

Report Card on the Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs

November 1, 2009

**State Board of Education
9th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243
615-741-2966
www.state.tn.us/sbe**

<http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/teacherreportcard.htm>

Purpose of the Report Card

Tennessee Code Annotated 49-5-108 specifies that the State Board of Education “with the assistance of the department of education and the Tennessee higher education commission, shall develop a report card or assessment on the effectiveness of teacher training programs.

The State Board is directed to “annually evaluate performance of each institution of higher education providing an approved program of teacher training and other state board approved teacher training programs”. The performance is meant to “focus on the performance of each institution's graduates and shall include, but not be limited to, the following areas:

- Placement and retention rates;
- Performance on PRAXIS examinations or other tests used to identify teacher preparedness; and
- Teacher effect data created pursuant to § 49-1-606.

Each teacher training institution and each LEA is directed to report all data as requested by the state board of education that the board needs to make such an evaluation. The report card or assessment shall be issued no later than November 1 of each year.

Table of Contents

I.	Purpose of the Report Card	1
II.	Preface	5
III.	Executive Summary	6
	A. T-Value Effects Summary	7
	1. Highly Effective Teachers	
	2. Comparison to TN Teacher Programs	
	3. Comparison to Veteran Teachers	
	B. Placement & Retention	13
	1. Traditional Programs	
	2. Alternative Programs	
	C. Praxis	15
IV.	Technical Report for the Effectiveness Study	16
V.	Institution Report Cards	28
	A. Aquinas College	29
	B. Austin Peay State University	30
	C. Belmont University	34
	D. Bethel College	38
	E. Bryan College	42
	F. Carson-Newman College	46
	G. Christian Brothers University	50
	H. Crichton College	54
	I. Cumberland University	58

J.	David Lipscomb University	62
K.	East Tennessee State University	66
L.	Fisk University	70
M.	Free-Will Baptist Bible College	71
N.	Freed-Hardeman University	72
O.	Johnson Bible College	76
P.	King College	77
Q.	Lambuth University	78
R.	Lane College	79
S.	Lee College	80
T.	LeMoyne Owen College	84
U.	Lincoln Memorial University	85
V.	Martin Methodist College	89
W.	Maryville College	90
X.	Middle Tennessee State University	94
Y.	Milligan College	98
Z.	Rhodes College	102
AA.	Southern Adventist University	103
BB.	Tennessee State University	104
CC.	Tennessee Technological University	108
DD.	Tennessee Wesleyen College	112
EE.	Trevecca Nazarene University	116
FF.	Tusculum College	120

GG.	Union University	124
HH.	University of Memphis	128
II.	University of the South	132
JJ.	University of Tennessee, Chattanooga	133
KK.	University of Tennessee, Knoxville	137
LL.	University of Tennessee, Martin	141
MM.	Vanderbilt University	145
VI.	Praxis	149
VII.	Appendix	150
A.	Traditionally Licensed Teachers	
1.	20 th and 80 th percentiles	
2.	Compared to Means of Institutions	
3.	Compared to Veteran Teachers	
B.	Alternatively Licensed Teachers	
1.	20 th and 80 th percentiles	
2.	Compared to Means of Institutions	
3.	Compared to Veteran Teachers	
C.	Combination of Traditional & Alternatively Licensed	
1.	20 th and 80 th percentiles	
2.	Compared to Means of Institutions	
3.	Compared to Veteran Teachers	
D.	Placement and Retention Analysis	223
E.	PRAXIS Examinations	227
1.	Summary Pass Rates	
2.	Professional Knowledge	
3.	Academic Content Areas (aggregate)	
4.	Early Childhood Education	
5.	Principles of Learning and Teaching	
6.	Elementary	
7.	Middle School	
8.	Reading Across the Curriculum	
9.	Biology, Chemistry, Physics	

Preface

- 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.
- This report would not have been possible without the cooperation and resources of the Governor's Office of State Planning and Policy, Tennessee Department of Education, Tennessee Higher Education Commission, SAS Institute, Inc., and the UT Center for Business and Economic Research. We thank each agency for their contribution to this project.
- The report format has been updated to include a summary for each respective institution of higher education.
- This year's edition allows for the comparison of traditionally licensed and alternatively licensed teachers by institution and content area for grades 4 through 8 (math, reading / language, science, and social studies).
- In reviewing last year's report, differences between outcomes when comparing the effects of teachers with three years vs. five years of experience did not convey statistically significant differences. This year's report is focused on the value added effects of teachers with three years of teaching experience (beginning teachers).

Executive Summary

Teacher Effectiveness

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).

A statewide summary follows, 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.

T-Value Effects: State Summary
Upper and Lower Quintiles (Grades 4 – 8)

Traditionally Licensed Teachers (2002 – 2008)

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

*Institutions with a **statistically significant positive difference** from the state distribution (upper or lower quintile).*

Subject	Statistically significant positive difference
Mathematics	Tusculum College University of Memphis
Reading / Language	University of Memphis
Science	East Tennessee State University Tennessee Technological University University of Tennessee, Martin
Social Studies	None

*Institutions with a **statistically significant negative difference** from the state distribution (upper or lower quintile).*

Subject	Statistically significant negative difference
Mathematics	Austin Peay State University Carson-Newman College
Reading / Language	Christian Brothers University
Science	Tusculum College University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
Social Studies	Austin Peay State University Tennessee State University

T-Value Effects: State Summary

Upper and Lower Quintiles (Grades 4 – 8)

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

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

*Institutions with a **statistically significant positive difference** from the state distribution (upper or lower quintile).*

Subject	Statistically significant positive difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	None
Science	None
Social Studies	None

*Institutions with a **statistically significant negative difference** from the state distribution (upper or lower quintile).*

Subject	Statistically significant negative difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	None
Science	None
Social Studies	None

T-Value Effects: State Summary
Comparison to Other Tennessee Programs

Traditionally Licensed Teachers (2002 – 2008)

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

*Institutions with a **statistically significant positive difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant positive difference
Mathematics	Union University University of Memphis
Reading / Language	None
Science	None
Social Studies	Cumberland University

*Institutions with a **statistically significant negative difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant negative difference
Mathematics	Austin Peay State University Carson-Newman College
Reading / Language	None
Science	Tennessee Wesleyan College University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
Social Studies	Middle Tennessee State University Tennessee State University

T-Value Effects: State Summary
Comparison to Other Tennessee Programs

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 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

*Institutions with a **statistically significant positive difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant positive difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	University of Memphis
Science	None
Social Studies	University of Memphis

*Institutions with a **statistically significant negative difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant negative difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	Middle Tennessee State University
Science	Trevecca Nazarene University
Social Studies	None

T-Value Effects: State Summary

Comparison to Veteran Teachers

Traditionally Licensed Teachers (2002 – 2008)

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

*Institutions with a **statistically significant positive difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant positive difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	None
Science	None
Social Studies	Cumberland University

*Institutions with a **statistically significant negative difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant negative difference
Mathematics	Austin Peay State University Carson Newman College East Tennessee State University Lee College Tennessee State University
Reading / Language	None
Science	Austin Peay State University Tennessee Wesleyan College University of Chattanooga
Social Studies	Austin Peay State University Middle Tennessee State University Tennessee State University

T-Value Effects: State Summary

Comparison to Veteran Teachers

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 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

*Institutions with a **statistically significant positive difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant positive difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	None
Science	None
Social Studies	None

*Institutions with a **statistically significant negative difference** from the reference population.*

Subject	Statistically significant negative difference
Mathematics	None
Reading / Language	Middle Tennessee State University
Science	None
Social Studies	None

Placement & Retention

In this edition of the report, placement and retention is analyzed based on program completers possessing a minimum of five years of eligibility. Research demonstrates that attrition is most severe during the first years of teaching, declining substantially after four to five years in the profession². The report contains analysis for the 2002-03 and 2003-04 cohort of Title II completers, cross referenced against the Tennessee Personnel Information Reporting System (PIRS). Analysis does not include teachers employed in private schools, or those teachers trained in Tennessee but teaching in other states.

Statewide Summary: Title II Program Completers in the PIRS database.

Cohort	Taught first 3 consecutive years	Taught 2 out of 3 eligible years	Taught 4 out of 5 eligible years.
2002-03	52.4%	70.6%	73.1%
2003-04	61.9%	70.2%	72.3%

Analysis by the National Center for Education Statistics (1999-2000) estimates that about 1/3 of school teachers leave the profession within the first three years of teaching and nearly half may leave during the first five years of teaching³.

Tennessee data is better than the national trend. Although the percentage of program completers in the first three consecutive years ranges between 52 and 62 percent, the statewide average is above 70 percent when examining the percentage of teachers employed in Tennessee's public schools for 4 out of 5 eligible years.

² Education Commission of the States (2005), [*Eight Questions on Teacher Retention and Recruitment: What Does the Research Say?*](#). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States Distribution Center.

³ National Commission on Teaching for America's Future (2003). [*No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children*](#). Washington, DC: NCTAF.

Placement & Retention: Preliminary Summary of Alternative Programs

Placement and retention analysis for this year’s report focuses on teachers with a maximum of five year’s of eligibility, including the 2002-03 and 2003-04 cohort of teachers of traditional teacher training programs.

Alternative teacher training programs, such as Teach Tennessee, The New Teacher Project, and Teach for America, contain data beginning as early as the 2005-06 academic year. The following is a preliminary summary of what the data reveals for such programs. Next year’s report will provide a more comparable comparison, based on the analyzed cohort of teachers.

Teach Tennessee

In the case of Teach Tennessee, this is the initial year in which the first cohort of teachers were eligible to begin teaching a maximum of five years from matriculation date. It is important to note that the following table outlines the percentage of cohort teachers which *began* the academic year teaching in a public school. This is also based on the 2005-06 cohort.

	Not Placed Yr. 1	Beginning Yr. 1	Beginning Yr. 2	Beginning Yr. 3	Beginning Yr. 4	Beginning Yr. 5
	0	1	2	3	4	5
June, 2005	23.5%	76.5%	61.8%	58.8%	55.9%	55.9%
November, 2005	25.0%	75.0%	70.8%	62.5%	54.2%	
June, 2006	3.2%	96.8%	74.2%	61.3%	45.2%	
November, 2006	41.7%	58.3%	54.2%	54.2%		
June, 2007	3.6%	96.4%	82.1%	75.0%		
June, 2008	38.5%	61.5%	34.6%			
June, 2009	36.4%	63.6%				
Grand Total	24.0%					

	Blue represents the % of cohort still teaching in public schools, based on maximum eligible years from original matriculation date
--	--

Teach for America

The Teach for America program commenced operations in Tennessee in the Fall of 2006. There will be two more iterations of the report before

detailed data from this initial cohort will be published.

A preliminary review of the data reveals that 90% (45 out of 50) of TFA corps members completed their two year commitment to the program. Similarly, 90% of TFA corps members transitioned successfully from their first year to their second year of teaching in Tennessee's public schools. The Praxis pass rate mirrors the Title II percentages of traditional teacher training programs (i.e. 97% or higher).

The New Teacher Project

The New Teacher Project commenced operations in Tennessee in the Fall of 2007. There will be two or three more iterations of the report before detailed data from this initial cohort will be published. On average, over 97% of New Teacher Project teaching fellows are hired within the first year of program completion. Additionally, Praxis pass rates mirrors the Title II percentages of traditional teacher training programs (i.e. 97% or higher).

Praxis Scores

Generally, most teacher training programs have a Praxis passing rate ranging from 97 to 100 percent for all tests. This high passage rates occurs because of the federal requirements for reporting data related to the Praxis as defined in Section 207 of the Title II Higher Education Act.

In 2009, Title II reporting requirements were updated to include new information related to alternatively licensed teachers. These new reporting requirements should reflect a different range of Praxis passing rates in future iterations of the report.

It is important to note that only statewide totals for the subject areas of Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics are included in this report, due to the low number of teaching graduates produced in these areas. The federal methodology does not report results for institutions with less than 10 test takers.

For 2006-07 there is no data available for Physics teachers, as the state did not have a combined total of 10 or more graduates.

Technical Report for the Effectiveness Study, 2008 - 2009 Commissioned for the Tennessee Teacher Quality Reforms

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

The Tennessee Teacher Quality Reforms initiative aims to improve student achievement and educational attainment in the state as a part of the state mandate to “develop a report card or assessment on the effectiveness of teacher training programs” (TCA 49-5-108). A key part of this goal will be realized via state and local programs focused on new teachers in terms of the recruitment, selection, preparation and support for these new teachers. The State of Tennessee asked SAS® EVAAS® to compare the teaching effectiveness of recent licensure recipients from various teacher preparation institutes to the effectiveness of other teachers in the state.

Thus, the goals of the effectiveness study were:

- To identify any university that tends to produce beginning teachers who are highly effective as well as to identify any university that tends to produce beginning teachers who are very ineffective
- To determine if a university is above or below the reference distribution with a fair and reliable statistical test

The importance of identifying such teacher training programs is evident in comparing the mean teacher NCE gain between highly effective teachers and highly ineffective teachers. This measure represents the average gain in learning for students. The chart below shows the mean teacher NCE gain for both the highest and lowest quintiles of teachers in the state for various subjects.⁴ The difference between the two groups reveals the substantial impact on student progress in terms of a student having a teacher from the highest or lowest quintile.

⁴ How the quintiles were selected is described later in this report.

Chart 1: Mean Teacher NCE Gains⁵

TCAP Subjects	Quintiles	
	Low	High
Math	-5.228	4.734
Reading/Language	-2.478	3.198
Science	-4.560	4.684
Social Studies	-4.820	4.854

In realizing the goals to assess teacher training programs, the effectiveness study also sought to provide a fair, rational method of comparison that is statistically sound, easy to interpret, and useful to both policymakers and the public. This was accomplished by examining the difference between the beginning teachers from each institution and two reference groups described in Section 4. This report is a technical document that explains these analyses in detail. This report does not include any results to the effectiveness study.

SECTION 2: KEY ELEMENTS OF THE TWO ANALYSES

The two analyses chosen to address the effectiveness study's goals used the same underlying data. This section describes what data were used, why and how they were used in the analyses, and the applied definition of effectiveness.

Data Used in the Effectiveness Study

The only teachers included in these two analyses were those who have value-added data from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), which is "a statistical system for educational outcome assessment which uses measures of student learning to enable the estimation of teacher, school, and school district statistical distributions" (TCA 49-1-603). TVAAS has been a part of state statute since 1992, and its use results in an extensive and useful statewide database on educational attainment of Tennessee students.⁶ The longitudinal, multivariate, mixed-model methodology of TVAAS produces more reliable estimates with less bias than other more simplistic models, an opinion recently corroborated by researchers at RAND.⁷ TVAAS has produced

⁵ Appendix 1 contains two additional charts similar to Chart 1, and they show the mean teacher NCE gain for new teachers.

⁶ More specific information on TVAAS methodology is available online at <http://www.sas.com/govedu/edu/sanderssaxtonhorn.pdf>

⁷ McCaffrey, D. F., Han, B. and Lockwood, J. R. (2008). *From Data to Bonuses: A Case Study of the Issues Related to Awarding Teachers Pay on the Basis of the Students' Progress*. Paper presented at the conference on Performance

teacher effect estimates since 1996, and these estimate a teacher's impact on student learning, as measured by students' performance on standardized tests, such as TCAP, Gateway and End-of-Course.

The teacher effect estimates were based on the TCAP subject tests in math, reading/language arts, science and social studies in grades four through eight as well as the high school End-of-Course and Gateway tests. Thus, teachers who teach non-tested subjects were not included in the analyses.

An additional group of teachers who were not included in the study were those who teach primarily special education students or students with low attendance records. This is because state statute prohibits the use of these students in value-added analysis (TCA 49-1-606).

SAS received two files from the State of Tennessee linking all teachers who had received their licensure from one of 39 Tennessee teacher preparation institutions to their respective institution of licensure.⁸ One file contained teachers who were licensed through the traditional route during the years 2002 – 2008 while the other file contained teachers who were licensed through the alternative route during the years 2003 - 2009. The timeframe was selected due to the study's focus: the effectiveness of teacher training programs in preparing beginning teachers, with the implicit assumption that other factors beyond the licensing institution could become quite influential in later years. At the request of the State of Tennessee, the definition of "beginning" teacher is those with 1 – 3 years of experience.

How the Data Were Used

Because individual teacher effects are private by state statute (TCA 49-1-606), the effectiveness study reported teacher effect data by group (subject, institution, type of licensure, etc.) so that the privacy of the teachers was not compromised. The grouping also increased the counts for each particular group so that fair comparisons could be made among teacher training programs since most institutions do not produce many teachers in a given subject/grade each year. More specifically, the study considered all grades in each subject together. In order for an institution

Incentives: Their Growing Impact on American K-12 Education, February 28-29, National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University's Peabody College: "Multivariate mixed model methods and fixed effects methods with shrinkage tend to provide estimates that appear to have relatively less noise and relatively less bias. Performance

measures from both methods tend to have strong cross-year correlation within teacher, weak correlation with students'

prior achievement, and relatively few teachers with small classes ranked in the extremes of the sample" (p. 37).

⁸ See Appendix 2 for a list of the teacher training programs.

to be included in the analysis for a particular subject, a minimum of five teachers from that institution were required. Results were reported for each type of licensure as well as for both types together.

Due to the emphasis on beginning teachers and the preparation received by their institutions, the effectiveness study utilized one-year estimates of teacher effectiveness from the year 2008 - 2009. More specifically, the *t-value* of the teacher effect was used as the basis of comparison rather than the teacher effect itself or the teacher gain.⁹ This solved three major problems, two of which apply specifically to TCAP tests.

First, using a measure based on the teacher effect rather than the teacher gain overcame issues relating to random assignment. Teachers from different institutions are not randomly assigned to their school districts; geography typically plays a role in the assignment. Because the TCAP tests utilize a value-added teacher effect that is centered on the district gain, an institution with a disproportionate number of their teachers in a district with either a very high or low gain could have a skewed comparison if teacher gain was used as the measure for evaluating teachers. By using a measure related to the teacher effect, the impact of the disproportional location of teachers from different teacher training programs was removed. Note, the district centering was not an issue for Gateway and End-of-Course tests because they utilize a value-added teacher effect centered on the average teacher in the *state* of Tennessee.

As a second advantage, using the *t-value* of the teacher effect, instead of the teacher effect alone, enables equitable comparisons across multiple grades, which was necessary for the reasons stated above. Because teacher effects are shrinkage estimates (BLUPs) in TVAAS methodology, they shrink back towards zero. In practice, this means they shrink back towards the district gain since the teacher effects are centered on the district gain. Because teacher variance components vary among grades, there are different amounts of shrinkage among different grades. For example, higher grades typically have less shrinkage. Thus, if one institution produces more teachers in higher grades than other institutions, then that institution could have an unfair advantage in any comparison because its teacher effects would likely have less shrinkage. However, as the shrinkage of any teacher effect increases, the standard error of the teacher effect decreases. Therefore, using the *t-value* of a teacher effect allowed a more fair comparison among teachers in different grades than using the teacher effect itself. Again, this issue did not

⁹ Teacher effect measures teacher effectiveness relative to the district average gain and is part of the solution to the mixed model equations for TCAP subjects. The *t-value* of the teacher effect is defined as the teacher effect divided by its standard error in all subjects. Teacher gain is defined as the teacher effect added to the district gain.

apply to Gateway and End-of-Course tests. However, for consistency as well as for the reason outlined below, the t-value of teacher effect is used for the high school subjects as well.

Finally, the use of the t-value of the teacher effect created a fair measure because teachers with very little data tend to have larger standard errors that shrink their measure towards zero. As a result, the use of the t-value promoted the use of teachers with sufficient data for evaluation. This benefit applies to TCAP tests as well as the Gateway and End-of-Course tests.

Definition of Effectiveness in the Study

At the request of the State of Tennessee, highly effective teachers were defined as those teachers in the highest quintile of the state distribution for their subject and grade, as measured by the t-value of the teacher effect. Likewise, highly ineffective teachers were defined as those teachers in the lowest quintile of the state distribution of teacher effect t-values for their subject and grade. The subject/grade combination was used as the basis of analysis so that teachers within any given subject/grade would not have any unfair advantage over any other subject/grade group. As demonstrated in the chart on page one, the study's emphasis on the highest and lowest quintiles is important because the difference in teacher gains between these two groups is substantial.

SECTION 3: IDENTIFYING INSTITUTIONS THAT TEND TO PRODUCE EITHER HIGHLY EFFECTIVE OR VERY INEFFECTIVE TEACHERS

The key elements discussed in Section 2 were then used to address the first goal of the study: identify whether an institution tends to produce more or less of these extreme teachers. To do so, the effectiveness study assessed the percentage of teachers from each institution in either the highest or lowest quintile, as measured by the t-value of their teacher effects. These percentages were compared to the state distribution and tested for statistical significance. In this way, policymakers can assess the effectiveness of teacher training programs in the state.

Defining the Quintiles and Percentages

As described in the previous section, quintiles used for this analysis were based upon the statewide distribution of the t-value of teacher effects from 2008 - 2009 value-added data. By definition, if an institution produced the same percentage of teachers as the state in each of these quintiles, then that institution would have 20% of its teachers in the quintile.

For each institution, the number of teachers in each of these quintiles was compared to the institution's total number of teachers, thus showing the percentage of teachers from a particular teacher training program in either the highest or lowest quintile.

Defining the Model

The difference between the institution's percentage of teachers in the extreme quintiles and the state's percentage was then tested for statistical significance in order to verify that the institution did tend to produce either highly effective or very ineffective teachers relative to the state population. Upper and lower quintiles were analyzed separately to avoid the inclusion of the middle quintile teachers (quintiles 2 – 4) since this latter group was not the focus of the effectiveness study. If an institution had less than five teachers in a subject/grade group, then they were not included in this analysis.

The model for this analysis utilized the binomial distribution to assess statistical significance, with a null hypothesis that the institution distribution is the same as the state distribution. More specifically, in the upper quintile analysis, a teacher was identified as either in the upper quintile or not. The number of teachers who fall into the upper quintile is distributed as a binomial distribution with success probability of 0.20 and the number of trials as the total number of teachers from that institution. Each institution had a certain percentage of teachers who fell into the upper quintile. The exact probability of this can be computed, assuming the null hypothesis, to provide a statistical test for whether or not the true probability of success is different from 0.20. A level of 0.10 was used to determine significance. Thus, if the probability was less than 0.10 of observing a value equal to or more extreme than the percentage of teachers in this quintile for a given institution, then the null hypothesis was rejected: there is sufficient evidence to show that the institution had a probability of producing teachers in the upper quintile that was either more or less than 0.20. The description of this analysis applied to the lower quintile analysis as well.

The tests described above provide a statistical comparison between each institution and the state distribution with respect to the percentage of teachers being produced that are highly effective or very ineffective.

Interpreting the Analysis

While the lower quintile analysis was the same as that for the upper quintile, the interpretation of the test for each quintile is different. For the lower quintile, it is better to have less than 20% of an institution's teachers in that quintile. Conversely, for the upper quintile, it is better to have more than 20% of an institution's teachers in that quintile.

If an institution has a statistically larger percentage of upper quintile teachers than the state distribution, then it tends to produce more highly effective teachers. Likewise if an institution has a statistically smaller percentage of lower quintile teachers than the state distribution, then it tends to produce less ineffective teachers. Teacher training programs with these qualities are doing a good job at producing beginning teachers. The reverse will also show teacher training programs that are doing a poor job at producing beginning teachers.

SECTION 4: DETERMINING IF A UNIVERSITY IS PRODUCING BEGINNING TEACHERS EITHER ABOVE OR BELOW THE REFERENCE DISTRIBUTION

The percentage of teachers from each institution who were either in the highest or lowest quintile provides very useful information to the effectiveness study, but a direct comparison of the teachers from one institution to a reference population would add to an understanding of how a teacher training program is performing overall. The mean t-value of the teachers has a direct relation to value-added analysis, which can enhance understanding among Tennessee's policymakers, educators, and public. Thus, the key elements discussed in Section 2 were then used to address the second goal of the study: determine if a university is above or below the reference distribution with a fair and reliable statistical test. This section describes how such an application was utilized.

Defining a Reference Population

The effectiveness study compared the performance of beginning teachers from the 39 institutions to the performance of teachers in a reference population. In this part of the study, there were two reference populations used for comparison, and they are each described below.

In the first set of analyses, the reference population was a control group that included any teacher who had more than three years of experience from the statewide distribution of teacher value-added data in the 2008 – 2009 school year. Using this reference population, the beginning teachers were compared by institution to these veteran teachers. In this set of analyses, the reference population included all types of licensure.

In the second set of analyses, the reference population was a control group that included beginning teachers linked to the 39 Tennessee institutions. If an institution did not have at least five teachers in a particular subject, then all teachers from that institution were removed from that subject's analyses. In this set of analyses, the reference population and comparison group had the same type of licensure, i.e.,

traditionally licensed beginning teachers were compared to other traditionally licensed beginning teachers.

Defining the Model

The calculation of the mean t-values of the teacher effects utilized a one-way ANOVA model with institution as the fixed effect. In addition to the 39 institutions of higher education used in the model, the institution effect comprised two other levels: (1) teachers with more than three years of experience and (2) any teacher who had three years or less of value-added data with an *unknown* institution of certification. This last group of teachers could include, for example, any teachers who came from other states or who may have been teaching non-tested subjects. For these reasons, they were included as a separate level of the effect. The three types of the institution effect provided the analyses with three distinct and possibly quite different groups of teachers. As such, the model allowed for different levels of variation in each group to ensure that an appropriate statistical test was utilized for each reference population.

As a first comparison, each teacher training program was compared to the veteran teachers in the model, provided that an institution had five or more teachers in that particular subject. The difference of the estimated mean teacher t-value of effects for each comparison was tested for significance.

As a second comparison, each teacher training program was compared to the beginning teachers. More specifically, each institution mean was compared to the mean of all of the institution means, with each institution weighted the same. The number of teachers for every institution was not a part of this weight since it would cause a small number of institutions to dominate the mean. This method of weighting ensured a more fair comparison among institutions. Again, if an institution had fewer than five teachers, then its data were removed from the analysis due to an insufficient number of teachers for a reliable statistical estimate.

As a third comparison, the difference between the two reference populations was considered to determine if the beginning teachers from the institutions were significantly different from the veteran teachers in Tennessee. More specifically, the mean of veteran teachers was compared to the mean of institution means for beginning teachers, provided that the beginning teachers' institution had at least five teachers in the subject being analyzed.

Index for Comparison

For ease of interpretation and utility for comparing the teacher training program, an index was created, based on the mean t-value of teacher effects. In the calculation of this index, each institution mean was compared with the mean of the reference population.

Each difference was between an individual teacher training program and the reference group, which represented either the veteran teachers or the beginning teacher subset.

The index analyses sought to present a balanced assessment of the net effectiveness of each teacher training program by showing how average teachers from each program would compare to the reference population. If any difference between the institution and reference mean is positive, then the institution mean is greater than the reference population mean t-value of teacher effects. A significant positive number indicates that a teacher training program has produced beginning teachers with statistically significantly larger mean t-values as compared to the reference population in terms of a teacher's mean t-value of effects in 2008 - 2009. A level of 0.10 was used to test statistical significance. These comparisons were made by type of licensure as well as by both types together for institutions that had sufficient data.

Interpreting the Indices

In the TCAP subjects, the mean t-value of teacher effects for each group (i.e., subject/grade combination for a particular institution) is a meaningful comparison that does not confound the district distribution of teachers and is also interpretable in NCE value-added teacher gains. The mean t-value can be interpreted as follows: on average, teachers in this group have estimated teacher gains that are X number of standard errors away from their district's mean NCE gain, where X represents the index for comparison. In other words, teachers in that group have sufficient data to show their estimated teacher gain is either above or below their district's mean NCE gain by the reported factor.

In the high school subjects, the mean t-value of teacher's effects is also a meaningful comparison across the state of Tennessee. The mean t-value can be interpreted as follows: on average, teachers in this group have estimated teacher effects that are X number of standard errors away from the average teacher effect in the state of Tennessee, where X represents the index for comparison. In other words, teachers in that group have sufficient data to show their estimated teacher effect is above or below the average teacher effect in the state of Tennessee.

Thus in both cases, an institution producing beginning teachers with significantly better t-values of teacher effects will have a positive impact

on student progress. Ideally, new methods of training at the institutions enable beginning teachers to outperform existing teachers.

SECTION 5: REPORTING THE RESULTS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

The effectiveness study results present the number, percentages, and index measures associated with each of the 39 Tennessee institutions by subject as long as that teacher training program has sufficient data. If the percentage or index measure is statistically significant from the statewide average at the 90% confidence level, this will be noted. Results were presented by institution for each type of license as well as for both types together.

Appendix 1: Mean Teacher NCE Gain for Beginning Teachers

Chart 2: Mean Teacher NCE Gains for Beginning Teachers with 1-3 Years Experience

TCAP Subjects	Quintiles	
	Low	High
Math	-5.500	4.575
Reading/Language	-2.711	2.879
Science	-4.953	4.252
Social Studies	-5.057	4.326

Appendix 2: List of Participating Institutions

Aquinas College
Austin Peay State University
Belmont University
Bethel College
Bryan College
Carson-Newman College
Christian Brothers University
Crichton College
Cumberland University
David Lipscomb University
East Tennessee State University
Fisk University
Free-Will Baptist Bible College
Freed-Hardeman College
Johnson Bible College
King College
Lambuth University
Lane College
LeMoyne Owen College
Lee College
Lincoln Memorial University
Martin Methodist College
Maryville College
Middle Tennessee State University
Milligan College
Rhodes College
Southern Adventist University
Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University
Tennessee Wesleyan College
Trevecca Nazarene University
Tusculum College
Union University
University of Memphis
University of South
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
University of Tennessee, Martin
Vanderbilt University

Institution Report Cards

Aquinas College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Aquinas 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
0.5%	21.1%	15.8%	21.1%	21.1%

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
0.5%	18.8%	12.5%	18.8%	18.8%

Austin Peay State University: 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=31)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
35.5%	9.7%

Science (N=21)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
19.1%	9.5%

Reading / Language Arts (N=40)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.5%	25.0%

Social Studies (N=26)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
42.3%	26.9%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=5)

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

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
25.0%	0.0%

Social Studies (N=2)

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

Austin Peay State University: 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	(+)
-0.7512		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.6431	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0305	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5229	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1856	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4139	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Austin Peay State University: 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

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.0506		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.7595		

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1410	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.6362		

Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0088	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5643	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Austin Peay State University: 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
5.4	61.8%	51.8%	70.7%	72.8%

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
3.3%	59.1%	55.7%	65.2%	65.2%

**Belmont University University:
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=3)

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

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.7%	33.3%

Social Studies (N=3)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003- 2009)

Math (N=3)

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

Science (N=1)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=1)

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

Social Studies (N=3)

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

**Belmont University University:
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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2162	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**Belmont University University:
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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1056	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Belmont University: 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
0.9%	58.1%	41.9%	61.3%	61.3%

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
1.5%	60.4%	41.5%	64.2%	66.0%

Bethel 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=3)

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

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=3)

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

Social Studies (N=4)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=2)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	16.7%

Social Studies (N=1)

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

Bethel 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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1095	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Bethel 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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2600	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Bethel 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%	78.3%	69.6%	82.6%	91.3%

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
0.6%	90.0%	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%

Bryan 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=2)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=3)

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

Social Studies (N=2)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=0)

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

Science (N=0)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=0)

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

Social Studies (N=0)

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

Bryan 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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Bryan 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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Bryan 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
0.5%	17.6%	0.0%	23.5%	29.4%

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%	33.3%	41.7%	45.8%	45.8%

Carson-Newman 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=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
55.6%	0.0%

Science (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
25.0%	25.0%

Reading / Language Arts (N=15)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
26.7%	6.7%

Social Studies (N=5)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=0)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=0)

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

Social Studies (N=0)

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

Carson-Newman 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	(+)
-1.6920		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0830	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2586	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3381	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Carson-Newman 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	(+)
-1.9915		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1994	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3691	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4514	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Carson-Newman 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
2.8%	72.3%	65.3%	84.2%	85.1%

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
3.4%	58.3%	70.8%	71.7%	74.2%

Christian Brothers University: 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=18)

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

Science (N=13)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0%	15.4%

Reading / Language Arts (N=17)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
41.2%	17.7%

Social Studies (N=18)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	16.7%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=2)

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

Science (N=2)

% 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
40.0%	20.0%

Social Studies (N=2)

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

Christian Brothers University: 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	(+)
	0.0393	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0117	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0350	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1393	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0539	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Christian Brothers University: 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	(+)
	-0.2602	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1281	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0756	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2526	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2043	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Christian Brothers University: 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
2.9%	73.5%	61.8%	78.4%	80.4%

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
2.7%	73.4%	67.0%	76.6%	76.6%

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 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
13.3%	26.7%

Science (N=13)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
7.7%	23.1%

Reading / Language Arts (N=20)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
25.0%	15.0%

Social Studies (N=13)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
15.4%	23.1%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=4)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=2)

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

Social Studies (N=3)

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

Cumberland University: 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=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
50.0%	33.3%

Science (N=5)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0%	22.2%

Social Studies (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
12.5%	37.5%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=3)

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

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=3)

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

Social Studies (N=1)

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

Cumberland University: 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	(+)
	-0.0149	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0142	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3285	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
		1.2462

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Cumberland University: 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	(+)
	-0.3144	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1022	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2180	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
		1.1330

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Cumberland University: 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
0.8%	72.4%	72.4%	82.8%	82.8%

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
1.0%	82.4%	85.3%	91.2%	94.1%

David Lipscomb University: 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=14)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
14.3%	7.1%

Science (N=15)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=15)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
13.3%	20.0%

Social Studies (N=18)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
11.1%	38.9%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=1)

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

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=3)

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

Social Studies (N=1)

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

David Lipscomb University: 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	(+)
	0.0757	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3466	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2646	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.5842	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

David Lipscomb University: 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	(+)
	-0.2238	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2302	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1541	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4709	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

David Lipscomb University: 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
1.4%	48.0%	40.0%	52.0%	54.0%

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
1.5%	50.0%	51.9%	57.4%	66.7%

**East Tennessee State University:
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=39)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
23.1%	18.0%

Science (N=40)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
7.5%	17.5%

Reading / Language Arts (N=41)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.0%	14.6%

Social Studies (N=38)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
10.5%	23.7%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=0)

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

Science (N=0)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=0)

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

Social Studies (N=1)

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

**East Tennessee State University:
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	(+)
	-0.3663	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3427	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1299	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2655	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**East Tennessee State University:
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	(+)
-0.6658		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2263	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2405	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1522	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

East Tennessee State University: 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
7.3%	54.8%	47.9%	68.2%	71.6%

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
6.6%	53.0%	61.7%	65.7%	70.0%

Fisk University: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Fisk University: 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
0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	50%	50%

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
0.2%	66.7%	83.3%	83.3%	83.3%

Free Will Baptist College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)

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

No analysis based on less than 5 teachers per content area.

Free Will Baptist Bible 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
0.4%	46.7%	40.0%	60.0%	66.7%

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
0.3%	55.6%	77.8%	77.8%	88.9%

Freed-Hardeman University: 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=7)

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

Science (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
11.1%	33.3%

Reading / Language Arts (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	16.7%

Social Studies (N=7)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=3)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.7%	0.0%

Social Studies (N=7)

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

Freed-Hardeman University: 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	(+)
	0.2896	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.5867	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1432	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0920	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0312	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.7392	

Freed-Hardeman University: 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	(+)
	-0.0099	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4704	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2537	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2053	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1816	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3029	

Freed-Hardeman University: 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
2.1%	68.9%	58.1%	74.3%	79.7%

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
1.6%	60.7%	51.8%	69.6%	71.4%

Johnson Bible College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Johnson Bible 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
0.3%	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%	33.3%

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
0.3%	55.6%	33.3%	55.6%	55.6%

King College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

King 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
0.4%	30.8%	30.8%	30.8%	38.5%

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
0.5%	33.3%	38.9%	44.4%	44.4%

Lambuth University: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Lambuth University: 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%	52.2%	30.4%	73.9%	73.9%

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
0.4%	85.7%	71.4%	92.9%	92.9%

Lane College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Lane 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%	0%	0%	0%	0%

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%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Lee 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=30)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
26.7%	10.0%

Science (N=28)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
21.4%	14.3%

Reading / Language Arts (N=37)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
32.4%	24.3%

Social Studies (N=31)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
25.8%	9.7%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=5)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0%	20.0%

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	16.7%

Social Studies (N=4)

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

Lee 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	(+)
	-0.4572	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4060	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1544	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4413	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2957	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0693	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Lee 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	(+)
-0.7566		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5223	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2650	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5546	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4725	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0812	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Lee 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
4.0%	47.9%	37.3%	54.2%	58.5%

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
4.3%	41.6%	45.6%	48.3%	51.7%

LeMoyne Owen College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)

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

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

LeMoyne-Owen 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
0.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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
0.1%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Lincoln Memorial University: 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=21)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
19.1%	14.3%

Science (N=21)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
19.1%	9.5%

Reading / Language Arts (N=27)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
14.8%	25.9%

Social Studies (N=17)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
23.5%	5.9%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=4)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=3)

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

Social Studies (N=2)

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

Lincoln Memorial University: 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	(+)
	-0.0693	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3500	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2118	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5002	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Lincoln Memorial University: 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	(+)
	-0.3688	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4664	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1013	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.6135	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Lincoln Memorial University: 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
3.8%	71.3%	63.2%	77.2%	77.2%

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
3.5%	71.9%	71.1%	75.2%	75.2%

Martin Methodist College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)
One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Martin Methodist 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
0.5%	36.8%	31.6%	73.7%	78.9%

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
0.3%	81.8%	81.8%	90.9%	90.9%

Maryville 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=4)

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

Science (N=5)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0%	20.0%

Reading / Language Arts (N=4)

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

Social Studies (N=5)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=0)

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

Science (N=0)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=0)

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

Social Studies (N=0)

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

Maryville 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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4764	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5466	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Maryville 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	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3601	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.6599	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Maryville 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
0.9%	80.6%	71.0%	83.9%	83.9%

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
1.1%	69.2%	79.5%	82.1%	82.1%

**Middle Tennessee State University:
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=48)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
18.8%	20.8%

Science (N=48)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
14.6%	20.8%

Reading / Language Arts (N=66)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.7%	19.7%

Social Studies (N=49)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
18.4%	12.2%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=4)

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

Science (N=5)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=10)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
40.0%	10.0%

Social Studies (N=5)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
40.0%	0.0%

**Middle Tennessee State University:
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	(+)
	0.0031	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3425	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0027	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.5496		

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5369	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.8737		

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4668	

**Middle Tennessee State University:
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	(+)
	-0.2964	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2261	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1132	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.6628		

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4020	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.0242		

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.9031	

Middle Tennessee State University: 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
10.6%	66.4%	57.9%	80.2%	82.8%

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
7.6%	78.9%	77.0%	86.0%	87.5%

Milligan 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=5)

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

Science (N=5)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=5)

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

Social Studies (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
37.5%	12.5%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=0)

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

Science (N=0)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=4)

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

Social Studies (N=1)

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

Milligan 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	(+)
	0.4269	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.6021	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3569	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0945	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Milligan 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	(+)
	0.1274	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4857	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4674	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2078	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Milligan 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
2.0%	28.6%	24.3%	37.1%	38.6%

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
1.2%	51.2%	55.8%	58.1%	60.5%

Rhodes College: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)*One year estimates of T-value of teacher effects (2008 – 2009)*

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Rhodes 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
0.4%	43.8%	43.8%	50.0%	62.5%

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
0.1%	50%	50%	50%	100%

**Southern Adventist University:
Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)**

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

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

Southern Adventist University: 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
0.8%	6.7%	0%	6.7%	6.7%

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
1.2%	7.0%	4.7%	7.0%	7.0%

Tennessee State University: 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=34)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
23.5%	11.8%

Science (N=38)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
15.8%	21.1%

Reading / Language Arts (N=37)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.2%	18.9%

Social Studies (N=38)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
34.2%	15.8%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.7%	50.0%

Science (N=4)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=15)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	6.7%

Social Studies (N=5)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
40.0%	0.0%

Tennessee State University: 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	(+)
	-0.3150	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2031	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3043	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.5620		

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.6173	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2072	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-1.0621	

Tennessee State University: 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	(+)
-0.6144		

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1879	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0925	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-0.6753		

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.7941	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3576	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-1.4985	

Tennessee State University: 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
3.8%	65.0%	56.9%	71.5%	73.7%

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
3.3%	69.2%	70.9%	77.8%	79.5%

**Tennessee Technological University:
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=50)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
14.0%	20.0%

Reading / Language Arts (N=82)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
19.5%	15.9%

Science (N=60)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
10.0%	20.0%

Social Studies (N=59)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
11.9%	15.3%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=5)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
12.5%	25.0%

Science (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	33.3%

Social Studies (N=5)

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

**Tennessee Technological University:
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	(+)
	0.1763	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1142	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0049	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0557	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0210	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1711	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0777	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**Tennessee Technological University:
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	(+)
	-0.1231	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0022	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1154	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0576	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.19781	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3060	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0728	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Tennessee Technological University: 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
8.1%	64.9%	56.9%	78.5%	80.2%

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
8.3%	63.0%	68.2%	78.1%	81.5%

**Tennessee Wesleyan 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=7)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
28.6%	0.0%

Science (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
50.0%	0.0%

Reading / Language Arts (N=10)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0%	10.0%

Social Studies (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
12.5%	25.0%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=0)

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

Science (N=1)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=0)

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

Social Studies (N=0)

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

**Tennessee Wesleyan 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	(+)
	-0.4267	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.4339		

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4338	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2782	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**Tennessee Wesleyan 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	(+)
	-0.7261	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.5503	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3232	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1649	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Tennessee Wesleyan 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
0.8%	74.1%	70.4%	77.8%	81.5%

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
0.9%	60.0%	80.0%	83.3%	86.7%

Trevecca Nazarene University: 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%	6.3%

Science (N=18)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.7%	5.6%

Reading / Language Arts (N=17)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
29.4%	5.9%

Social Studies (N=19)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
5.3%	5.3%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.2%	22.2%

Science (N=13)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
38.5%	23.1%

Reading / Language Arts (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
11.1%	0.0%

Social Studies (N=10)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
20.0%	10.0%

Trevecca Nazarene University: 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	(+)
	-0.5287	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4620	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3055	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2636	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0363	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
-1.1092		

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0239	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0719	

Trevecca Nazarene University: 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	(+)
	-0.8282	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5784	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4160	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3769	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2131	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.9744	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1266	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5083	

Trevecca Nazarene University: 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
0.5%	58.8%	52.9%	64.7%	64.7%

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
1.2%	68.3%	65.9%	73.2%	73.2%

Tusculum 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=29)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
20.7%	34.5%

Science (N=27)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
37.0%	22.2%

Reading / Language Arts (N=37)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
10.8%	18.9%

Social Studies (N=19)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
10.0%	30.0%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=1)

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

Science (N=1)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=1)

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

Social Studies (N=1)

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

Tusculum 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	(+)
	0.6206	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3128	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0878	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4967	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Tusculum 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	(+)
	0.3212	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4292	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0228	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3835	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Tusculum 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
1.3%	48.9%	42.6%	74.5%	78.7%

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
1.9%	44.6%	60.0%	63.1%	64.6%

Union University: 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=7)

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

Science (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.7%	33.3%

Reading / Language Arts (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.2%	11.1%

Social Studies (N=7)

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

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=8)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
25.0%	12.5%

Science (N=3)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=7)

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

Social Studies (N=3)

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

Union University: 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	(+)
		1.2857

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3815	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5256	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4698	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0052	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2241	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Union University: 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	(+)
	0.9862	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2651	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.6362	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3565	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1716	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0737	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Union University: 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
1.7%	61.0%	54.2%	71.2%	72.9%

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
2.9%	65.7%	63.7%	73.5%	75.5%

University of Memphis: 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=85)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
23.8%	34.5%

Science (N=83)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
18.1%	16.9%

Reading / Language Arts (N=89)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
23.6%	29.2%

Social Studies (N=86)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.1%	20.9%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=15)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
20.0%	26.7%

Science (N=20)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
15.0%	15.0%

Reading / Language Arts (N=19)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
8.3%	25.0%

Social Studies (N=3)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
26.3%	36.8%

University of Memphis: 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	(+)
		0.5590

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0625	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0683	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0233	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5845	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.2461	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
		0.5771

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
		1.3713

University of Memphis: 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	(+)
	0.2595	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0422	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0539	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0900	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.4077	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4267	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1112	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.9349	

University of Memphis: 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
11.8%	73.5%	60.9%	80.1%	82.2%

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
13.0%	68.6%	63.8%	73.9%	75.4%

University of the South: Teacher T-Value Effects (Grades 4 – 8)

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

Less than 5 teachers per content area. Not eligible for analysis.

University of the South: 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
0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%

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
0.2%	50.0%	50.0%	75.0%	75.0%

**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%

**University of Tennessee, Knoxville:
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=21)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
23.8%	4.8%

Science (N=16)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=23)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
8.7%	8.7%

Social Studies (N=14)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
28.6%	7.1%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=3)

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

Science (N=7)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0	42.9%

Reading / Language Arts (N=4)

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

Social Studies (N=3)

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

**University of Tennessee, Knoxville:
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	(+)
	-0.1798	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0434	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0152	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1948	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.9934	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

**University of Tennessee, Knoxville:
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	(+)
	-0.4792	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0730	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.1258	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.3081	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	1.1283	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

University of Tennessee Knoxville: 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
9.5%	64.6%	52.8%	70.5%	73.5%

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
11.2%	68.1%	64.0%	77.8%	78.6%

**University of Tennessee, Martin:
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=19)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
5.3%	10.5%

Reading / Language Arts (N=37)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
13.5%	24.3%

Science (N=24)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
4.2%	8.3%

Social Studies (N=25)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
8.0%	16.0%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
22.2%	22.2%

Reading / Language Arts (N=7)

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

Science (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
11.1%	33.3%

Social Studies (N=5)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
40.0%	0.0%

**University of Tennessee, Martin:
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	(+)
	0.4304	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1234	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.1072	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4048	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.8924	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.7277	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4097	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.5097	

**University of Tennessee, Martin:
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	(+)
	0.1310	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0070	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0034	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2915	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.7156	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.8626	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2592	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.9461	

University of Tennessee Martin: 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
4.0%	68.3%	64.1%	79.6%	82.4%

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
3.4%	64.4%	62.7%	72.9%	78.8%

Vanderbilt University: 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=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
0.0%	16.7%

Science (N=6)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
16.7%	33.3%

Reading / Language Arts (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
33.3%	22.2%

Social Studies (N=9)

% Below the 20 th Percentile	% Above the 80 th Percentile
11.1%	22.2%

Alternatively Licensed Teachers (2003 – 2009)

Math (N=4)

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

Science (N=2)

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

Reading / Language Arts (N=0)

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

Social Studies (N=0)

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

Vanderbilt University: 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	(+)
	0.9124	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.4971	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.2011	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0783	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Vanderbilt University: 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	(+)
	0.6129	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.3807	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	0.0905	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-0.0349	

Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Mean T-Value

Math

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Science

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Reading / Language Arts

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Social Studies

(-)	NSSD	(+)
	-	

Vanderbilt University: 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
2.5%	22.7%	15.9%	26.1%	29.5%

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
2.9%	29.1%	22.3%	33.0%	34.0%

Praxis Scores

Introduction

Data reporting requirements for the Higher Education Act focus on “program completers”, as defined by the reporting institution. This requirement does not facilitate the reporting of data for teacher candidates who have finished all graduation requirements and all licensure requirements yet have still failed the Praxis II, the Principle of Learning and Teaching Test, or other subject area test. Additionally, the reporting requirement does not include a record of teachers who failed the Praxis exam on their first attempt, subsequently passing the exam in a later test administration.

The Praxis data contained herein (Appendix, pages 227 – 243) is for the most recent year in which Praxis data is reported publicly, the 2006-07 academic year. The following categories are based on a minimum number of 10 test takers for inclusion in the federal report:

- Summary Pass Rates
- Professional Knowledge
- Academic Content Areas (aggregate)
- Early Childhood Education
- Principles of Learning and Teaching
- Elementary
- Middle School
- Reading Across the Curriculum
- Biology, Chemistry, Physics

Table cells with asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers for the specified institution. The report also includes quartile ranges, as identified below:

Quartile I -- Range, Mean	100 - 100, 100.0
Quartile II -- Range, Mean	95 - 99, 97.8
Quartile III -- Range, Mean	91 - 93, 91.9
Quartile IV -- Range, Mean	75 - 90, 83.1

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

Due to the low number of program completers per institution in the areas of Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Mathematics, statewide totals are reported. Institutions with 10 or more test takers in these specified areas are included.

Appendix

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	11	35.5	3	9.7	31
Belmont University	3
Bethel College	3
Bryan College	2
Carson-Newman College	5	55.6	0	0.0	9
Christian Brothers University	3	16.7	3	16.7	18
Crichton College	2	13.3	4	26.7	15
Cumberland University	3	50.0	2	33.3	6
David Lipscomb University	2	14.3	1	7.1	14
East Tennessee State University	9	23.1	7	18.0	39
Fisk University	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	1	14.3	1	14.3	7
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	1
Lambuth University	2
Lane College	0
Lee College	8	26.7	3	10.0	30
Lemoyne Owen College	2
Lincoln Memorial University	4	19.1	3	14.3	21
Martin Methodist College	3
Maryville College	4
Middle Tennessee State University	9	18.8	10	20.8	48
Milligan College	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	8	23.5	4	11.8	34
Tennessee Technological University	7	14.0	10	20.0	50

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	2	28.6	0	0.0	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	3	18.8	1	6.3	16
Tusculum College	6	20.7	10	34.5	29
Union University	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
University Of Memphis	20	23.8	29	34.5	84
University Of South	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	3	18.8	2	12.5	16
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	5	23.8	1	4.8	21
University Of Tennessee, Martin	1	5.3	2	10.5	19
Vanderbilt University	0	0.0	1	16.7	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	9	22.5	10	25.0	40
Belmont University	1	16.7	2	33.3	6
Bethel College	3
Bryan College	3
Carson-Newman College	4	26.7	1	6.7	15
Christian Brothers University	7	41.2	3	17.7	17
Crichton College	5	25.0	3	15.0	20
Cumberland University	0	0.0	2	22.2	9
David Lipscomb University	2	13.3	3	20.0	15
East Tennessee State University	9	22.0	6	14.6	41
Fisk University	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	2	33.3	1	16.7	6
Johnson Bible College	1
King College	1
Lambuth University	3
Lane College	0
Lee College	12	32.4	9	24.3	37
Lemoyne Owen College	1
Lincoln Memorial University	4	14.8	7	25.9	27
Martin Methodist College	4
Maryville College	4
Middle Tennessee State University	15	22.7	13	19.7	66
Milligan College	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	6	16.2	7	18.9	37
Tennessee Technological University	16	19.5	13	15.9	82

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience**

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0	0.0	1	10.0	10
Trevecca Nazarene University	5	29.4	1	5.9	17
Tusculum College	4	10.8	7	18.9	37
Union University	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
University Of Memphis	21	23.6	26	29.2	89
University Of South	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	1	8.3	2	16.7	12
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	2	8.7	2	8.7	23
University Of Tennessee, Martin	5	13.5	9	24.3	37
Vanderbilt University	3	33.3	2	22.2	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	4	19.1	2	9.5	21
Belmont University	3
Bethel College	3
Bryan College	2
Carson-Newman College	2	25.0	2	25.0	8
Christian Brothers University	0	0.0	2	15.4	13
Crichton College	1	7.7	3	23.1	13
Cumberland University	2	40.0	1	20.0	5
David Lipscomb University	3	20.0	3	20.0	15
East Tennessee State University	3	7.5	7	17.5	40
Fisk University	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	1	11.1	3	33.3	9
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	1
Lambuth University	3
Lane College	0
Lee College	6	21.4	4	14.3	28
Lemoyne Owen College	1
Lincoln Memorial University	4	19.1	2	9.5	21
Martin Methodist College	1
Maryville College	0	0.0	1	20.0	5
Middle Tennessee State University	7	14.6	10	20.8	48
Milligan College	1	20.0	2	40.0	5
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	6	15.8	8	21.1	38
Tennessee Technological University	6	10.0	12	20.0	60

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	3	50.0	0	0.0	6
Trevecca Nazarene University	3	16.7	1	5.6	18
Tusculum College	10	37.0	6	22.2	27
Union University	1	16.7	2	33.3	6
University Of Memphis	15	18.1	14	16.9	83
University Of South	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	8	44.4	1	5.6	18
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	3	18.8	3	18.8	16
University Of Tennessee, Martin	1	4.2	2	8.3	24
Vanderbilt University	1	16.7	2	33.3	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	11	42.3	7	26.9	26
Belmont University	3
Bethel College	4
Bryan College	2
Carson-Newman College	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Christian Brothers University	6	33.3	3	16.7	18
Crichton College	2	15.4	3	23.1	13
Cumberland University	1	12.5	3	37.5	8
David Lipscomb University	2	11.1	7	38.9	18
East Tennessee State University	4	10.5	9	23.7	38
Fisk University	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	1
Freed-Hardeman University	2	28.6	1	14.3	7
Johnson Bible College	1
King College	1
Lambuth University	4
Lane College	0
Lee College	8	25.8	3	9.7	31
Lemoyne Owen College	1
Lincoln Memorial University	4	23.5	1	5.9	17
Martin Methodist College	1
Maryville College	2	40.0	2	40.0	5
Middle Tennessee State University	9	18.4	6	12.2	49
Milligan College	3	37.5	1	12.5	8
Rhodes College	1
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	13	34.2	6	15.8	38
Tennessee Technological University	7	11.9	9	15.3	59

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	1	12.5	2	25.0	8
Trevecca Nazarene University	1	5.3	1	5.3	19
Tusculum College	2	10.0	6	30.0	20
Union University	1	14.3	1	14.3	7
University Of Memphis	19	22.1	18	20.9	86
University Of South	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	7	22.6	7	22.6	31
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	4	28.6	1	7.1	14
University Of Tennessee, Martin	2	8.0	4	16.0	25
Vanderbilt University	1	11.1	2	22.2	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.7512	31
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	3
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-1.6920	9
Christian Brothers University	0.0393	18
Crichton College	0.2380	15
Cumberland University	-0.0149	6
David Lipscomb University	0.0757	14
East Tennessee State University	-0.3663	39
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	0.2896	7
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	2
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.4572	30
Lemoyne Owen College	.	2
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.0693	21
Martin Methodist College	.	3
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	0.0031	48
Milligan College	0.4269	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.3150	34
Tennessee Technological University	0.1763	50
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-0.4267	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.5287	16
Tusculum College	0.6206	29
Union University	1.2857	7
University Of Memphis	0.5590	84
University Of South	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.2559	16
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.1798	21
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.4304	19
Vanderbilt University	0.9124	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.0305	40
Belmont University	0.2162	6
Bethel College	.	3
Bryan College	.	3
Carson-Newman College	-0.2586	15
Christian Brothers University	0.0350	17
Crichton College	-0.1527	20
Cumberland University	0.3285	9
David Lipscomb University	0.2646	15
East Tennessee State University	-0.1299	41
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.1432	6
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.1544	37
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	0.2118	27
Martin Methodist College	.	4
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.0027	66
Milligan College	-0.3569	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.2031	37
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0049	82
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.4338	10
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.3055	17
Tusculum College	0.0878	37
Union University	-0.5256	9
University Of Memphis	0.0683	89
University Of South	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.0774	12
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.0152	23
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.1072	37
Vanderbilt University	0.2011	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.6431	21
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	3
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.0830	8
Christian Brothers University	-0.0117	13
Crichton College	0.5664	13
Cumberland University	0.0142	5
David Lipscomb University	0.3466	15
East Tennessee State University	0.3427	40
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	0.5867	9
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.4060	28
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.3500	21
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	0.4764	5
Middle Tennessee State University	0.3425	48
Milligan College	0.6021	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.3043	38
Tennessee Technological University	0.1142	60
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-1.4339	6
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.4620	18
Tusculum College	-0.3128	27
Union University	0.3815	6
University Of Memphis	0.0625	83
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-1.1014	18
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.0434	16
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.1234	24
Vanderbilt University	0.4971	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.5229	26
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	4
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.3381	5
Christian Brothers University	-0.1393	18
Crichton College	0.3959	13
Cumberland University	1.2462	8
David Lipscomb University	0.5842	18
East Tennessee State University	0.2655	38
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	1
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.0920	7
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	4
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.4413	31
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.5002	17
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	-0.5466	5
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.5496	49
Milligan College	-0.0945	8
Rhodes College	.	1
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.5620	38
Tennessee Technological University	0.0557	59
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.2782	8
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.2636	19
Tusculum College	0.4967	20
Union University	0.4698	7
University Of Memphis	0.0233	86
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.0537	31
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.1948	14
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.4048	25
Vanderbilt University	0.0783	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-1.0506	31
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	3
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-1.9915	9
Christian Brothers University	-0.2602	18
Crichton College	-0.0615	15
Cumberland University	-0.3144	6
David Lipscomb University	-0.2238	14
East Tennessee State University	-0.6658	39
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.0099	7
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	2
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.7566	30
Lemoyne Owen College	.	2
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.3688	21
Martin Methodist College	.	3
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.2964	48
Milligan College	0.1274	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.6144	34
Tennessee Technological University	-0.1231	50
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-0.7261	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.8282	16
Tusculum College	0.3212	29
Union University	0.9862	7
University Of Memphis	0.2595	84
University Of South	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.5554	16
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.4792	21
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.1310	19
Vanderbilt University	0.6129	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.1410	40
Belmont University	0.1056	6
Bethel College	.	3
Bryan College	.	3
Carson-Newman College	-0.3691	15
Christian Brothers University	-0.0756	17
Crichton College	-0.2633	20
Cumberland University	0.2180	9
David Lipscomb University	0.1541	15
East Tennessee State University	-0.2405	41
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.2537	6
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.2650	37
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	0.1013	27
Martin Methodist College	.	4
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.1132	66
Milligan College	-0.4674	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.0925	37
Tennessee Technological University	-0.1154	82
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.3232	10
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.4160	17
Tusculum College	-0.0228	37
Union University	-0.6362	9
University Of Memphis	-0.0422	89
University Of South	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.1880	12
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.1258	23
University Of Tennessee, Martin	-0.0034	37
Vanderbilt University	0.0905	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.7595	21
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	3
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.1994	8
Christian Brothers University	-0.1281	13
Crichton College	0.4500	13
Cumberland University	-0.1022	5
David Lipscomb University	0.2302	15
East Tennessee State University	0.2263	40
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	0.4704	9
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.5223	28
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.4664	21
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	0.3601	5
Middle Tennessee State University	0.2261	48
Milligan College	0.4857	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.1879	38
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0022	60
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-1.5503	6
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.5784	18
Tusculum College	-0.4292	27
Union University	0.2651	6
University Of Memphis	-0.0539	83
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-1.2178	18
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.0730	16
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.0070	24
Vanderbilt University	0.3807	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.6362	26
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	4
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.4514	5
Christian Brothers University	-0.2526	18
Crichton College	0.2826	13
Cumberland University	1.1330	8
David Lipscomb University	0.4709	18
East Tennessee State University	0.1522	38
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	1
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.2053	7
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	4
Lane College	.	0
Lee College	-0.5546	31
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.6135	17
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	-0.6599	5
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.6628	49
Milligan College	-0.2078	8
Rhodes College	.	1
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.6753	38
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0576	59
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.1649	8
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.3769	19
Tusculum College	0.3835	20
Union University	0.3565	7
University Of Memphis	-0.0900	86
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.1670	31
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.3081	14
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.2915	25
Vanderbilt University	-0.0349	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Belmont University	3
Bethel College	2
Bryan College	0
Carson-Newman College	0
Christian Brothers University	2
Crichton College	4
Cumberland University	3
David Lipscomb University	1
East Tennessee State University	0
Fisk University	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	3
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	0
Lambuth University	0
Lane College	4
Lee College	0	0.0	1	20.0	5
Lemoyne Owen College	0
Lincoln Memorial University	4
Martin Methodist College	1
Maryville College	0
Middle Tennessee State University	4
Milligan College	0
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	1	16.7	3	50.0	6
Tennessee Technological University	1	20.0	2	40.0	5

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	2	22.2	2	22.2	9
Tusculum College	1
Union University	2	25.0	1	12.5	8
University Of Memphis	3	20.0	4	26.7	15
University Of South	1
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	3
University Of Tennessee, Martin	2	22.2	2	22.2	9
Vanderbilt University	4

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	2	25.0	0	0.0	8
Belmont University	1
Bethel College	2	33.3	1	16.7	6
Bryan College	0
Carson-Newman College	0
Christian Brothers University	2	40.0	1	20.0	5
Crichton College	2
Cumberland University	3
David Lipscomb University	3
East Tennessee State University	0
Fisk University	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	1	16.7	0	0.0	6
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	0
Lambuth University	0
Lane College	3
Lee College	2	33.3	1	16.7	6
Lemoyne Owen College	1
Lincoln Memorial University	3
Martin Methodist College	1
Maryville College	0
Middle Tennessee State University	4	40.0	1	10.0	10
Milligan College	4
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	5	33.3	1	6.7	15
Tennessee Technological University	1	12.5	2	25.0	8

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	1	11.1	0	0.0	9
Tusculum College	1
Union University	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
University Of Memphis	2	8.3	6	25.0	24
University Of South	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	1	20.0	2	40.0	5
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	4
University Of Tennessee, Martin	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
Vanderbilt University	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	3
Belmont University	1
Bethel College	2
Bryan College	0
Carson-Newman College	2
Christian Brothers University	2
Crichton College	2
Cumberland University	3
David Lipscomb University	3
East Tennessee State University	0
Fisk University	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	2
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	0
Lambuth University	0
Lane College	1
Lee College	3
Lemoyne Owen College	3
Lincoln Memorial University	2
Martin Methodist College	1
Maryville College	0
Middle Tennessee State University	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Milligan College	0
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	4
Tennessee Technological University	2	33.3	2	33.3	6

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	1
Trevecca Nazarene University	5	38.5	3	23.1	13
Tusculum College	1
Union University	3
University Of Memphis	3	15.0	3	15.0	20
University Of South	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	4
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0	0.0	3	42.9	7
University Of Tennessee, Martin	1	11.1	3	33.3	9
Vanderbilt University	2

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	2
Belmont University	3
Bethel College	1
Bryan College	0
Carson-Newman College	0
Christian Brothers University	2
Crichton College	3
Cumberland University	1
David Lipscomb University	1
East Tennessee State University	1
Fisk University	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	0
Lambuth University	0
Lane College	1
Lee College	4
Lemoyne Owen College	0
Lincoln Memorial University	2
Martin Methodist College	1
Maryville College	0
Middle Tennessee State University	2	40.0	0	0.0	5
Milligan College	1
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	2	40.0	0	0.0	5
Tennessee Technological University	4

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	2	20.0	1	10.0	10
Tusculum College	1
Union University	3
University Of Memphis	5	26.3	7	36.8	19
University Of South	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	3
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	3
University Of Tennessee, Martin	2	40.0	0	0.0	5
Vanderbilt University	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.1856	5
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	2
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	0
Christian Brothers University	.	2
Crichton College	.	4
Cumberland University	.	3
David Lipscomb University	.	1
East Tennessee State University	.	0
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	.	3
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	4
Lee College	0.2957	5
Lemoyne Owen College	.	0
Lincoln Memorial University	.	4
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	.	4
Milligan College	.	0
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.6173	6
Tennessee Technological University	0.0210	5
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	0.0363	9
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	-0.0052	8
University Of Memphis	-0.5845	15
University Of South	.	1
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	0.6974	7
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Martin	-0.8924	9
Vanderbilt University	.	4

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.4139	8
Belmont University	.	1
Bethel College	-0.1095	6
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	0
Christian Brothers University	-0.0539	5
Crichton College	.	2
Cumberland University	.	3
David Lipscomb University	.	3
East Tennessee State University	.	0
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.0312	6
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	3
Lee College	0.0693	6
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	.	3
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.8737	10
Milligan College	.	4
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.2072	15
Tennessee Technological University	0.0777	8
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	0.0239	9
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	0.2241	7
University Of Memphis	0.5771	24
University Of South	.	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	0.3077	5
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	.	4
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.4097	7
Vanderbilt University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	.	3
Belmont University	.	1
Bethel College	.	2
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	2
Christian Brothers University	.	2
Crichton College	.	2
Cumberland University	.	3
David Lipscomb University	.	3
East Tennessee State University	.	0
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	.	2
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	.	3
Lemoyne Owen College	.	3
Lincoln Memorial University	.	2
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.5369	5
Milligan College	.	0
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	.	4
Tennessee Technological University	0.1711	6
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	1
Trevecca Nazarene University	-1.1092	13
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	.	3
University Of Memphis	-0.2461	20
University Of South	.	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	.	4
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.9934	7
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.7277	9
Vanderbilt University	.	2

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	.	2
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	1
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	0
Christian Brothers University	.	2
Crichton College	.	3
Cumberland University	.	1
David Lipscomb University	.	1
East Tennessee State University	.	1
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	0.7392	7
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	.	4
Lemoyne Owen College	.	0
Lincoln Memorial University	.	2
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.4668	5
Milligan College	.	1
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for
Alternatively Licensed Teachers:**

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-1.0621	5
Tennessee Technological University	.	4
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.0719	10
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	.	3
University Of Memphis	1.3713	19
University Of South	.	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Martin	-0.5097	5
Vanderbilt University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.0088	5
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	2
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	0
Christian Brothers University	.	2
Crichton College	.	4
Cumberland University	.	3
David Lipscomb University	.	1
East Tennessee State University	.	0
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	.	3
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	4
Lee College	0.4725	5
Lemoyne Owen College	.	0
Lincoln Memorial University	.	4
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	.	4
Milligan College	.	0
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.7941	6
Tennessee Technological University	0.1978	5
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	0.2131	9
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	0.1716	8
University Of Memphis	-0.4077	15
University Of South	.	1
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	0.8742	7
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Martin	-0.7156	9
Vanderbilt University	.	4

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.5643	8
Belmont University	.	1
Bethel College	-0.2600	6
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	0
Christian Brothers University	-0.2043	5
Crichton College	.	2
Cumberland University	.	3
David Lipscomb University	.	3
East Tennessee State University	.	0
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.1816	6
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	3
Lee College	-0.0812	6
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	.	3
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	-1.0242	10
Milligan College	.	4
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.3576	15
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0728	8
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.1266	9
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	0.0737	7
University Of Memphis	0.4267	24
University Of South	.	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	0.1572	5
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	.	4
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.2592	7
Vanderbilt University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	.	3
Belmont University	.	1
Bethel College	.	2
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	2
Christian Brothers University	.	2
Crichton College	.	2
Cumberland University	.	3
David Lipscomb University	.	3
East Tennessee State University	.	0
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	.	2
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	.	3
Lemoyne Owen College	.	3
Lincoln Memorial University	.	2
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.4020	5
Milligan College	.	0
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	.	4
Tennessee Technological University	0.3060	6
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	1
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.9744	13
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	.	3
University Of Memphis	-0.1112	20
University Of South	.	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	.	4
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	1.1283	7
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.8626	9
Vanderbilt University	.	2

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	.	2
Belmont University	.	3
Bethel College	.	1
Bryan College	.	0
Carson-Newman College	.	0
Christian Brothers University	.	2
Crichton College	.	3
Cumberland University	.	1
David Lipscomb University	.	1
East Tennessee State University	.	1
Fisk University	.	1
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	0.3029	7
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	0
Lambuth University	.	0
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	.	4
Lemoyne Owen College	.	0
Lincoln Memorial University	.	2
Martin Methodist College	.	1
Maryville College	.	0
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.9031	5
Milligan College	.	1
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Alternatively Licensed Teachers: Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-1.4985	5
Tennessee Technological University	.	4
Tennessee Wesleyan College	.	0
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.5083	10
Tusculum College	.	1
Union University	.	3
University Of Memphis	0.9349	19
University Of South	.	0
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Martin	-0.9461	5
Vanderbilt University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	12	33.3	4	11.1	36
Belmont University	1	16.7	2	33.3	6
Bethel College	0	0.0	1	20.0	5
Bryan College	2
Carson-Newman College	5	55.6	0	0.0	9
Christian Brothers University	4	20.0	3	15.0	20
Crichton College	2	10.5	5	26.3	19
Cumberland University	4	44.4	2	22.2	9
David Lipscomb University	2	13.3	1	6.7	15
East Tennessee State University	9	23.1	7	18.0	39
Fisk University	3
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	3	30.0	1	10.0	10
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	1
Lambuth University	2
Lane College	4
Lee College	8	22.9	4	11.4	35
Lemoyne Owen College	2
Lincoln Memorial University	6	24.0	4	16.0	25
Martin Methodist College	4
Maryville College	4
Middle Tennessee State University	9	17.3	12	23.1	52
Milligan College	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	9	22.5	7	17.5	40
Tennessee Technological University	8	14.6	12	21.8	55

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers
Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience**

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	2	28.6	0	0.0	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	5	20.0	3	12.0	25
Tusculum College	6	20.0	10	33.3	30
Union University	3	20.0	3	20.0	15
University Of Memphis	23	23.2	33	33.3	99
University Of South	4
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	4	17.4	4	17.4	23
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	5	20.8	3	12.5	24
University Of Tennessee, Martin	3	10.7	4	14.3	28
Vanderbilt University	2	20.0	1	10.0	10

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	11	22.9	10	20.8	48
Belmont University	1	14.3	2	28.6	7
Bethel College	2	22.2	1	11.1	9
Bryan College	3
Carson-Newman College	4	26.7	1	6.7	15
Christian Brothers University	9	40.9	4	18.2	22
Crichton College	5	22.7	3	13.6	22
Cumberland University	1	8.3	2	16.7	12
David Lipscomb University	3	16.7	4	22.2	18
East Tennessee State University	9	22.0	6	14.6	41
Fisk University	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	3	25.0	1	8.3	12
Johnson Bible College	1
King College	1
Lambuth University	3
Lane College	3
Lee College	14	32.6	10	23.3	43
Lemoyne Owen College	2
Lincoln Memorial University	4	13.3	8	26.7	30
Martin Methodist College	2	40.0	1	20.0	5
Maryville College	4
Middle Tennessee State University	19	25.0	14	18.4	76
Milligan College	3	33.3	2	22.2	9
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	11	21.2	8	15.4	52
Tennessee Technological University	17	18.9	15	16.7	90

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers
Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects
Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)
***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience**

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0	0.0	1	10.0	10
Trevecca Nazarene University	6	23.1	1	3.9	26
Tusculum College	5	13.2	7	18.4	38
Union University	3	18.8	3	18.8	16
University Of Memphis	23	20.4	32	28.3	113
University Of South	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	2	11.8	4	23.5	17
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	4	14.8	3	11.1	27
University Of Tennessee, Martin	6	13.6	11	25.0	44
Vanderbilt University	3	33.3	2	22.2	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers

Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	5	20.8	2	8.3	24
Belmont University	4
Bethel College	0	0.0	0	0.0	5
Bryan College	2
Carson-Newman College	2	20.0	2	20.0	10
Christian Brothers University	0	0.0	3	20.0	15
Crichton College	3	20.0	3	20.0	15
Cumberland University	2	25.0	2	25.0	8
David Lipscomb University	3	16.7	3	16.7	18
East Tennessee State University	3	7.5	7	17.5	40
Fisk University	3
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	0
Freed-Hardeman University	2	18.2	3	27.3	11
Johnson Bible College	0
King College	1
Lambuth University	3
Lane College	1
Lee College	6	19.4	4	12.9	31
Lemoyne Owen College	4
Lincoln Memorial University	4	17.4	3	13.0	23
Martin Methodist College	2
Maryville College	0	0.0	1	20.0	5
Middle Tennessee State University	8	15.1	11	20.8	53
Milligan College	1	20.0	2	40.0	5
Rhodes College	0
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	6	14.3	9	21.4	42
Tennessee Technological University	8	12.1	14	21.2	66

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers
Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	3	42.9	0	0.0	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	8	25.8	4	12.9	31
Tusculum College	10	35.7	6	21.4	28
Union University	1	11.1	2	22.2	9
University Of Memphis	18	17.5	17	16.5	103
University Of South	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	9	40.9	3	13.6	22
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	3	13.0	6	26.1	23
University Of Tennessee, Martin	2	6.1	5	15.2	33
Vanderbilt University	1	12.5	2	25.0	8

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	0
Austin Peay State University	11	39.3	7	25.0	28
Belmont University	0	0.0	1	16.7	6
Bethel College	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Bryan College	2
Carson-Newman College	1	20.0	1	20.0	5
Christian Brothers University	7	35.0	3	15.0	20
Crichton College	2	12.5	6	37.5	16
Cumberland University	2	22.2	3	33.3	9
David Lipscomb University	3	15.8	7	36.8	19
East Tennessee State University	4	10.3	10	25.6	39
Fisk University	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	1
Freed-Hardeman University	3	21.4	3	21.4	14
Johnson Bible College	1
King College	1
Lambuth University	4
Lane College	1
Lee College	9	25.7	4	11.4	35
Lemoyne Owen College	1
Lincoln Memorial University	4	21.1	1	5.3	19
Martin Methodist College	2
Maryville College	2	40.0	2	40.0	5
Middle Tennessee State University	11	20.4	6	11.1	54
Milligan College	3	33.3	1	11.1	9
Rhodes College	1
Southern Adventist University	0
Tennessee State University	15	34.9	6	14.0	43
Tennessee Technological University	8	12.7	10	15.9	63

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Number and Percentage of Beginning Teachers* by Institution in Upper and Lower Quintiles for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers
Quintiles are based on the 2008 - 2009 State Distribution of Teacher T-Value of Effects

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience

Institution	Number Below 20th Percentile	Percentage Below 20th Percentile	Number Above 80th Percentile	Percentage Above 80th Percentile	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee Wesleyan College	1	12.5	2	25.0	8
Trevecca Nazarene University	3	10.3	2	6.9	29
Tusculum College	2	9.5	6	28.6	21
Union University	2	20.0	3	30.0	10
University Of Memphis	24	22.9	25	23.8	105
University Of South	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	7	20.6	8	23.5	34
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	4	23.5	3	17.7	17
University Of Tennessee, Martin	4	13.3	4	13.3	30
Vanderbilt University	1	11.1	2	22.2	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the state distribution.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the state distribution.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.6421	36
Belmont University	1.0595	6
Bethel College	0.7992	5
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-1.7277	9
Christian Brothers University	-0.1314	20
Crichton College	0.3359	19
Cumberland University	-0.3104	9
David Lipscomb University	-0.0125	15
East Tennessee State University	-0.4020	39
Fisk University	.	3
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.6101	10
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	2
Lane College	.	4
Lee College	-0.3172	35
Lemoyne Owen College	.	2
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.2233	25
Martin Methodist College	.	4
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	0.0975	52
Milligan College	0.3912	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.1394	40
Tennessee Technological University	0.1698	55
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-0.4623	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.1895	25
Tusculum College	0.5735	30
Union University	0.8156	15
University Of Memphis	0.4222	99
University Of South	.	4
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	0.1435	23
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.1798	24
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.1227	28
Vanderbilt University	0.0575	10

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.0844	48
Belmont University	0.1767	7
Bethel College	-0.0242	9
Bryan College	.	3
Carson-Newman College	-0.2420	15
Christian Brothers University	0.0223	22
Crichton College	-0.1294	22
Cumberland University	-0.0170	12
David Lipscomb University	0.2106	18
East Tennessee State University	-0.1133	41
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.0905	12
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	3
Lee College	-0.1121	43
Lemoyne Owen College	.	2
Lincoln Memorial University	0.2640	30
Martin Methodist College	-0.0754	5
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.1059	76
Milligan College	-0.4383	9
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.0899	52
Tennessee Technological University	0.0155	90
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.4504	10
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.1886	26
Tusculum College	0.0437	38
Union University	-0.1984	16
University Of Memphis	0.1845	113
University Of South	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	0.0407	17
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.0621	27
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.1656	44
Vanderbilt University	0.2177	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.7548	24
Belmont University	.	4
Bethel College	0.2986	5
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.0372	10
Christian Brothers University	0.1286	15
Crichton College	0.1325	15
Cumberland University	0.1315	8
David Lipscomb University	0.1569	18
East Tennessee State University	0.3214	40
Fisk University	.	3
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	0.0825	11
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	-0.4234	31
Lemoyne Owen College	.	4
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.0305	23
Martin Methodist College	.	2
Maryville College	0.4552	5
Middle Tennessee State University	0.2620	53
Milligan College	0.5808	5
Rhodes College	.	0
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	0.3723	42
Tennessee Technological University	0.1209	66
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-1.4886	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.6493	31
Tusculum College	-0.2856	28
Union University	0.1723	9
University Of Memphis	0.0301	103
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.7690	22
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.3877	23
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.3355	33
Vanderbilt University	0.4697	8

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.5172	28
Belmont University	-0.2283	6
Bethel College	0.3933	5
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.3969	5
Christian Brothers University	-0.3205	20
Crichton College	1.1941	16
Cumberland University	0.7413	9
David Lipscomb University	0.4024	19
East Tennessee State University	0.3658	39
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	1
Freed-Hardeman University	0.1033	14
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	4
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	-0.3160	35
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.4659	19
Martin Methodist College	.	2
Maryville College	-0.6054	5
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.6306	54
Milligan College	-0.0740	9
Rhodes College	.	1
Southern Adventist University	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

**Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect Among Beginning Teachers* for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:
Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Means for All Institutions**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

***Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.**

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Tennessee State University	-0.7165	43
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0158	63
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.2194	8
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.3678	29
Tusculum College	0.4367	21
Union University	0.3958	10
University Of Memphis	0.1499	105
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.0330	34
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.1267	17
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.1397	30
Vanderbilt University	0.0195	9

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.9059	36
Belmont University	0.7957	6
Bethel College	0.5354	5
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-1.9915	9
Christian Brothers University	-0.3952	20
Crichton College	0.0721	19
Cumberland University	-0.5742	9
David Lipscomb University	-0.2763	15
East Tennessee State University	-0.6658	39
Fisk University	.	3
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.8739	10
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	2
Lane College	.	4
Lee College	-0.5810	35
Lemoyne Owen College	.	2
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.4871	25
Martin Methodist College	.	4
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.1663	52
Milligan College	0.1274	5
Rhodes College	.	0

Notes

. indicates an insitution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Math (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Southern Adventist University	.	0
Tennessee State University	-0.4032	40
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0939	55
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-0.7261	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.4533	25
Tusculum College	0.3097	30
Union University	0.5518	15
University Of Memphis	0.1584	99
University Of South	.	4
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.1203	23
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.0840	24
University Of Tennessee, Martin	-0.1411	28
Vanderbilt University	-0.2063	10

Notes

. indicates an insitution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.2116	48
Belmont University	0.0495	7
Bethel College	-0.1514	9
Bryan College	.	3
Carson-Newman College	-0.3691	15
Christian Brothers University	-0.1049	22
Crichton College	-0.2566	22
Cumberland University	-0.1442	12
David Lipscomb University	0.0834	18
East Tennessee State University	-0.2405	41
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.2177	12
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	3
Lee College	-0.2393	43
Lemoyne Owen College	.	2
Lincoln Memorial University	0.1368	30
Martin Methodist College	-0.2026	5
Maryville College	.	4
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.2331	76
Milligan College	-0.5655	9
Rhodes College	.	0

Notes

. indicates an insitution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Reading/Language (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Southern Adventist University	.	0
Tennessee State University	-0.0373	52
Tennessee Technological University	-0.1116	90
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.3232	10
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.3158	26
Tusculum College	-0.0835	38
Union University	-0.3256	16
University Of Memphis	0.0573	113
University Of South	.	3
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.0864	17
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	-0.1893	27
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.0384	44
Vanderbilt University	0.0905	9

Notes

. indicates an insitution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.8499	24
Belmont University	.	4
Bethel College	0.2035	5
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.1323	10
Christian Brothers University	0.0334	15
Crichton College	0.0373	15
Cumberland University	0.0364	8
David Lipscomb University	0.0618	18
East Tennessee State University	0.2263	40
Fisk University	.	3
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	0
Freed-Hardeman University	-0.0126	11
Johnson Bible College	.	0
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	3
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	-0.5186	31
Lemoyne Owen College	.	4
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.1256	23
Martin Methodist College	.	2
Maryville College	0.3601	5
Middle Tennessee State University	0.1668	53
Milligan College	0.4857	5
Rhodes College	.	0

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Science (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Southern Adventist University	.	0
Tennessee State University	0.2772	42
Tennessee Technological University	0.0258	66
Tennessee Wesleyan College	-1.5837	7
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.7444	31
Tusculum College	-0.3807	28
Union University	0.0772	9
University Of Memphis	-0.0650	103
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.8641	22
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.2926	23
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.2404	33
Vanderbilt University	0.3746	8

Notes

. indicates an insitution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Aquinas College	.	0
Austin Peay State University	-0.5717	28
Belmont University	-0.2828	6
Bethel College	0.3389	5
Bryan College	.	2
Carson-Newman College	-0.4514	5
Christian Brothers University	-0.3750	20
Crichton College	1.1396	16
Cumberland University	0.6868	9
David Lipscomb University	0.3479	19
East Tennessee State University	0.3113	39
Fisk University	.	2
Free-Will Baptist Bible College	.	1
Freed-Hardeman University	0.0488	14
Johnson Bible College	.	1
King College	.	1
Lambuth University	.	4
Lane College	.	1
Lee College	-0.3705	35
Lemoyne Owen College	.	1
Lincoln Memorial University	-0.5204	19
Martin Methodist College	.	2
Maryville College	-0.6599	5
Middle Tennessee State University	-0.6851	54
Milligan College	-0.1285	9
Rhodes College	.	1

Notes

. indicates an institution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Tennessee Higher Education Study

Comparison of the 2008 - 2009 Mean T-Value of Teacher Effect for Traditionally and Alternatively Licensed Teachers:

Beginning Teachers* Mean by Institution Compared to the Mean of Veteran Teachers from the Statewide Distribution of 2008 - 2009 Teacher Valued-Added Data**

Subject: Social Studies (includes all grades)

*Beginning Teachers defined as having 1-3 years of experience from institutions with at least 5 teachers.

**Veteran Teachers defined as having more than 3 years of experience.

Institution	Mean T-Value	Number of Teachers in Institution
Southern Adventist University	.	0
Tennessee State University	-0.7710	43
Tennessee Technological University	-0.0703	63
Tennessee Wesleyan College	0.1649	8
Trevecca Nazarene University	-0.4222	29
Tusculum College	0.3822	21
Union University	0.3413	10
University Of Memphis	0.0955	105
University Of South	.	2
University Of Tennessee, Chattanooga	-0.0875	34
University Of Tennessee, Knoxville	0.0722	17
University Of Tennessee, Martin	0.0852	30
Vanderbilt University	-0.0349	9

Notes

. indicates an insitution had fewer than 5 teachers.

Red cells indicate a statistically significant negative difference from the reference population.

Green cells indicate a statistically significant positive relationship from the reference population.

Completers 2002-03, Title II Database

	Total	State %	In PIRS Database		In PIRS Database		In PIRS Database	
			Year 1	%	3 Consecutive Years	%	5 Consecutive Years	%
Aquinas College	19	0.5%	4.0	21.1%	3.0	15.8%	2.0	10.5%
Austin Peay State University	191	5.4%	118.0	61.8%	99.0	51.8%	86.0	45.0%
Belmont University	31	0.9%	18.0	58.1%	13.0	41.9%	9.0	29.0%
Bethel College	23	0.6%	18.0	78.3%	16.0	69.6%	16.0	69.6%
Bryan College	17	0.5%	3.0	17.6%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Carson-Newman College	101	2.8%	73.0	72.3%	66.0	65.3%	63.0	62.4%
Christian Brothers University	102	2.9%	75.0	73.5%	63.0	61.8%	56.0	54.9%
Crichton College	22	0.6%	17.0	77.3%	14.0	63.6%	13.0	59.1%
Cumberland University	29	0.8%	21.0	72.4%	21.0	72.4%	20.0	69.0%
David Lipscomb University	50	1.4%	24.0	48.0%	20.0	40.0%	14.0	28.0%
East Tennessee State University	261	7.3%	143.0	54.8%	125.0	47.9%	114.0	43.7%
Fisk University	2	0.1%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Free Will Baptist Bible College	15	0.4%	7.0	46.7%	6.0	40.0%	5.0	33.3%
Freed-Hardeman University	74	2.1%	51.0	68.9%	43.0	58.1%	34.0	45.9%
Johnson Bible College	12	0.3%	2.0	16.7%	2.0	16.7%	1.0	8.3%
King College	13	0.4%	4.0	30.8%	4.0	30.8%	3.0	23.1%
Lambuth University	23	0.6%	12.0	52.2%	7.0	30.4%	7.0	30.4%
Lee College	142	4.0%	68.0	47.9%	53.0	37.3%	48.0	33.8%
LeMoyne-Owen College	7	0.2%	7.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%	7.0	100.0%
Lincoln Memorial University	136	3.8%	97.0	71.3%	86.0	63.2%	82.0	60.3%
Martin Methodist College	19	0.5%	7.0	36.8%	6.0	31.6%	6.0	31.6%
Maryville College	31	0.9%	25.0	80.6%	22.0	71.0%	16.0	51.6%
Middle Tennessee State University	378	10.6%	251.0	66.4%	219.0	57.9%	201.0	53.2%
Milligan College	70	2.0%	20.0	28.6%	17.0	24.3%	16.0	22.9%
Rhodes College	16	0.4%	7.0	43.8%	7.0	43.8%	6.0	37.5%
Southern Adventist University	30	0.8%	2.0	6.7%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Tennessee State University	137	3.8%	89.0	65.0%	78.0	56.9%	69.0	50.4%
Tennessee Technological University	288	8.1%	187.0	64.9%	164.0	56.9%	152.0	52.8%
Tennessee Wesleyan College	27	0.8%	20.0	74.1%	19.0	70.4%	15.0	55.6%
Trevecca Nazarene University	17	0.5%	10.0	58.8%	9.0	52.9%	7.0	41.2%
Tusculum College	47	1.3%	23.0	48.9%	20.0	42.6%	19.0	40.4%
Union University	59	1.7%	36.0	61.0%	32.0	54.2%	30.0	50.8%
University of Memphis	422	11.8%	310.0	73.5%	257.0	60.9%	224.0	53.1%
University of Tennessee Knoxville	339	9.5%	219.0	64.6%	179.0	52.8%	149.0	44.0%
University of Tennessee Chattanooga	187	5.2%	111.0	59.4%	89.0	47.6%	80.0	42.8%
University of Tennessee Martin	142	4.0%	97.0	68.3%	91.0	64.1%	87.0	61.3%
University of the South	3	0.1%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%	0.0	0.0%
Vanderbilt University	88	2.5%	20.0	22.7%	14.0	15.9%	9.0	10.2%
State of Tennessee	3570	100.0%	2,196.0	61.5%	1,871.0	52.4%	1,666.0	46.7%

Completers 2002-03, Title II Database

	Total
Aquinas College	19
Austin Peay State University	191
Belmont University	31
Bethel College	23
Bryan College	17
Carson-Newman College	101
Christian Brothers University	102
Crichton College	22
Cumberland University	29
David Lipscomb University	50
East Tennessee State University	261
Fisk University	2
Free Will Baptist Bible College	15
Freed-Hardeman University	74
Johnson Bible College	12
King College	13
Lambuth University	23
Lee College	142
LeMoyné-Owen College	7
Lincoln Memorial University	136
Martin Methodist College	19
Maryville College	31
Middle Tennessee State University	378
Milligan College	70
Rhodes College	16
Southern Adventist University	30
Tennessee State University	137
Tennessee Technological University	288
Tennessee Wesleyan College	27
Trevecca Nazarene University	17
Tusculum College	47
Union University	59
University of Memphis	422
University of Tennessee Knoxville	339
University of Tennessee Chattanooga	187
University of Tennessee Martin	142
University of the South	3
Vanderbilt University	88
State of Tennessee	3570

In PIRS Database	
2 out of 3 years	%
4	21.1%
135	70.7%
19	61.3%
19	82.6%
4	23.5%
85	84.2%
80	78.4%
18	81.8%
24	82.8%
26	52.0%
178	68.2%
1	50.0%
9	60.0%
55	74.3%
3	25.0%
4	30.8%
17	73.9%
77	54.2%
7	100.0%
105	77.2%
14	73.7%
26	83.9%
303	80.2%
26	37.1%
8	50.0%
2	6.7%
98	71.5%
226	78.5%
21	77.8%
11	64.7%
35	74.5%
42	71.2%
338	80.1%
239	70.5%
123	65.8%
113	79.6%
1	33.3%
23	26.1%
2519	70.6%

In PIRS Database	
3 out of 5 years	%
4	21.1%
139	72.8%
19	61.3%
21	91.3%
5	29.4%
86	85.1%
82	80.4%
18	81.8%
24	82.8%
27	54.0%
187	71.6%
1	50.0%
10	66.7%
59	79.7%
4	33.3%
5	38.5%
17	73.9%
83	58.5%
7	100.0%
105	77.2%
15	78.9%
26	83.9%
313	82.8%
27	38.6%
10	62.5%
2	6.7%
101	73.7%
231	80.2%
22	81.5%
11	64.7%
37	78.7%
43	72.9%
347	82.2%
249	73.5%
127	67.9%
117	82.4%
1	33.3%
26	29.5%
2608	73.1%

In PIRS Database	
4 out of 5 years	%
4	21.1%
139	72.8%
19	61.3%
21	91.3%
5	29.4%
86	85.1%
82	80.4%
18	81.8%
24	82.8%
27	54.0%
187	71.6%
1	50.0%
10	66.7%
59	79.7%
4	33.3%
5	38.5%
17	73.9%
83	58.5%
7	100.0%
105	77.2%
15	78.9%
26	83.9%
313	82.8%
27	38.6%
10	62.5%
2	6.7%
101	73.7%
231	80.2%
22	81.5%
11	64.7%
37	78.7%
43	72.9%
347	82.2%
249	73.5%
127	67.9%
117	82.4%
1	33.3%
26	29.5%
2608	73.1%

Completers 2003-04, Title II Database

	Total	State %	In PIRS Database		In PIRS Database		In PIRS Database	
			Year 1	%	3 Consecutive Years	%	5 Consecutive Years	%
Aquinas College	16	0.5%	3.0	18.80%				
Austin Peay State University	115	3.3%	68.0	59.10%	64.0	55.70%	55.0	47.80%
Belmont University	53	1.5%	32.0	60.40%	22.0	41.50%	12.0	22.60%
Bethel College	20	0.6%	18.0	90.00%	19.0	95.00%	19.0	95.00%
Bryan College	24	0.7%	8.0	33.30%	10.0	41.70%	7.0	29.20%
Carson-Newman College	120	3.4%	70.0	58.30%	85.0	70.80%	79.0	65.80%
Christian Brothers University	94	2.7%	69.0	73.40%	63.0	67.00%	59.0	62.80%
Crichton College	25	0.7%	13.0	52.00%	16.0	64.00%	12.0	48.00%
Cumberland University	34	1.0%	28.0	82.40%	29.0	85.30%	27.0	79.40%
David Lipscomb University	54	1.5%	27.0	50.00%	28.0	51.90%	16.0	29.60%
East Tennessee State University	230	6.6%	122.0	53.00%	142.0	61.70%	142.0	61.70%
Fisk University	6	0.2%	4.0	66.70%	5.0	83.30%	3.0	50.00%
Free Will Baptist Bible College	9	0.3%	5.0	55.60%	7.0	77.80%	3.0	33.30%
Freed-Hardeman University	56	1.6%	34.0	60.70%	29.0	51.80%	29.0	51.80%
Johnson Bible College	9	0.3%	5.0	55.60%	3.0	33.30%	3.0	33.30%
King College	18	0.5%	6.0	33.30%	7.0	38.90%	6.0	33.30%
Lambuth University	14	0.4%	12.0	85.70%	10.0	71.40%	10.0	71.40%
Lee College	149	4.3%	62.0	41.60%	68.0	45.60%	57.0	38.30%
LeMoyné-Owen College	4	0.1%	4.0	100.00%	4.0	100.00%	4.0	100.00%
Lincoln Memorial University	121	3.5%	87.0	71.90%	86.0	71.10%	82.0	67.80%
Martin Methodist College	11	0.3%	9.0	81.80%	9.0	81.80%	7.0	63.60%
Maryville College	39	1.1%	27.0	69.20%	31.0	79.50%	30.0	76.90%
Middle Tennessee State University	265	7.6%	209.0	78.90%	204.0	77.00%	180.0	67.90%
Milligan College	43	1.2%	22.0	51.20%	24.0	55.80%	21.0	48.80%
Rhodes College	2	0.1%	1.0	50.00%	1.0	50.00%	2.0	100.00%
Southern Adventist University	43	1.2%	3.0	7.00%	2.0	4.70%	1.0	2.30%
Tennessee State University	117	3.3%	81.0	69.20%	83.0	70.90%	59.0	50.40%
Tennessee Technological University	292	8.3%	184.0	63.00%	199.0	68.20%	195.0	66.80%
Tennessee Wesleyan College	30	0.9%	18.0	60.00%	24.0	80.00%	22.0	73.30%
Trevecca Nazarene University	41	1.2%	28.0	68.30%	27.0	65.90%	13.0	31.70%
Tusculum College	65	1.9%	29.0	44.60%	39.0	60.00%	37.0	56.90%
Union University	102	2.9%	67.0	65.70%	65.0	63.70%	55.0	53.90%
University of Memphis	456	13.0%	313.0	68.60%	291.0	63.80%	277.0	60.70%
University of Tennessee Knoxville	392	11.2%	267.0	68.10%	251.0	64.00%	235.0	59.90%
University of Tennessee Chattanooga	202	5.8%	102.0	50.50%	115.0	56.90%	99.0	49.00%
University of Tennessee Martin	118	3.4%	76.0	64.40%	74.0	62.70%	76.0	64.40%
University of the South	8	0.2%	4.0	50.00%	4.0	50.00%	3.0	37.50%
Vanderbilt University	103	2.9%	30.0	29.10%	23.0	22.30%	13.0	12.60%
State of Tennessee	3500	100.0%	2,147.0	61.30%	2,165.0	61.90%	1,952.0	55.80%

Completers 2003-04, Title II Database

	Total	State %	In PIRS Database		In PIRS Database		In PIRS Database	
			2 out of 3 years	%	3 out of 5 years	%	4 out of 5 years	%
Aquinas College	16	0.5%	3	18.8%	3	18.8%	3	18.8%
Austin Peay State University	115	3.3%	75	65.2%	75	65.2%	75	65.2%
Belmont University	53	1.5%	34	64.2%	35	66.0%	35	66.0%
Bethel College	20	0.6%	19	95.0%	19	95.0%	19	95.0%
Bryan College	24	0.7%	11	45.8%	11	45.8%	11	45.8%
Carson-Newman College	120	3.4%	86	71.7%	89	74.2%	89	74.2%
Christian Brothers University	94	2.7%	72	76.6%	72	76.6%	72	76.6%
Crichton College	25	0.7%	17	68.0%	17	68.0%	17	68.0%
Cumberland University	34	1.0%	31	91.2%	32	94.1%	32	94.1%
David Lipscomb University	54	1.5%	31	57.4%	36	66.7%	36	66.7%
East Tennessee State University	230	6.6%	151	65.7%	161	70.0%	161	70.0%
Fisk University	6	0.2%	5	83.3%	5	83.3%	5	83.3%
Free Will Baptist Bible College	9	0.3%	7	77.8%	8	88.9%	8	88.9%
Freed-Hardeman University	56	1.6%	39	69.6%	40	71.4%	40	71.4%
Johnson Bible College	9	0.3%	5	55.6%	5	55.6%	5	55.6%
King College	18	0.5%	8	44.4%	8	44.4%	8	44.4%
Lambuth University	14	0.4%	13	92.9%	13	92.9%	13	92.9%
Lee College	149	4.3%	72	48.3%	77	51.7%	77	51.7%
LeMoyne-Owen College	4	0.1%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%
Lincoln Memorial University	121	3.5%	91	75.2%	91	75.2%	91	75.2%
Martin Methodist College	11	0.3%	10	90.9%	10	90.9%	10	90.9%
Maryville College	39	1.1%	32	82.1%	32	82.1%	32	82.1%
Middle Tennessee State University	265	7.6%	228	86.0%	232	87.5%	232	87.5%
Milligan College	43	1.2%	25	58.1%	26	60.5%	26	60.5%
Rhodes College	2	0.1%	1	50.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Southern Adventist University	43	1.2%	3	7.0%	3	7.0%	3	7.0%
Tennessee State University	117	3.3%	91	77.8%	93	79.5%	93	79.5%
Tennessee Technological University	292	8.3%	228	78.1%	238	81.5%	238	81.5%
Tennessee Wesleyan College	30	0.9%	25	83.3%	26	86.7%	26	86.7%
Trevecca Nazarene University	41	1.2%	30	73.2%	30	73.2%	30	73.2%
Tusculum College	65	1.9%	41	63.1%	42	64.6%	42	64.6%
Union University	102	2.9%	75	73.5%	77	75.5%	77	75.5%
University of Memphis	456	13.0%	337	73.9%	344	75.4%	344	75.4%
University of Tennessee Knoxville	392	11.2%	305	77.8%	308	78.6%	308	78.6%
University of Tennessee Chattanooga	202	5.8%	126	62.4%	132	65.3%	132	65.3%
University of Tennessee Martin	118	3.4%	86	72.9%	93	78.8%	93	78.8%
University of the South	8	0.2%	6	75.0%	6	75.0%	6	75.0%
Vanderbilt University	103	2.9%	34	33.0%	35	34.0%	35	34.0%
State of Tennessee	3500	100.0%	2457	70.2%	2530	72.3%	2530	72.3%

2006 – 2007: Summary Pass Rates

Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate	Quartile
Aquinas College	12	12	100	I
Austin Peay State University	153	146	95	III
Belmont University	39	37	95	III
Bethel College	16	16	100	I
Bryan College	*	*	*	*
Carson-Newman College	68	68	100	I
Christian Brothers University	60	58	97	III
Crichton College	27	25	93	IV
Cumberland University	24	24	100	I
David Lipscomb University	56	56	100	I
East Tennessee State University	252	252	100	I
Fisk University	*	*	*	*
Free Will Baptist Bible College	10	10	100	I
Freed-Hardeman University	68	67	99	II
Johnson Bible College	20	20	100	I
King College	14	14	100	I
Lambuth University	15	15	100	I
Lane College	*	*	*	*
Lee University	183	181	99	II
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*	*
Lincoln Memorial University	149	147	99	II
Martin Methodist College	12	12	100	I
Maryville College	49	43	88	IV
Middle Tennessee State	344	324	94	III

University				
Milligan College	56	56	100	I
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	113	112	99	II
Rhodes College	*	*	*	*
South College	33	33	100	I
Southern Adventist University	26	26	100	I
Tennessee State University	93	93	100	I
Tennessee Technological University	323	318	98	III
Tennessee Wesleyan College	31	31	100	I
Trevecca Nazarene University	117	117	100	I
Tusculum College	149	148	99	II
Union University	30	30	100	I
University Of Memphis	439	406	92	IV
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	175	173	99	II
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	156	154	99	II
University Of Tennessee - Martin	194	170	88	IV
University Of The South	*	*	*	*
Tennessee Summary	3,538	3,426	97	
Quartile I -- Range, Mean	100 - 100, 100.0			
Quartile II -- Range, Mean	99 - 99, 99.0			
Quartile III -- Range, Mean	94 - 98, 95.8			
Quartile IV -- Range, Mean	88 - 93, 90.3			

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Professional Knowledge

Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate	Quartile
Aquinas College	12	12	100	I
Austin Peay State University	153	151	99	II
Belmont University	38	37	97	III
Bethel College	16	16	100	I
Bryan College	*	*	*	*
Carson-Newman College	68	68	100	I
Christian Brothers University	60	59	98	II
Crichton College	27	25	93	IV
Cumberland University	23	23	100	I
David Lipscomb University	56	56	100	I
East Tennessee State University	247	247	100	I
Fisk University	*	*	*	*
Free Will Baptist Bible College	10	10	100	I
Freed-Hardeman University	66	66	100	I
Johnson Bible College	20	20	100	I
King College	14	14	100	I
Lambuth University	15	15	100	I
Lane College	*	*	*	*
Lee University	182	182	100	I
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*	*
Lincoln Memorial University	149	149	100	I
Martin Methodist College	12	12	100	I
Maryville College	46	43	93	IV
Middle Tennessee State	342	327	96	III

University				
Milligan College	54	54	100	I
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	113	113	100	I
Rhodes College	*	*	*	*
South College	33	33	100	I
Southern Adventist University	25	25	100	I
Tennessee State University	93	93	100	I
Tennessee Technological University	323	321	99	II
Tennessee Wesleyan College	31	31	100	I
Trevecca Nazarene University	117	117	100	I
Tusculum College	148	148	100	I
Union University	30	30	100	I
University Of Memphis	405	380	94	III
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	175	175	100	I
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	147	145	99	II
University Of Tennessee - Martin	189	175	93	IV
University Of The South	*	*	*	*
Tennessee Summary	3,471	3,404	98	
Quartile I -- Range, Mean	100 - 100, 100.0			
Quartile II -- Range, Mean	98 - 99, 98.8			
Quartile III -- Range, Mean	94 - 97, 95.7			
Quartile IV -- Range, Mean	93 - 93, 93.0			

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Academic Content Areas (aggregate)

Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate	Quartile
Aquinas College	12	12	100	I
Austin Peay State University	157	151	96	III
Belmont University	38	36	95	III
Bethel College	16	16	100	I
Bryan College	*	*	*	*
Carson-Newman College	61	61	100	I
Christian Brothers University	57	56	98	II
Crichton College	27	25	93	IV
Cumberland University	19	18	95	III
David Lipscomb University	60	59	98	II
East Tennessee State University	248	248	100	I
Fisk University	*	*	*	*
Free Will Baptist Bible College	10	10	100	I
Freed-Hardeman University	69	62	90	IV
Johnson Bible College	20	20	100	I
King College	18	18	100	I
Lambuth University	15	15	100	I
Lane College	*	*	*	*
Lee University	180	176	98	II
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*	*
Lincoln Memorial University	154	152	99	II
Martin Methodist College	12	12	100	I
Maryville College	52	48	92	IV
Middle Tennessee State	328	322	98	II

University				
Milligan College	57	57	100	I
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	110	110	100	I
Rhodes College	*	*	*	*
South College	33	33	100	I
Southern Adventist University	25	25	100	I
Tennessee State University	92	91	99	II
Tennessee Technological University	308	306	99	II
Tennessee Wesleyan College	31	31	100	I
Trevecca Nazarene University	120	120	100	I
Tusculum College	152	144	95	III
Union University	35	35	100	I
University Of Memphis	403	385	96	III
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	191	189	99	II
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	141	141	100	I
University Of Tennessee - Martin	187	176	94	IV
University Of The South	*	*	*	*
Tennessee Summary	3,469	3,390	98	
Quartile I -- Range, Mean	100 - 100, 100.0			
Quartile II -- Range, Mean	98 - 99, 98.5			
Quartile III -- Range, Mean	95 - 96, 95.4			
Quartile IV -- Range, Mean	90 - 94, 92.3			

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Early Childhood Education

Early Childhood Education			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Tennessee Summary	16	16	100

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Education of Young Children

Education Of Young Children			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Belmont University	17	16	94
East Tennessee State University	40	40	100
Middle Tennessee State University	19	19	100
Tennessee Technological University	13	13	100
Union University	11	11	100
University Of Memphis	15	15	100
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	76	76	100
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	18	18	100
University Of Tennessee - Martin	17	17	100
Tennessee Summary	268	267	100

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Principles of Learning and Teaching

Principles Of Learning And Teaching (Plt) P-4			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Belmont University	13	12	92
Carson-Newman College	*	*	*
Cumberland University	*	*	*
East Tennessee State University	46	46	100
Freed-Hardeman University	*	*	*
Lee University	*	*	*
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*
Middle Tennessee State University	*	*	*
Milligan College	*	*	*
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	13	13	100
Tennessee State University	*	*	*
Tennessee Technological University	11	11	100
Tusculum College	*	*	*
Union University	*	*	*
University Of Memphis	15	15	100
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	72	72	100
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	19	19	100
University Of Tennessee - Martin	13	13	100
Tennessee Summary	249	248	100

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

Principles Of Learning And Teaching (Plt) 5-9			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Austin Peay State University	10	10	100
Christian Brothers University	10	10	100
Middle Tennessee State University	15	15	100
Tennessee Technological University	10	10	100
University Of Memphis	20	18	90
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	19	17	89
Tennessee Summary	139	133	96

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

Principles Of Learning And Teaching (Plt) 7-12			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Austin Peay State University	42	42	100
Belmont University	13	13	100
Bethel College	*	*	*
Bryan College	*	*	*
Carson-Newman College	18	17	94
Christian Brothers University	11	11	100
Cumberland University	*	*	*
David Lipscomb University	17	17	100
East Tennessee State University	45	45	100
Fisk University	*	*	*
Free Will Baptist Bible College	*	*	*
Freed-Hardeman University	20	20	100

King College	*	*	*
Lambuth University	*	*	*
Lane College	*	*	*
Lee University	77	77	100
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*
Lincoln Memorial University	52	52	100
Martin Methodist College	*	*	*
Maryville College	25	24	96
Middle Tennessee State University	109	104	95
Milligan College	29	29	100
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	38	38	100
Rhodes College	*	*	*
Southern Adventist University	10	10	100
Tennessee State University	20	19	95
Tennessee Technological University	75	74	99
Tennessee Wesleyan College	*	*	*
Trevecca Nazarene University	21	21	100
Tusculum College	14	14	100
Union University	*	*	*
University Of Memphis	93	92	99
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	61	61	100
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	48	48	100
University Of Tennessee - Martin	54	51	94
University Of The South	*	*	*
Tennessee Summary	943	930	99

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Elementary Education: Curriculum Instruction and Assessment

Elementary Education: Curriculum Instruction And Assessment			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Aquinas College	12	12	100
Austin Peay State University	81	80	99
Bethel College	11	11	100
Bryan College	*	*	*
Carson-Newman College	27	27	100
Christian Brothers University	37	37	100
Crichton College	27	25	93
Cumberland University	10	10	100
David Lipscomb University	30	30	100
East Tennessee State University	149	149	100
Fisk University	*	*	*
Free Will Baptist Bible College	*	*	*
Freed-Hardeman University	39	39	100
Johnson Bible College	17	17	100
King College	10	10	100
Lambuth University	*	*	*
Lee University	85	85	100
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*
Lincoln Memorial University	96	96	100
Martin Methodist College	10	10	100
Maryville College	20	19	95
Middle Tennessee State University	171	164	96
Milligan College	18	18	100
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	27	27	100

Rhodes College	*	*	*
South College	33	33	100
Southern Adventist University	15	15	100
Tennessee State University	67	67	100
Tennessee Technological University	199	198	99
Tennessee Wesleyan College	25	25	100
Trevecca Nazarene University	94	94	100
Tusculum College	125	125	100
Union University	13	13	100
University Of Memphis	237	219	92
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	55	54	98
University Of Tennessee - Martin	89	83	93
Tennessee Summary	1,853	1,816	98

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Elementary Education: Content Knowledge

Elementary School: Content Knowledge			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Aquinas College	12	12	100
Austin Peay State University	74	73	99
Belmont University	17	16	94
Bethel College	11	11	100
Carson-Newman College	35	35	100
Christian Brothers University	38	38	100
Crichton College	25	25	100
Cumberland University	10	10	100
David Lipscomb University	30	30	100

East Tennessee State University	191	191	100
Freed-Hardeman University	39	39	100
Johnson Bible College	17	17	100
King College	10	10	100
Lee University	81	81	100
Lincoln Memorial University	96	96	100
Martin Methodist College	10	10	100
Maryville College	20	20	100
Middle Tennessee State University	188	187	99
Milligan College	22	22	100
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	32	32	100
South College	33	33	100
Southern Adventist University	14	14	100
Tennessee State University	71	71	100
Tennessee Technological University	157	157	100
Tennessee Wesleyan College	25	25	100
Trevecca Nazarene University	95	95	100
Tusculum College	119	119	100
Union University	19	19	100
University Of Memphis	244	241	99
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	77	77	100
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	61	61	100
University Of Tennessee - Martin	84	81	96
Tennessee Summary	1,984	1,975	100

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Middle School Content Knowledge

Middle School: Content Knowledge			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Austin Peay State University	24	23	96
East Tennessee State University	12	12	100
Freed-Hardeman University	11	5	45
Lee University	22	20	91
Middle Tennessee State University	10	10	100
Tennessee Technological University	79	79	100
Tusculum College	43	35	81
University Of Memphis	34	22	65
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	15	15	100
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	13	13	100
University Of Tennessee - Martin	43	40	93
Tennessee Summary	360	323	90

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Reading Across the Curriculum

Reading Across Curriculum: Elementary			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Aquinas College	12	12	100
Austin Peay State University	98	98	100
Belmont University	18	18	100
Bethel College	12	12	100
Bryan College	*	*	*
Carson-Newman College	36	36	100
Christian Brothers University	44	44	100
Crichton College	27	27	100
Cumberland University	13	13	100
David Lipscomb University	30	30	100
East Tennessee State University	197	197	100
Fisk University	*	*	*
Free Will Baptist Bible College	*	*	*
Freed-Hardeman University	46	46	100
Johnson Bible College	20	20	100
King College	10	10	100
Lambuth University	*	*	*
Lee University	110	110	100
Lemoyne-Owen College	*	*	*
Lincoln Memorial University	96	96	100
Martin Methodist College	10	10	100
Maryville College	19	19	100
Middle Tennessee State University	214	214	100
Milligan College	27	27	100
Peabody College Of Vanderbilt University	77	77	100

South College	33	33	100
Southern Adventist University	15	15	100
Tennessee State University	74	74	100
Tennessee Technological University	234	234	100
Tennessee Wesleyan College	25	25	100
Trevecca Nazarene University	93	93	100
Tusculum College	132	132	100
Union University	23	23	100
University Of Memphis	281	281	100
University Of Tennessee - Chattanooga	107	107	100
University Of Tennessee - Knoxville	85	85	100
University Of Tennessee - Martin	110	110	100
Tennessee Summary	2,358	2,358	100

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.

** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers.

[Top of page](#)

2006 – 2007: Statewide Totals: Biology, Chemistry, Physics

Biology: Content Essays			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
University Of Memphis	10	9	90
Tennessee Summary	52	48	92

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.
 ** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers. [Top of page](#)

Biology: Content Knowledge			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
University Of Memphis	13	12	92
Tennessee Summary	65	63	97

Chemistry: Content Knowledge (Revised)			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Tennessee Summary	14	13	93

Physics: Content Essays			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Tennessee Summary	*	*	*

Physics: Content Knowledge (Revised)			
Institution	Number Tested	Number Passed	Pass Rate
Tennessee Summary	*	*	*

* An asterisk indicates less than 10 test takers or program completers.
 ** Two asterisks indicate less than 10 test takers or no test takers. [Top of page](#)

A copy of this report can be found at

<http://www.tennessee.gov/sbe/teacherreportcard.htm>

State Board of Education
9th Floor Andrew Johnson Tower
710 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243
615-741-2966
www.state.tn.us/sbe