OVERALL PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE CATEGORY</th>
<th>POINTS EARNED</th>
<th>1.3 PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASE FROM 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOMAIN SUMMARY

CANDIDATE PROFILE

- 40.0% of points earned (1 Performance Category)
- 3 scored metrics
- 20 points available

EMPLOYMENT

- 99.5% of points earned (4 Performance Category)
- 2 scored metrics
- 15 points available

PROVIDER IMPACT

- 69.0% of points earned (3 Performance Category)
- 4 scored metrics
- 40 points available

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OVER TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Earned</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Performance Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>50.5 out of 75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>49.6 out of 75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>41.7 out of 75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

The Educator Preparation Report Card contains four (4) domains: Candidate Profile, Employment, Satisfaction, and Provider Impact. Each domain is comprised of multiple metrics. To date, data has not been collected for the Satisfaction domain, so it will be unscored this year. A provider must have at least ten total completers or licensed, job-embedded candidates and must generate a score on at least one half of the metrics in each domain in order to generate an overall performance category rating. For more information, please refer to the technical guide.

The 2018 Educator Preparation Report Card presents data on the State Board’s key priority areas for preparing educators for Tennessee. This is calculated using the percentage of points earned across all metrics. Category 1 represents the lowest performance, and Category 4 represents the highest performance.

The 2018 Educator Preparation Report Card will include data on three cohorts of completers (2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17). Performance on each metric is displayed in the format shown in the graphic on the right.

The score of 77.2 earned this EPP 1.7 of 3 possible points on this metric. This score increased 8.6 percentage points from 2016.

1. Scores in this range are below the scored range and earn an EPP no points.
2. This is the scored range. Scores in this range earn an EPP partial points proportionate to their score.
3. This range is above the target score. Values in this range earn an EPP maximum points.
ABOUT THIS PROVIDER

Website
http://www.mtsu.edu/education/

Dean
Dr. Lana Seivers

Established as one of Tennessee’s original Normal Schools in 1911, MTSU was founded for the purpose of preparing teachers. Today, preparing future teachers, counselors, and school leaders is still central to the mission of the College of Education by offering students a course of study that focuses on research, best practices, strong content knowledge, and clinical experiences. MTSU’s rich history in teacher preparation continues through such exceptional programs as Ready2Teach; Ed.D in Assessment, Learning, & School Improvement; Ph.D Literacy Studies; Center for the Study & Treatment of Dyslexia; Center for Counseling & Psychological Services; Center for Educational Media; and three on-campus Early Childhood lab programs serving young children. Collaborative partnerships with 43 school districts support program design, clinical experiences, and pre-service development, enabling MTSU teacher candidates to positively impact student performance on the first day they enter the classroom.

COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS

Teachers in Three-Year Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of State Three-Year Cohort

- Rest of the State: 90.8%
- This Provider: 9.2%

Enrollment by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State of Residency for Cohort Members

- In State: 97%
- Out of State: 3%
COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS CONTINUED

Initial License Type for Cohort Members

- Post Baccalaureate: 33.0%
- Baccalaureate: 67.0%

Clinical Practice Type for Cohort Members

- Internship: 0.0%
- Job Embedded: 20.5%
- Student Teaching: 79.5%

Percent of Admission Assessments Submitted to Program*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Analogies</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praxis Core</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Providers often consider multiple assessments in the admission process; some candidates were admitted using a former version of the Praxis assessment.
**Candidate Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Percentage Change from 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>40.0%</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage of Cohort with Qualifying Assessment Scores

This measure reports the percentage of the cohort with qualifying assessment scores on the ACT, SAT, or all three components of the Praxis: CORE. Providers often consider multiple assessments in the admission process; some candidates were admitted using a former version of the Praxis assessment.

**EPP Score**: 86.9
**State Score**: 86.4
**Possible Scoring Range**: 100

The score of 86.9 earned this EPP **0.1** of 3 possible points on this metric.

**N-Size**: 627

### Percentage of High-Demand Endorsements

This measure reports the percentage of endorsement issued in the areas of English as a Second Language, Secondary Math, Secondary Science (Biology, Chemistry, and Physics), Spanish, and Special Education (Modified, Comprehensive, and Interventionist).

For a complete list of specific endorsement areas, see the Technical Manual.

**EPP Score**: 19.4
**State Score**: 5.9
**Possible Scoring Range**: 33.7

The score of 19.4 earned this EPP **4.8** of 10 possible points on this metric.

**N-Size**: 955

### Percentage of Racially Diverse Cohort Members

This measure reports the percentage of cohort members who reported having a racially or ethnically diverse background.

**EPP Score**: 13.4
**State Score**: 3.1
**Possible Scoring Range**: 27.0

The score of 13.4 earned this EPP **3.0** of 7 possible points on this metric.

### See How the Candidate Profile Metrics are Calculated
EMPLOYMENT

Rate of First-Year Employment in Tennessee Public Schools
This measure reports the rate at which members of the three-year cohort were employed in Tennessee public schools within one year of receiving their initial license.
N-Size: 955

Score

- EPP Score: 80.3
- State Score: 52.7
- Possible Scoring Range: 80.7

The score of 80.3 earned this EPP 5.9 of 6 possible points on this metric.

Rate of Employment within Three Years In Tennessee Public Schools
This measure reports the rate at which members of the three-year cohort were employed for at least one year in Tennessee public schools within three years of receiving their initial license.
N-Size: 352

Score

- EPP Score: 81.8
- State Score: 0
- Possible Scoring Range: 100

This metric is unscored.

Second Year Retention Rate
This measure reports the percentage of first-year employed cohort members who remained teaching in Tennessee public schools their second year.
N-Size: 516

Score

- EPP Score: 97.3
- State Score: 77.8
- Possible Scoring Range: 95.5

The score of 97.3 earned this EPP 9.0 of 9 possible points on this metric.

Third Year Retention Rate
This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who were employed and remain teaching in Tennessee public schools for three years running.
N-Size: 289

Score

- EPP Score: 87.5
- State Score: 0
- Possible Scoring Range: 100

This metric is unscored.

SEE HOW THE EMPLOYMENT METRICS ARE CALCULATED
Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 3 or Above

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned a Classroom Observation score of at least a 3 ("At Expectations").
N-Size: 745

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score of 96.6 earned this EPP 6.0 of 6 possible points on this metric.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 4 or Above

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned a Classroom Observation score of at least a 4 ("Above Expectations").
N-Size: 745

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score of 62 earned this EPP 7.9 of 9 possible points on this metric.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth Scores (TVAAS*) are Level 3 or Above

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned a Student Growth Score (TVAAS*) of at least a 3 ("At Expectations").
N-Size: 343

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score of 58.9 earned this EPP 5.5 of 10 possible points on this metric.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Student Growth Scores (TVAAS*) are Level 4 or Above

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned a Student Growth Score (TVAAS*) of at least a 4 ("Above Expectations").
N-Size: 343

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score of 24.8 earned this EPP 8.2 of 15 possible points on this metric.

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Overall Level of Effectiveness Scores are Level 3 or Above

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned an overall level of effectiveness score of at least 3 ("At Expectations"). Overall Level of Effectiveness includes all components of a teacher's annual evaluation by state law and policy.
N-Size: 719

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This metric is unscored.
Percentage of Cohort Members whose Overall Level of Effectiveness Scores are Levels 4-5

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned an overall level of effectiveness score of at 4 or 5 (“above expectations” or “significantly above expectations”). Overall Level of Effectiveness includes all components of a teacher’s annual evaluation by state law and policy.

N-Size: 719

SEE HOW THE PROVIDER IMPACT METRICS ARE CALCULATED

*Due to challenges experienced with statewide student assessment in the 2017-18 school year, state law held students, teachers, and schools harmless from adverse actions based on results of those assessments. The data included in this report ensure providers are held harmless if any of their completers chose not to count their 2017-18 evaluation results due to assessment irregularities. To learn how this was accounted for in the data, click here. To view the relevant legislation, click here. To read a report conducted by a third-party research organization regarding the effect of assessment delivery challenges on student results, click here.