



UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE - MARTIN

OVERALL PERFORMANCE



DOMAIN SUMMARY

CANDIDATE PROFILE

3 scored metrics
20 points available

23.4% of points earned



1 Performance Category

EMPLOYMENT

2 scored metrics
15 points available

98.5% of points earned



4 Performance Category

PROVIDER IMPACT

4 scored metrics
40 points available

56.9% of points earned



2 Performance Category

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OVER TIME


Year	Percentage of points earned	Points earned out of 75	Performance Category
2017-18	56.2%	42.2 out of 75	2
2016-17	45.2%	33.9 out of 75	2
2015-16	50.7%	38.0 out of 75	2

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

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

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

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



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

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

ABOUT THIS PROVIDER

Website

<http://www.utm.edu/departments/ess>

Director

Donna Neblett


Completer Placement Across Tennessee




The University of Tennessee at Martin is comprised of five academic colleges: Agriculture and Applied Sciences; Business and Global Affairs; Education, Health, and Behavioral Sciences; Engineering and Natural Sciences; and Humanities and Fine Arts. The Department of Educational Studies offers the majority of UT Martin's Educator Preparation Programs (EPP). The remainder of the programs are offered by unit partners housed in other colleges. The mission of the Educator Preparation Program is to prepare educators in initial and advanced programs as facilitators of active learning for P-12 learners in diverse and inclusive communities. This mission encompasses excellence in a variety of learning and field placement settings, fosters an innovative and student-focused learning community through coursework that is rigorous and standards-based, and integrates evidence-based educational practices in teaching and learning.

COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS


Teachers in Three-Year Cohort




Percent of State Three-Year Cohort



Enrollment by Ethnicity




State of Residency for Cohort Members




COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS CONTINUED


Initial License Type for Cohort Members



Clinical Practice Type for Cohort Members



Percent of Admission Assessments Submitted to Program*:



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


CANDIDATE PROFILE

1 PERFORMANCE CATEGORY **23.4%** OF POINTS EARNED **4.7** OUT OF **20** POINTS **-2.6** PERCENTAGE POINTS DECREASE FROM 2017

Percentage of Cohort with Qualifying Assessment Scores

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


N-Size: 368



Percentage of High-Demand Endorsements

This measure reports the percentage of all endorsements issued in the area of English as a Second Language, Secondary Math, Secondary Science (Biology, Chemistry, and Physics), Spanish, and Special Education (Modified, Comprehensive, and Interventionist). For a complete list of specific endorsement areas, see the Technical Manual.


N-Size: 555



Percentage of Racially Diverse Cohort Members

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

N-Size: 541



[SEE HOW THE CANDIDATE PROFILE METRICS ARE CALCULATED](#)


EMPLOYMENT

4 PERFORMANCE CATEGORY 98.5% OF POINTS EARNED **14.8** OUT OF **15** POINTS 11.2 PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASE FROM 2017

Rate of First-Year Employment in Tennessee Public Schools

This measure reports the rate at which members of the three-year cohort were employed in Tennessee public schools within one year of receiving their initial license.


N-Size: 555



Rate of Employment within Three Years In Tennessee Public Schools

This measure reports the rate at which members of the three-year cohort were employed for at least one year in Tennessee public schools within three years of receiving their initial license.


N-Size: 250



Second Year Retention Rate

This measure reports the percentage of first-year employed cohort members who remained teaching in Tennessee public schools their second year.


N-Size: 322



Third Year Retention Rate

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who were employed and remain teaching in Tennessee public schools for three years running.

N-Size: 212



[SEE HOW THE EMPLOYMENT METRICS ARE CALCULATED](#)


PROVIDER IMPACT

2 PERFORMANCE CATEGORY **56.9%** OF POINTS EARNED **22.7** OUT OF **40** POINTS **17.9** PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASE FROM 2017

Percentage of Cohort Members whose Classroom Observation Scores are Level 3 or Above

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


N-Size: 446



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

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


N-Size: 446



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

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


N-Size: 195



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

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


N-Size: 195



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

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


N-Size: 435



Percentage of Cohort Members whose Overall Level of Effectiveness Scores are Levels 4-5

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

N-Size: 435



SEE HOW THE PROVIDER IMPACT METRICS ARE CALCULATED

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