

Standard 4.1 Impact on P-12 Students

To acquire impact-on-student-learning data, the EPP chair contacted a representative at each partner district's central office asking permission to communicate with completers and request they share their class' anonymous testing data. Data have been collected since 2016.

Data tables below show completers' impact on student learning growth.

Please see the data tables on following pages.

Tag 4.1 Impact on P-12 Students

Table: 2019-2020 Completers (Data Received during 2020-2021 School Year)

Completer's Graduation Year	Program	Partner District	Testing Year	Grade/Subject Tested/ Assessment	Number of Students	School Information	Testing Data
Spring 2020	ELEM	Yukon	2020	1 st / Math / Teacher-created unit about coins	18	56.6% non-Caucasian 76.1% economic disadvantage students	Learning gain 88.7% Range 22%-66% (pre-test) 71%-100% (post-test)

Table: Data Received 2019-2020 School Year

Completer's Graduation Year	Program	Partner District	Testing Year	Grade/Subject Tested/ Assessment	Number of Students	School Information	Testing Data
Spring 2019	Early Child.	Edmond	2019	K / S.S. Teacher-created unit assessment	15	27% non-Caucasian 20.5% free/reduced lunch	Learning gain 86.1% Range 0%-100% (pre-test) 75%-100% (post-test)
Spring 2019	ELEM	Moore	2019	3 rd / Math Teacher-created assessment	18	53% non-Caucasian 51% free/reduced lunch	Learning gain 89% Range 0%-55% (pre-test) 60%-100% (post-test)
Spring 2019	ELEM	Edmond	2019	3rd grade 1. District Reading Test 2. District Math Test	22 22	27% non-Caucasian 20.5% free/reduced lunch	Reading Fall – Composite score 377 Reading Winter – Comp. score 409 Math Fall – Composite score 177 Math Winter – Comp. score 198

Table: Data Received 2018-2019 School Year

Completer's Graduation Year	Program	Partner District	Testing Year	Grade/Subject Tested/ Assessment	Number of Students	School Information	Testing Data
Spring 2018	ELEM.	Edmond	Fall 2018	4 th / Math Teacher-created unit assessment	23	33% non-Caucasian 17.6% free/reduced lunch	Learning gain 71% Range 20%-91% (pre-test) 37%-100% (post-test)
Spring 2018	ELEM.	Edmond	Fall 2018	5 th / Social Studies Teacher-created assessment	22	35.5% non-Caucasian 22.5% free/reduced lunch	Learning gain 49% Range 10%-100% (pre-test) 30%-100% (post-test)

Tag 4.1 Impact on P-12 Students

Spring 2017	Early Child.	Choctaw	Fall 2018	1 st grade Star Early Literacy	14	15% minority 60% free/reduced lunch	Aug. test – Range 18-73; Mean 44.3 Dec. test – Range 24-94; Mean 72 Learning Gain = 51% Scores given as percentile ranks
-------------	--------------	---------	-----------	--	----	--	--

Table: Data Received 2017-2018 School Year

Completer's Graduation Year	Program	Partner District	Testing Year	Grade/Subject Tested/ Assessment	Number of Students	School Information	Testing Data
Spring 2017	ELEM.	Edmond	Fall 2017	5 th / Science Teacher-created unit assessment	20	46% minority 37% free/reduced lunch	Learning gain 60% Range 56-94 (raw scores)
Spring 2017	ELEM.	Edmond	Fall 2017	2 nd / History Teacher-created unit assessment	18	28% minority 37% free/reduced lunch	Learning gain 60% Range 20-100 (percentages)
Spring 2017	Early Child.	Choctaw	Fall 2017	1 st grade Star Early Literacy	20	15% minority 60% free/reduced lunch	Aug. test – Range 53-252; Mean 98.20 Dec. test – Range 70-409; Mean 165.65
Spring 2015	Early Child.	Edmond	Fall 2017	K Dibels Literacy	22	28% minority 37% free/reduced lunch	Fall test – Range 1-92; Mean 46.45 Winter – Range 1-177; Mean 147.36
Fall 2014	EC/ELEM	Mid-Del	Sept. 2017 & Jan. 2018	K Star Early Literacy	25	66% minority 66% free/reduced lunch	Sept. benchmark – Range 349-800; Mean 525.52 Jan. benchmark – Range 435-730; Mean 598.68
Spring 2017	Early Child	Putnam City	Fall 2017 & spring 2018	K / Reading & Math / AIMSWEB Benchmark	17	72% minority 86% free/reduced lunch	Name Fluency – Sept. -- Range 1-59; Mean 10.29 Jan. – Range 1-74; Mean 17.00 May – Range 1-85; Mean 26.76 Letter Sound Fluency – Sept. -- Range 0-35; Mean 6.00 Jan. – Range 0-54; Mean 13.00 May – Range 0-70; Mean 26.65

Tag 4.1 Impact on P-12 Students

							Phoneme Segmentation- Jan. – Range 2-41; Mean 18.41 May – Range 0-56; Mean 23.59 Nonsense Word Fluency- Jan. – Range 0-80; Mean 17.06 May – Range 5-101; Mean 24.82 Math Oral Counting to 100 Sept. -- Range 4-61; Mean 29 Jan. – Range 35-100; Mean 57 May – Range 42-100; Mean 63 Math Number Identification (1-10) Sept. -- Range 4-61; Mean 26.35 Jan. – Range 6-56; Mean 23.06 May – Range 11-65; Mean 35.88 Math Quantity Discrimination Jan. – Range 1-28; Mean 8.24 May – Range 1-28; Mean 13.18
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Table: Data Received 2016-2017 School year

Completer's Graduation Year	Program	Partner District	Testing Year	Grade/Subject Tested/ Assessment	Number of Students	School Information	Testing Data
Spring 2014	Early Childhood	Edmond	2016-2017	K Star Early Literacy	20	33% minority 44% Free/reduced lunch	1 st quarter benchmark – Range 351-797; Mean 516 4 th quarter benchmark – Range 449-840; Mean 683

Table: Data Received Spring 2016 & Fall 2016

Completer's Graduation Year	Program	Partner District	Testing Year	Grade/Subject Tested/ Assessment	Number of Students	School Information	Testing Data
2014	ELEM & Early Child.	Mid-Del	Sept. & Nov. 2016	K - Star Early Literacy Test*	20	66% non-Caucasian 66% Free/reduced lunch	Sept. test – Range 341-788; Mean 505 Nov. test – Range 773-426; Mean 610
2015	Early Child.	Mid-Del	Sept. & Oct. 2016	K – Star Early Literacy Test*	17	77% black, 15% Caucasian, 8% Hispanic	Sept. test – Range 430-824; Mean 505

Tag 4.1 Impact on P-12 Students

						78% Free/reduced lunch	Oct. test – Range 522-868; Mean 689
2015	Science	Edmond	Spring 2016	H.S. Biology** benchmark and End of Instruction Exam	122	20% non-Caucasian 18% Free/Reduced lunch	March 2016 Benchmark – 42% below proficient & 58% at or above proficient April 2016 End-of-Instruction Exam 28% below proficient & 72% at or above proficient.

Instruments

1. Table 1 and following: The Star Early Literacy Assessment is produced by the Renaissance Learning. The assessment “measures early literacy...skills throughout the early primary grades (pre-K-3)” (Renaissance Learning, 2013, p. 2). Regarding reliability, the Star Early Literacy has an internal consistency reliability coefficient of 0.85 and a retest reliability of 0.79 (p. 20). Regarding validity, the assessment is aligned to state and national standards, including Common Core. Predictive validity studies in grades K-3 show a range of 0.52 to 0.67, and concurrent validity studies have a range of 0.52 to 0.68 (p. 21).
2. Table 1: The Biology End-of-Instruction Exam is produced by Measured Progress (a non-profit organization) for the State Department of Education. The exam assesses students’ knowledge of the Oklahoma PASS Biology Academic Standards. Reliability and validity data can be found on pages 55-60 and 66-67 of the technical document at <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/documents/files/2015-16%20Oklahoma%20EOI%20Technical%20Report.pdf>).
3. Table 3: The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) was created through the Institute for Research and Learning Disabilities at the University of Minnesota. “All DIBELS measures have estimated reliability in the .90s” (Good et al., 2004, p. 2) and “the DIBELS measures were also found to predict both oral reading fluency...” (Good, p. 2).
4. Table 3: The teacher-created unit assessments (fall 2017 data) were created by the completers. Assessment data came from pre- and post-tests following the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) instructions. (Candidates complete a full TWS during clinical practice and

Tag 4.1 Impact on P-12 Students

learn how to create valid and reliable pre- and post-tests and calculate learning gain scores.) Completers followed these same procedures to generate the assessment data.

5. Table 3: AIMSWEB is a commercial product from Pearson. The assessments are designed for benchmark testing for math and reading. According to the Pearson website, the AIMSWEB is valid and reliable.

6. Table 4: Teacher-created unit assessments were created by the completers. Assessment data came from pre- and post-tests following the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) instructions. (Candidates complete a full TWS during clinical practice and learn how to create valid and reliable pre- and post-tests and calculate learning gain scores.) Completers followed these same procedures to generate the assessment data.

7. Table 5: Teacher-created unit assessments were created by the completers. Assessment data came from pre- and post-tests following the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) instructions. (Candidates complete a full TWS during clinical practice and learn how to create valid and reliable pre- and post-tests and calculate learning gain scores.) Completers followed these same procedures to generate the assessment data.

8. Table 5: District 3rd grade benchmark tests for reading and mathematics.

Note: At this time, there is no method to externally benchmark data from Standard 4.1.

Citations

Good, R.H., Kaminski, R.A., Shinn, M., Bratten, J., Shinn, M., Laimon, D., Smith, S., & Flindt, N. (2004). Technical Adequacy of DIBELS: Results of the Early Childhood Research Institute on measuring growth and development (Technical Report, No. 7). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon.

Renaissance Learning. (2013). The research foundation for star assessments: The science of star [White paper]. December 4, 2017, <https://www.renaissance.com/resources/research/>.