The purpose of this study was to explore the impact of the IEP (Individualized Education Program)-Quality Tutorial, which was designed to improve the quality of IEPs, on student outcomes, including performance on state Reading and Math tests.

### Method & Data Resources

#### Data Source
1. 80 Teachers in 12 districts participated in the IEP online training tutorial in Fall 2013.
2. 72 teacher remained in study by the end of 2014 (intervention: 34; control: 38).
3. Students who were taught by these 72 teachers and had scores from both years were included in the analyses, which were conducted for each content area.

#### Procedures
1. Teachers were randomly assigned by district to either a control or an intervention group.
2. Teachers in the intervention group could access the online Tutorial training. Teachers in the control group obtained access to the tutorial only after the study was done.
3. Teachers provided the state test scores of their students in 2013 (school year 2012-13), and 2014 (school year 2013-14). These represented times before and after the IEPQ Training intervention.

#### Analysis
Descriptive analyses and ANCOVA were conducted by content area (reading and math).

#### Conclusion
This study found that students taught by the intervention teachers who received the IEPQ tutorial online training had higher scaled scores on both Reading and Math state assessments than students who were taught by teachers in the control group.

### Results

#### Reading

![Figure 1](#). The mean of ISAT Reading Scaled Score in each Year by Intervention and Control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Both year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Both year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Math

![Figure 3](#). The mean of ISAT Math Scaled Score in each year by Intervention and Control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Both year</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Both year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>272.72</td>
<td>272.72</td>
<td>194.45</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>212.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Use</td>
<td>228.61</td>
<td>228.61</td>
<td>170.87</td>
<td>228.61</td>
<td>228.61</td>
<td>170.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>269.59</td>
<td>269.59</td>
<td>202.22</td>
<td>269.59</td>
<td>269.59</td>
<td>202.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proficiency Level

#### Reading

For Reading, in Year 2014, group was significantly related to proficiency level; this was not found in Year 2013.

The post-hoc test showed:
1. the percentage of students in the control group in the proficiency level 1, Academic Warning, was significantly higher than the percentage in the Intervention group ($\chi^2 = 12.62, p = .0004$)
2. the percentage of students in the intervention group in proficiency level 2, Below Standards, was significantly higher than the percentage in the control group ($\chi^2 = 9.52, p = .0020$)
3. no significant result was found for proficiency level 3 (Meet Standards, $\chi^2 = 0.25, p = .6199$).

No relation was found between PF and Year on Math.