for our time here at UF." -sophomore, Sam Wayre

### **Principal Preparation Programs**

Initiative:	Embedding Internships into Strand Courses
Purpose:	Create more opportunities for candidates to get experience.
Goal:	All candidates gain more internship experiences
Number of Participants:	70
Strategy:	Before the culminating field experience, in the eight core classes required for a principal's license, there is a small internship built into each. This allows for candidates to gain experience in every aspect of the principal's job.