<u>Impact on Student Learning – Kentucky Accountability Tests Comparison</u>

As a proxy measure of how UofL CEHD graduates are impacting student learning, a comparison of schools has been completed. The steps for the comparison were the following:

- 1) Obtain a list of all teachers in Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS) from EPSB Report. This report is primarily teachers that have completed their certification program in academic year 2015-2016 or after.
- 2) Determine the schools with the most UofL graduates in the data set along with the schools with the most UofL graduates from Academic Years 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022.
- 3) Using the JCPS data files, identity two schools at each level with the highest number of UofL completers. Then, identify schools with the lowest number of completers to utilize as a comparison school. From the group of comparison schools, the school with the most similar percentage of students that qualify for Free/Reduced Lunch (%F/R) was selected as the control school. By using %F/R, the EPP is attempting to control for student family income-level, which has been shown to be associated with differential student outcomes. The schools selected have the largest difference in number of UofL graduates in the data set (specifically focused on teachers with three years of experience or less). Note: these schools tend to serve a high percentage of students from poverty.
- 4) The data to be compared will be the 2021-2022 state accountability test scores.

	School	Total UofL Graduate in Dataset	# UofL Graduate in 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022	%F/R	READING_ MATH INDICATOR RATE	Difference READING_ MATH INDICATOR RATE	READING_ MATH INDICATOR RATING	SCIENCE_SOCIAL STUDIES_COMBI NED WRITING INDICATOR RATE	Difference SCIENCE_SOCIAL STUDIES_COMBINED WRITING INDICATOR RATE	SCIENCE_SOCIAL STUDIES_COMBI NED WRITING INDICATOR RATING
Elementary	School A	9	5	92.7%	32.8	5.3	2	45.8	17.2	2
Pair 1	School B	4	1	89.5%	27.5		1	28.6		1
Elementary	School C	8	5	92.2%	11.4	-6.4	1	20	-6.0	1
Pair 2	School D	3	0	94.1%	17.8		1	26		1
Middle	School E	23	13	59.9%	42.8	-0.6	2	42	4.7	2
Pair 1	School F	8	3	61.2%	43.4		2	37.3		2
Middle	School G	18	6	65.6%	41.8	-4.5	2	42	-5.4	2
Pair 2	School H	8	3	65.4%	46.3		2	47.4		2
High	School I	25	7	71.2%	39.9	4.0	2	37.3	15.9	2
Pair 1	School J	13	2	72.4%	35.9		1	21.4		1
High	School K	16	6	62.9%	44	1.9	2	39	-0.5	2
Pair 2	School L	7	2	62.4%	42.1		2	39.5		2

Conclusion

When comparing schools that have a higher number of new UofL graduates to schools with lower number of new UofL graduates, the scores are comparable. The comparison schools were chosen to control for percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch while providing the largest differential in number of recent UofL completers teaching within the school.

	Average Difference READING_MATH INDICATOR RATE	Average Difference SCIENCE_SOCIAL STUDIES_COMBINED WRITING INDICATOR RATE
Elementary School Comparison	-0.6	5.6
Middle School Comparison	-2.6	-0.4
High School Comparison	3.0	7.7