

Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs

December 1, 2010

**State Board of Education
9th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243
615.741.2966**

**Tennessee Higher Education Commission
404 James Robertson Parkway
Suite 1900
Nashville, TN 37243
615.741.3605**

Table of Contents

I. Report Summary	3
- Introduction	
- How to Use this Report	
- Teacher Effect Data	
- Placement and Retention Results	
- Praxis Results	
- Limitations of the Report Card	
- Future Iterations of the Report Card	
- Teacher Training Programs At-A-Glance	
II. Institution Report Cards	12
- Aquinas College	13
- Austin Peay State University	17
- Belmont University	21
- Bethel College	25
- Bryan College	29
- Carson-Newman College	33
- Christian Brothers University	37
- Cumberland University	41
- David Lipscomb University	45
- East Tennessee State University	49
- Fisk University	53
- Freed-Hardeman University	57
- Free-Will Baptist Bible College	61
- Johnson Bible College	65
- King College	69
- Lambuth University	73
- Lane College	77
- Lee University	81
- Lemoyne Owen College	85
- Lincoln Memorial University	89
- Martin Methodist College	93
- Maryville College	97
- Middle Tennessee State University	101
- Milligan College	105
- South College	109
- Southern Adventist University	113
- Teach for America	117

- Teach Tennessee	121
- Tennessee State University	125
- Tennessee Technological University	129
- Tennessee Wesleyan College	133
- Trevecca Nazarene University	137
- Tusculum College	141
- Union University	145
- University of Memphis	149
- University of Tennessee, Chattanooga	153
- University of Tennessee, Knoxville	157
- University of Tennessee, Martin	161
- University of the South	165
- Vanderbilt University	169
- Victory University	173
III. Appendix	177
A. Technical Report for the Effectiveness Study	178
B. Traditionally Licensed Teachers Effect Data	188
C. Alternatively Licensed Teachers Effect Data	244
D. Combined Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers Effect Data	298
E. Praxis Results	353
i. Summary Pass Rates	
ii. Professional Knowledge	
iii. Academic Content Areas (aggregate)	
iv. Education of Young Children	
v. Elementary Education: Curriculum Instruction and Assessment	
vi. Elementary School Content Knowledge	
vii. Middle School Content Knowledge	
viii. Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary	
ix. Principles of Learning and Teaching	
x. Tennessee Statewide Summary Praxis Results: STEM	

REPORT SUMMARY

Introduction

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-5-108 requires the state to develop a report card or assessment on the effectiveness of teacher training programs. This report includes data on the performance of each institution's graduates in the following areas required by state statute: placement and retention rates, PRAXIS results, and teacher effect data based on Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) scores. The analysis contained within this report is not based on a comprehensive set of measures upon which the quality of teacher training programs should be ranked. The information contained herein is to establish a baseline for teacher training programs and for the public to evaluate and review program effectiveness, based on specific measures of quality as defined by Tennessee Code Annotated 49-5-108.

Currently, the main function of the report card is to provide information on the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and is exclusively used as a reporting tool. This is the 3rd year that the report has been produced in this format. The report is currently being redesigned as part of the state's First to the Top initiatives. More information on the redesign process is provided at the end of this section.

How to Use this Report

The individual institution pages report on several indicators related to teacher effect data, placement and retention information, and praxis pass rates. The teacher effect analysis is only based on the teachers who have Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) scores. The individual institution reports only include the teacher effect estimates based on the TCAP subject tests in math, reading/language arts, science, and social studies in grades four through eight. The Appendix also includes effect data for teachers who taught high school courses with End-of-Course and Gateway exams. Therefore, it is important to note that the data being reported is limited to the beginning teachers (1 to 3 years of experience) from each institution who went on to teach in one of the TCAP tested subjects. Additionally, the data only represents the teachers in public K-12 schools in Tennessee, and does not reflect data on teachers who went on to teach in private schools or out of state.

The teacher effect data for the beginning teachers is used in comparison to three reference populations:

- *The 2009 – 2010 state distribution of teacher t-value of effects:* These data represents the percentage of beginning teachers from a training program in either the highest or lowest quintiles. A statistically significant larger percentage of teachers in the highest quintile indicates that an institution tends to produce highly effective teachers; conversely, a statistically significant larger percentage of teachers in the lowest quintile indicates that an institution tends to produce less effective teachers.
- *The 2009 – 2010 mean t-value effects of beginning teachers compared to the mean of the means for other Tennessee teacher training programs:* This analysis compares the effectiveness of beginning teachers from each institution to the average effectiveness of beginning teachers from all institutions.
- *The 2009 – 2010 mean t-value of teacher effect for beginning teachers compared to the mean of veteran teachers:* This analysis compares the effectiveness of beginning teachers from each institution to the statewide average effectiveness of teachers with more than three years of experience.¹

Teacher Effect Data

The SAS Institute, Inc. performed the analysis of teacher effect data for beginning teachers (defined as those with 1 to 3 years of experience) from all teacher preparation programs in the state. The goals of the study were: (1) to identify teacher training programs that tend to produce new teachers who are highly effective as well as to identify programs that tend to produce new teachers who are very ineffective, and (2) to determine if a teacher training program is above or below the reference distribution for each level of effectiveness with a fair and reliable statistical test. This report allows programs to differentiate between the performance of traditionally licensed and alternatively licensed teachers in comparison to three reference populations. A more detailed explanation of how to interpret the reference populations can be found in the section above.

¹ See the Technical Report in the Appendix for more information on the analysis and specific calculations

Statewide Teacher Effect Summary Information

Institutions with statistically significant positive and negative differences in the effectiveness of traditionally and alternatively licensed teachers with one to three years of experience in comparison to reference population

Subject	Statistically Significant Negative Difference	Statistically Significant Positive Difference
Percentage in Upper and Lower Effectiveness Quintiles based on the 2009 - 2010 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects		
Math	Lincoln Memorial TSU	Vanderbilt
Reading/Language Arts	Carson-Newman TSU U of Memphis UTC UTM	Teach for America
Science	Lincoln Memorial Trevecca Nazarene UTM	Teach for America
Social Studies	Carson-Newman MTSU	Teach for America
Comparison to the Mean of Means for All Institutions		
Math	Lincoln Memorial MTSU TSU	Christian Brothers ETSU Teach for America Vanderbilt
Reading/Language Arts	Carson-Newman TSU U of Memphis	Teach for America
Science		Belmont Teach for America
Social Studies	Lincoln Memorial MTSU	Lee Teach for America
Comparison to the Mean of Veteran Teachers		
Math	Lincoln Memorial MTSU TSU TTU Tusculum	Vanderbilt
Reading/Language Arts	Carson-Newman Christian Brothers ETSU MTSU TSU TTU Trevecca Nazarene Union	Teach for America

2010 Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs

	U of Memphis UTC UTM	
Science	APSU TSU U of Memphis UTM	Teach for America
Social Studies	Carson-Newman Christian Brothers Lincoln Memorial MTSU TSU TTU Trevecca Nazarene U of Memphis	Teach for America

Comparison of the 2009-2010 mean t-value of teacher effect of beginning teachers (1-3 years experience) to veteran teachers (more than 3 years experience) for traditionally and alternatively licensed teachers

Subject	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers	Number of Institutions
Algebra I	-0.2748	158	16
Biology I	-0.1334	72	9
English I	-0.8902	70	10
English II	-0.1709	47	6
Math	-0.2951	671	25
Reading/Language Arts	-0.2731	843	28
Science	-0.1520	668	27
Social Studies	-0.2913	700	26
US history	-0.2034	22	4

Notes:

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive difference

Placement and Retention Results

The report contains analysis for the 2003-04 through the 2007-08 cohorts of Title II completers, cross referenced against the Tennessee Personnel Information Reporting System (PIRS). The Center for Business and Economic Research at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville compared data from the state Completers Database² and PIRS in order to determine the placement and retention of teachers from specific institutions. This report provides data on the first year placement rate of each institution’s graduates as well as the percentage of graduates who continued to teach consecutively for three, four, and five years. The placement and retention data for the Teach Tennessee and Teach for America teachers were calculated using additional data provided by each program. This report does not include information on those teachers trained in Tennessee who went on to work in private schools or schools out of state.

*Placement and Retention Statewide Summary:
Title II Program Completers in the PIRS database*

Cohort Year	Completers	Teaching in Year 1	Teaching 3 Consecutive Years	Teaching 4 Consecutive Years	Teaching 5 Consecutive Years
2003 – 04	3500	61.3%	53.0%	49.9%	45.7%
2004 – 05	3791	62.5%	52.8%	47.8%	45.6%
2005 – 06	4030	62.9%	52.0%	49.7%	
2006 – 07	3822	62.3%	51.0%		
2007 – 08	3662	56.1%			

Note: Table does not include Teach Tennessee or Teach for America teachers

Praxis Results

Teacher candidates are required to take the Praxis II exams in order to be eligible to teach in Tennessee. Praxis II exams are offered in multiple content areas. Tennessee requires that teacher candidates take Praxis examinations to be recommended for licensure and receive endorsements in specific fields. The majority of teacher preparation programs have a high passing rate for all tests, ranging from 97 to 100 percent. Therefore, Praxis results do not necessarily provide information on variation between preparation programs. The table below provides statewide summary information on Praxis pass rates. Each institution page includes Praxis information as well for that specific preparation program. In addition, there is more detailed information on all Praxis results in the Appendix.

² Completers Database includes all teacher program graduates from public and private institutions of higher education in Tennessee

Statewide Summary of Praxis Pass Rates (2007-2008)

PRAXIS Results	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Summary Pass Rates	3,527	3,471	98
Professional Knowledge	3,399	3,353	99
Academic Content Areas	3,904	3,872	99

Limitations of the Report Card

The report card can be improved in several areas; specifically, data quality, design, and use. Several different sources are used to gather the data for the report card. Using these various sources can result in duplicative data and differing cohorts of students involved in each measure. Over the past several years, the report card has been based on data reported for Title II of the Higher Education Act. These data are no longer provided directly to the state and new data collection methods will need to be developed and implemented.

Tennessee statute required three specific measures be used to evaluate teacher preparation programs. Since the report card's inception, these measures have been refined and clarified. Further refinement is needed to have the most accurate assessment of the quality of teachers being produced. However, statute does not limit the scope of the report card to these three measures. One of the goals of the report card redesign is to identify additional measures that can be used to assess the quality of teacher training programs.

Once the data quality and design of the report card have been addressed, discussions concerning the use of the report card can take place. With a solid design and accurate data, the report card can be used to measure the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and provide accountability for producing effective teachers.

Future Iterations of the Report Card

Tennessee was one of the first two states to win funding in the federal Race to the Top Grant competition, and will be receiving a total \$501 million over the next four years. These funds will enable the state to make sweeping changes in the education system to help improve student learning and achievement. Research has consistently shown that the quality of teaching is the most important in-school factor affecting student achievement. Therefore, it is critical that the institutions responsible for preparing our state's teachers have the ability to use relevant data to assess the strengths and weaknesses of their programs and work towards making improvements. Over the next year, the

Tennessee Higher Education Commission will work in collaboration with teacher preparation programs, the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and other key stakeholders to redesign this report card in order for it to be more easily understood and a more useful report.

Tennessee's Race to the Top application specifies that committees will be formed to (1) Examine the three variables currently included on the report card and determine what other measurements accurately reflect effectiveness, (2) study report card redesign options, if any, so the data are clear and easily understood, and (3) discuss ways in which to use the report card (i.e. program improvement, program renewal or non-renewal). The committees will complete their work over the next year, and the revised report card will be released in the Fall of 2011.

Teacher Training Programs At-A-Glance

Teacher Training Program	Number of Completers 2007-08	Statistically Significant Positive Rating (Y/N)	Statistically Significant Negative Rating (Y/N)	Percent of 2005-06 Completers Teaching 4 Consecutive Years	Praxis II Summary Pass Rates 2007-08
Aquinas College	15	N	N	11.1%	100%
Austin Peay State University	162	N	Y	53.7%	98%
Belmont University	53	Y	N	49.1%	96%
Bethel College	15	N	N	71.4%	100%
Bryan College	15	N	N	15.8%	93%
Carson-Newman College	75	N	Y	54.2%	100%
Christian Brothers Univ.	116	Y	Y	35.6%	86%
Cumberland University	29	N	N	70.0%	97%
David Lipscomb University	76	N	N	32.7%	100%
East Tennessee State University	292	Y	Y	47.4%	100%
Fisk University	6	N	N	21.4%	n/a
Freed-Hardeman University	67	Y	N	52.9%	100%
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	10	N	N	27.3%	100%
Johnson Bible College	26	N	N	23.5%	100%
King College	17	N	N	30.0%	100%
Lambuth University	10	N	N	65.0%	90%
Lane College	3	N	N	0.0%	n/a
Lee University	130	Y	N	29.6%	99%
Lemoyne Owen College	3	N	N	71.4%	n/a
Lincoln Memorial University	148	N	Y	68.1%	100%
Martin Methodist College	15	N	N	21.1%	100%

2010 Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs

Teacher Training Program	Number of Completers 2007-08	Statistically Significant Positive Rating (Y/N)	Statistically Significant Negative Rating (Y/N)	Percent of 2005-06 Completers Teaching 4 Consecutive Years	Praxis II Summary Pass Rates 2007-08
Maryville College	45	N	N	56.0%	100%
MTSU	338	N	Y	62.5%	100%
Milligan College	44	N	N	48.1%	100%
South College	41	N	N	48.6%	100%
Southern Adventist University	32	N	N	6.1%	100%
Teach for America -Memphis	45	Y	N	8.9%	n/a
Teach Tennessee	41	N	N	57.9%	n/a
Tennessee State University	94	N	Y	39.5%	100%
Tennessee Tech University	374	N	Y	56.3%	99%
Tennessee Wesleyan College	35	N	N	66.7%	100%
Trevecca Nazarene Univ.	65	N	Y	49.0%	100%
Tusculum College	155	N	Y	65.3%	100%
Union University	43	N	Y	56.1%	100%
University of Memphis	420	N	Y	53.3%	97%
UT - Chattanooga	215	Y	Y	35.1%	100%
UT - Knoxville	177	N	N	54.5%	98%
UT - Martin	167	N	Y	55.5%	90%
University of the South	1	N	N	0.0%	n/a
Vanderbilt University	111	Y	N	7.0%	100%
Victory University	23	N	N	41.4%	100%