MEMPHIS TEACHER RESIDENCY

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

4 Performance Category 94.7% of points earned 68.2 points earned 10.3 percentage points increase from 2017

DOMAIN SUMMARY

CANDIDATE PROFILE

86.5% of points earned
3 scored metrics
20 points available

EMPLOYMENT

100.0% of points earned
2 scored metrics
15 points available

PROVIDER IMPACT

96.2% of points earned
4 scored metrics
40 points available

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OVER TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

The Educator Preparation Report Card contains four (4) domains: Candidate Profile, Employment, Satisfaction, and Provider Impact. Each domain is comprised of multiple metrics. To date, data has not been collected for the Satisfaction domain, so it will be un-scored 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.

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

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.
MEMPHIS TEACHER RESIDENCY

ABOUT THIS PROVIDER

Website
http://www.MemphisTR.org/

Director of Education
Molly Nied

Memphis Teacher Residency (MTR) partners with Union University to prepare elementary and secondary teachers for Memphis schools in six partner neighborhoods where MTR has focused its efforts toward equal educational opportunity for all students. Residents in the twelve-month residency program work toward a Master of Urban Education from Union University while gaining classroom experience in a full-year internship placement within a mentor teacher’s classroom. Graduating residents who are not already licensed earn a Tennessee teaching license, and all graduating residents work to fulfill a three-year teaching commitment in an MTR partner neighborhood school.

MTR’s mission:
“As a response to the gospel mandate to love our neighbors as ourselves, MTR will partner to provide students in Memphis neighborhoods with the same, or better, quality of education as is available to any student in Memphis by recruiting, training and supporting effective teachers within a Christian context.”

This provider has a partnership with Union University. The 161 completers reported here also received training from Union University and are reported on that institution’s report card as well.

COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS

Teachers in Three-Year Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of State Three-Year Cohort

- Rest of the State: 98.4%
- This Provider: 1.6%

State of Residency for Cohort Members

- Out of State: 11.2%
- In State: 88.8%
COMPLETER CHARACTERISTICS CONTINUED

Initial License Type for Cohort Members

- Post Baccalaureate: 99.4%
- Baccalaureate: 0.6%

Clinical Practice Type for Cohort Members

- Internship: 99.4%
- Student Teaching: 0.6%
- Job Embedded: 0.0%
CANDIDATE PROFILE

PERFORMANCE CATEGORY

86.5% OF POINTS EARNED

14.7 OUT OF 17 POINTS

8.9 PERCENTAGE POINTS INCREASE 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.

No data this year

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: 161

Score

EPP Score | State Score | Possible Scoring Range

27.3 | 5.9 | 33.7

The score of 27.3 earned this EPP 7.7 of 10 possible points on this metric.

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: 161

Score

EPP Score | State Score | Possible Scoring Range

27.3 | 3.1 | 27.0

The score of 27.3 earned this EPP 7.0 of 7 possible points on this metric.

SEE HOW THE CANDIDATE PROFILE METRICS ARE CALCULATED
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: 161

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score of 96.9 earned this EPP 6.0 of 6 possible points on this metric.

Rate of Employment within Three Years In Tennessee Public Schools

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

N-Size: 56

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This metric is unscored

Second Year Retention Rate

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

N-Size: 110

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The score of 96.4 earned this EPP 9.0 of 9 possible points on this metric.

Third Year Retention Rate

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

N-Size: 55

Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EPP Score</th>
<th>State Score</th>
<th>Possible Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This metric is unscored

See how the employment metrics are calculated
PERCENTAGE OF COHORT MEMBERS WHOSE CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SCORES ARE LEVEL 3 OR ABOVE

This measure reports the percentage of members of the three-year cohort who earned a Classroom Observation score of at least a 3 ("At Expectations").
N-Size: 102

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: 102

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: 88

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: 88

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: 99
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: 99

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.