

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 follows¹:

- 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.

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

**University of Tennessee, Chattanooga:
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=16)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
18.8%	12.5%

Science (N=18)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
44.4%	5.6%

Reading / Language Arts (N=12)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
8.3%	16.7%

Social Studies (N=31)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.6%	22.6%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=7)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
14.3%	28.6%

Science (N=4)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
-	-

Reading / Language Arts (N=5)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
20.0%	40.0%

Social Studies (N=3)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
-	-

**University of Tennessee, Chattanooga:
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	(+)
	-0.2559	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.1014		

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0774	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0537	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.6974	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3077	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**University of Tennessee, Chattanooga:
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	(+)
	-0.5554	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.2178		

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1880	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1670	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.8742	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1572	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

University of Tennessee Chattanooga: 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
5.2%	59.4%	47.6%	65.8%	67.9%

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
5.8%	50.5%	56.9%	62.4%	65.3%