

## ***Introduction to the Data***

In response to Tennessee Code Annotated 49-5-108, the State Board of Education collaborated with the Governor's Office of State Planning and Policy to commission a study of teacher effect data, performed by SAS Institute, Inc.

The goals of the study were:

- 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.
- 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 year's report allows programs to differentiate between the performance of traditionally licensed and alternatively licensed teachers (1 to 3 years experience) in comparison to three reference populations. The reference populations are as follows<sup>1</sup>:

- the 2008- 2009 state distribution of teacher t-value of effects (grades 4 – 8).
- the 2008 – 2009 mean t-value effects of beginning teachers compared to the mean of the means for other Tennessee teacher training programs.
- the 2008 – 2009 mean t-value of teacher effect for beginning teachers compared to the mean of veteran teachers (i.e. teachers possessing more than 3 years experience).

The following institution report card is based on the following demarcations:

- **Green** indicates a ***statistically significant positive difference*** in relationship to the reference population or state distribution.
- **Red** indicates a ***statistically significant negative difference*** in relationship to the reference population or state distribution.

---

<sup>1</sup> The technical report for the study can be found on pages 16 – 27.

**Chrichton College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)**

*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

**Percentage of Effective Teachers (1 to 3 Years Experience) based on the 2008-2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects**

*Traditionally Licensed Teachers (2002 – 2008)*

Math (N=15)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
13.3%	26.7%

Science (N=13)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
7.7%	23.1%

Reading / Language Arts (N=20)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
25.0%	15.0%

Social Studies (N=13)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
15.4%	23.1%

*Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)*

Math (N=4)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
-	-

Science (N=2)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
-	-

Reading / Language Arts (N=2)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
-	-

Social Studies (N=3)

% Below the 20 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	% Above the 80 <sup>th</sup> Percentile
-	-

**Chrichton College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)**

*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

**Comparison of the 2008 – 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers as Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Key

- NSSD - No Statistically Significant Difference
- ( - ) – Statistically significant negative difference
- ( + ) – Statistically significant positive difference

*Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value*

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2380	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.5664	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1527	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3959	

*Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value*

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**Chrichton College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)**

*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

**Comparison of the 2008 – 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Beginning Teachers as Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008- 2009 Teacher Value-Added Data**

Key

- NSSD - No Statistically Significant Difference
- ( - ) – Statistically significant negative difference
- ( + ) – Statistically significant positive difference

*Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value*

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0615	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4500	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2633	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2826	

*Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value*

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

### **Crichton College: Placement & Retention**

2002 – 03 Completers in the Personnel Information Reporting System (PIRS)				
% of state total	Year 1	3 consecutive years	2 out of 3 Years	4 out of 5 years
0.6%	77.3%	63.6%	81.8%	81.8%

2003 – 04 Completers in the Personnel Information Reporting System (PIRS)				
% of state total	Year 1	3 consecutive years	2 out of 3 Years	4 out of 5 years
0.7%	52.0%	64.0%	68.0%	68.0%