

In this Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) proposal, Teach For America (TFA) addresses Absolute Priority 1: Supporting Practices and Strategies for Which There Is Moderate Evidence of Effectiveness and Absolute Priority 2: Teacher or Principal Recruitment, Selection, and Preparation. In addition, this proposal addresses Competitive Preference Priority 1: Supporting Practices and Strategies for Which There Is Strong Evidence of Effectiveness; Competitive Preference Priority 3: Promoting Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Education; and Competitive Preference Priority 4: Supporting High-Need Students. These competitive preferences are addressed in Sections A and B.

A. Significance

Teach For America (TFA) is a nationally significant, externally validated program that recruits, selects, and trains new teachers, whom we call corps members (CMs), for placement in high-need schools, with the expectation that they put their students on the path to college and life success. Since 1990, TFA has placed and supported over 54,000 teachers in high-need schools throughout the country. We currently have more than 46,000 alumni of our program, including 12,000 teachers, 1,010 principals, and 290 school system leaders. TFA requests a \$17 million SEED grant to:

- Scale up a redesign of all of our national summer training institutes, the cornerstone of our pre-service preparation, to enable our CMs to deliver effective instruction aligned with college and career-ready (CCR) standards.
- Pilot the “hand-off” of the principles embedded in the redesign (see above) to regions. This would mean that regions, in their ongoing CM support and development during the school year, would reinforce and extend the training that CMs received during the summer.
- Open new and refine existing regional training institutes, in which individual TFA regions design and implement pre-service training grounded in their local contexts.
- Implement a new Rural Cooperative Institute (RCI) focused on preparing CMs to lead their

students to success while building a strong collective understanding of the unique assets and needs of rural communities.

A SEED grant will help prepare 3,600 new CMs to begin teaching in Fall 2017 and 3,900 new CMs in Fall 2018, with at least 30% of each cohort teaching STEM subjects.

A1. National Significance

This project is nationally significant because of its scale and scope, selectivity, diversity, and proven effectiveness.

Scale and scope. TFA is our nation's largest producer of teachers for high-need schools, and this project will enable us to directly support the 7,500 new CMs TFA will recruit in 2017 and 2018. Those CMs will go on to teach all P-12 grade levels and subject areas in high-need schools in 53 communities in 36 states and Washington, DC, including 15 rural regions.¹ In the schools where we place teachers,² 84% of students receive free or reduced-price lunch.³ There is a greater than 50% likelihood that these students fail to meet proficiency standards in either math or reading.⁴ Approximately 90% of the students in TFA placement schools are students of color.

Selectivity. TFA employs a rigorous, highly selective, and research-based selection process to choose program participants from a large and diverse pool of candidates nationwide.

Rigorous. For more than 25 years, TFA has studied program participants with the greatest success in advancing student achievement. Working with experts from academia, education, and business, we developed a set of selection criteria based on qualities found to distinguish successful

¹ TFA's rural regions are in: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Hawaii, Kentucky, the Louisiana Delta, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, the Rio Grande Valley, South Carolina, South Dakota, South Louisiana, and Washington.

² In the 2016-17 school year, TFA placed teachers in more than 2,300 public schools in over 500 LEAs.

³ These estimates are derived primarily from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)'s Common Core of Data and TFA's internal placement data. Statistics related to socioeconomic diversity are also derived from district poverty rates from the U.S. Census Bureau's Small Area Income Poverty Estimates (SAIPE).

⁴ U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, NCES, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2015 Mathematics and Reading Assessments.

teaching in low-income communities. To gain admission, applicants must successfully pass through multiple stages of evaluation: submit a written application, complete an online activity, and engage in an all-day final evaluation comprised of: sample teaching; a group activity; and an individual interview—during which TFA staff collect evidence pertaining to an applicant’s proficiency level in each of the selection criteria. By linking historical CM scores on those selection criteria with student achievement results, we developed an approach to selection that roots each decision in what we know about the likelihood of success based on the performance of past CMs. In order to ensure that we execute the model faithfully, we train selectors (differentiated for new and veteran selectors) and include many safeguards to ensure consistency in our admissions decisions—for example, teams of experts audit selection decisions to ensure consistent and fair application of the evaluation criteria. (For more detail on our selection criteria and processes, see Appendix B.)

Competitive. In 2016, 37,000 individuals from 49 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, representing more than 700 colleges and universities applied to TFA. After our rigorous selection process, only 14% were accepted. 3,500 matriculated and subsequently completed training as part of our prior SEED project. The quality of the corps is remarkable: CMs have an average undergraduate GPA of 3.43 and the vast majority held leadership positions in their past endeavors.

Supported by Research. Recent third-party studies have found that TFA’s selection model successfully identifies teachers who will have a positive impact on student achievement, even in their first year of teaching.⁵ These findings are especially significant in light of limited evidence on the factors that predict teacher effectiveness.

Diversity. TFA teachers are diverse. Fifty-one percent of our 2016 CMs identify as people of

⁵ Dobbie, W. (2011). *Teacher Characteristics and Student Achievement: Evidence from Teach For America*.

Retrieved from <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/teachercharacteristicsjuly2011.pdf>

Bastian, K. (2013). *Selecting and Preparing Teachers and School Leaders to Improve Educational Outcomes* (Ph.D. thesis). Retrieved from <https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/indexablecontent/uuid:6855eb08-955d-44dd-9e23-4486ecbf2eff>

color, 48% received Pell Grants as undergraduates (a proxy for being from a low-income background), 34% were the first in their family to attend college, and 38% joined TFA from the professional ranks or from graduate school. Our corps is significantly more racially diverse than traditional teacher education programs, with 21% identifying as African American and 14% as Latino (compared to 6% and 4%, respectively, at colleges of education).⁶ While low-income students can be well-served by teachers of all racial backgrounds, increasing the number of CMs who share their students' racial and economic backgrounds can lead to additional impact.⁷ Furthermore, during the two corps years included in this grant, we will aim to maintain a corps in which 30% of our CMs teach STEM subjects and 80% of whom are from groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM. Thirty-three percent of our 2016 CMs teach STEM subjects, and 88% of them identify as being from one or more underrepresented groups in STEM.⁸

A proven model. A substantial and growing body of research consistently shows that TFA CMs are effective teachers. This is detailed in Section A3 under “Strong Evidence of Effectiveness”.

A2. Development and Advancement of Teacher Theory, Knowledge, and Practices

By supporting the execution, evolution, and improvement of TFA's teacher preparation and training program, this project will yield new insights, knowledge, and practices that will enrich TFA's and the field's understanding of how to prepare new teachers to deliver effective instruction aligned with CCR standards in high-need schools. Institutes, as described in Section B, prepare CMs to teach effectively. As controlled settings where coaches observe and provide significant feedback

⁶ American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2013). *The Changing Teacher Preparation Profession: A Report from AACTE's Professional Education Data System [PEDS]*. Retrieved from https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=145&ref=rl.

⁷ Egalite, A.J., Kisida, B., & Winters, M.A. (2015). Representation in the Classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 45 (April), 44-52.

⁸ 66% are female, 43% are people of color (including 20% African American, 13% Latino, 9% Asian American or Pacific Islander, <1% Alaska Native, American Indian or Native Hawaiian), and 46% are Pell Grant recipients.

and instruction to CMs daily while they work to invest their students and rapidly improve their practice, they also offer a unique opportunity to deepen our understanding of teacher preparation and student learning. Thus, institutes create a forum for testing and developing new theories, knowledge, and practices as we work to evolve our teacher development model to improve CM instructional practice within a constantly changing educational landscape.

For example, our last two SEED grants enabled us to develop and pilot a major redesign of the institute model, first, at a more localized level at our Chicago regional institute in close partnership with University of Washington faculty, and then a scalable, adapted version at one of our national institutes in Tulsa. Based on the potential we observed and buy-in from staff who trained CMs under the redesigned model, we have decided to scale the redesign to all five national institutes. Further, we intend to create a comprehensive continuum for CM development by training regional support staff to reinforce the principles embedded in the redesign. As part of this project, we will better understand how to implement the redesign within our larger CM development framework as we: 1) determine the right staffing and staff training models through the scale-up and 2) develop and pilot a “hand off” of the redesign principles for regions to integrate into their ongoing CM support and development. Lessons learned from this work will not only inform future TFA’s trainings and ongoing support structures, but will also be integrated into future theory, frameworks, and resources we develop and share externally and across the TFA network (see Section D).

A fundamental aspect of the redesign and hand-off is to ensure CMs are equipped with the knowledge and skills to provide effective instruction aligned with CCR standards. Our training focuses CM curriculum on content-based instructional principles that guide CMs' instructional decisions and are supported by content-based instructional activities, tools, and resources, all of which are directly aligned with CCR standards. This project will also allow us to better cultivate culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) in CMs’ instructional practice as it is critically important to

effective CCR instruction. Finally, we are shifting our andragogy to utilize a learning cycle, derived from our prior partnership with University of Washington faculty, to support novice teachers' preparation, enactment, and analysis of complex teaching. For more detail about the redesign and hand-off, see Sections B and C.

As educators and administrators in states across the country align their curricula and assessments to CCR standards, the products and the lessons learned from our redesign efforts would contribute significantly to practical advances in the field, especially for our many LEA and university partners nationwide. Surveys of educators have found that teachers want more information about how the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), one of the more common CCR standards, changes instructional practice (57 percent) and more quality professional development in CCSS instruction (84 percent).⁹ The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) found that fewer than one in nine teacher preparation programs in elementary education and just over one-third of programs in secondary education are training candidates in content at the level necessary to teach to the CCSS.¹⁰

Finally, it is worth noting that TFA has a track record of innovative partnerships with schools of education to share, advance, and sometimes co-develop theory, knowledge, and practice related to teacher preparation. (See Section B1) This collaborative work will be influenced and informed by the new resources and knowledge developed during this new SEED project.

A3. Magnitude of Results in Improved Teaching and Student Achievement

In addition to the national significance and capacity to advance the field, the magnitude and importance of TFA's teacher preparation program are further evidenced by our success in meeting

⁹ Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2013). *Findings from a National Survey of Teacher Perspectives on the Common Core*. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/media/epe_survey_teacher_perspectives_common_core_2013.pdf.

Primary Sources. (2014). *Update: Teachers' Views on Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.scholastic.com/primarysources/PrimarySources-2014update.pdf>.

¹⁰ Greenberg, J., McKee, A., & Walsh, K. (2013). *Teacher Prep Review: A Review of the Nation's Teacher Preparation Programs*. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/Teacher_Prep_Review_2013_Report.

some of education’s most intractable challenges, including: 1) producing highly effective teachers for high-need classrooms; 2) developing our CMs into educational leaders oriented towards achieving dramatic student learning gains; and 3) addressing the effects of summer learning loss for thousands of students in high-need schools across the country.

Strong evidence of effectiveness. There is substantial literature demonstrating the effectiveness, in terms of promoting student achievement, of teachers selected, trained, and supported by TFA—including two studies that meet What Works Clearinghouse standards without reservations. In 2013, Mathematica Policy Research (MPR) completed a randomized control trial study commissioned by the Institute of Education Sciences showing that secondary school math students taught by TFA teachers scored 7.3% of a standard deviation higher than students of other teachers in the same schools who entered teaching via less selective programs, traditional or alternative.¹¹ A 2004 MPR study, found elementary math students taught by novice TFA teachers scored 26% of a standard deviation higher than students of other comparably experienced teachers in the same schools.¹²

A number of additional studies also offer evidence suggesting TFA teachers have a statistically significant, positive impact on student achievement, in a variety of subject areas and grade levels. A 2015 national study, supported by an i3 Scale-up grant and using an experimental design, found that CMs teaching math and reading in elementary grades were as effective as other teachers in the same schools, who typically had nearly 14 years of experience. When the analysis was restricted to teachers in early grades, CMs in both reading and math are found to be more effective. P-2 reading students of TFA CMs scored 12% of a standard deviation higher on reading skills tests—equivalent

¹¹ Clark, M.A., Chiang, H.S., Silva, T., McConnell, S., Sonnenfeld, K., Erbe, A., & Puma, M. (2013). *The Effectiveness of Secondary Math Teachers from Teach For America and the Teaching Fellows Programs* (NCEE 2013-4015). Retrieved from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20134015/pdf/20134015.pdf>.

¹² Decker, P.T., Mayer, D. P., & Glazerman, S. (2004). *The Effects of TFA on Students: Findings from a National Evaluation*. Retrieved from <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/the-effects-of-teach-for-america-on-students-findings-from-a-national-evaluation>.

to about 1.3 additional months of learning—than their peers taught by other teachers. First and second grade math students of CMs scored 16% of a standard deviation higher on math skills tests,¹³ about 1.5 additional months of learning.¹⁴ Two non-experimental studies using a particularly robust identification strategy (student fixed-effects) found evidence suggesting that TFA CMs are at least as effective, often more, than other teachers to whom their students would likely be assigned in their absence.¹⁵ Further, TFA consistently ranks at or near the top (across a wide variety of grade levels and subject areas) among teacher preparation programs in states that compile rankings based on student achievement results.¹⁶ TFA’s proven ability to produce teachers who are more likely to positively affect student achievement than other new teachers, and in some cases veteran teachers, indicates that investing in TFA’s teacher training program will result in greater numbers of effective and highly-effective teachers for high-need students. Even more, this project will allow us to strengthen CM preparation and ongoing support and development on a larger scale.

A lasting commitment to improving student achievement. TFA CMs have a demonstrated history of fostering student achievement gains in large part because TFA’s teacher training program explicitly orients teachers towards achieving dramatic gains with high-need students each year they are in the classroom. The TFA training experience, beginning with institute, is designed to deeply

¹³ The math finding is statistically significant at a *p*-value of 0.054.

¹⁴ Clark, M.A., Isenberg, E., Liu, A.Y., Makowsky, L., & Zukiewicz, M. (2017). *Revised Final Report: Impacts of the Teach For America Investing in Innovation Scale-Up*. Retrieved from <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/impacts-of-the-teach-for-america-investing-in-innovation-scaleup>.

¹⁵ Xu, Z., Hannaway, J., Taylor, C. (2011). Making a Difference?: The Effect of Teach for America on Student Performance in High School. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(3), 447–469.

Ready, D. D. (2014). *Teach For America teachers in Duval County Public Schools: An analysis of retention and performance*. Retrieved from https://www.tc.columbia.edu/faculty/ddr2111/faculty-profile/files/FINAL_TFA_DUVAL.pdf.

¹⁶ Patterson, K. M., & Bastian, K. C. (2014). *UNC Teacher Quality Research: Teacher Portals Effectiveness Report*. Retrieved from <https://publicpolicy.unc.edu/files/2015/07/UNC-Teacher-Quality-Research-Teacher-Portals-Effectiveness-Report.pdf>.

Tennessee State Board and Department of Education (2016). *The 2016 Teacher Preparation Report Card on the Effectiveness of Providers Preparing Tennessee Teachers*. Retrieved from <http://teacherprepreportcard.tn.gov/>

Noell, G.H., & Gansle, K.A. (2009). *Teach For America teachers' contribution to student achievement in Louisiana in grades 4-9: 2004-2005 to 2006-2007*. Retrieved from http://www.nctq.org/docs/TFA_Louisiana_study.PDF.

influence the personal and professional lives of CMs during and after their commitment. Although historically only 15% of incoming CMs report that teaching was one of their top career options, nearly two-thirds stay in education after completing their commitments, with roughly 60% teaching at least a third year.¹⁷ A 2011 study found that participating in TFA significantly increases tolerance, makes individuals much more optimistic about the life chances of children living in poverty, and makes them more likely to remain in education.¹⁸ TFA alumni teach, become school and LEA leaders, work at education-related non-profits, and take on other education leadership roles. SEED funding will dramatically strengthen our teacher training program, thus, better positioning these future leaders to advance our nation toward the day when all children have access to a high quality education. (See Sections B2 and D1 for more information.)

Addressing summer learning loss. Summer learning loss is a well-documented occurrence, particularly for children from low-income backgrounds. A 1996 meta-analysis found that summer school programs characterized by individualized instruction for students and close monitoring of progress were associated with greater effectiveness.¹⁹ As a key component of the institute program, CMs receive intensive pedagogical and content instruction that they put into practice with summer school students. Institute is structured to provide students with individual instruction, close monitoring, and constant tracking of student academic progress.

B. Quality of the Project Design and Services

B1. Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

The proposed SEED project would enable TFA to implement and evaluate 18 summer training

¹⁷ Donaldson, M. L., & Johnson, S. M. (2011). Teach For America teachers: How long do they teach? Why do they leave? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 93(2), 47-51.

¹⁸ Fryer Jr., R.G., & Dobbie, W. (2011) *The Impact of Voluntary Service on Future Outcomes: Evidence from Teach For America*. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17402>.

¹⁹ Cooper, H., Nye, B., Charlton, K., Lindsay, J., & Greathouse, S. (1996). The Effects of Summer Vacation on Achievement Test Scores: A Narrative and Meta-analytic Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(3), 227-268.

institutes in 2017 and 2018, preparing a total of 7,500 incoming CMs to enter high-need classrooms. In particular, this project enables TFA to: 1) increase the rigor and relevance of CM training by supporting a scale-up of our training redesign at all of our national institutes; 2) develop and pilot a “hand-off” of the redesign principles to regions to integrate into their ongoing CM support and development; 3) open new and refine existing regional institutes; and 4) launch a new Rural Cooperative Institute (RCI) to build CM understanding of the unique assets and needs of rural communities.

The following table summarizes the key objectives, measures, and quantitative goals for the project, including the percentage of teachers trained through this project who demonstrate evidence of being highly effective in their first year during the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years. Below the table, we describe exactly what each of these initiatives will entail.

Table 1. Project Objectives, Measures, and Goals

Plan and execute summer training institutes (national and regional institutes and RCI)		
Objective	Measures	Goals
Implement summer institutes to prepare and retain first-year CMs to teach in low- income communities	# of institutes	2017: 18 institutes
	# of first year CMs	3,600 CMs
	% of CMs that begin institute who become first year teachers	95% retention rate
Evaluate teacher performance and identify the percentage of highly effective teachers, based on student	% of trained CMs who teach STEM subjects	30% STEM CMs
	% of STEM CMs who are from underrepresented groups—i.e., who identify as female, a person of color, or being from a low-income background	80% of STEM CMs underrepresented
	% of trained CMs who serve concentrations of high-need students and are “highly effective” in their first year of teaching	2018: 18 institutes 3,900 CMs 95% retention rate 30% STEM CMs 80% of STEM CMs underrepresented
Evaluate teacher performance and identify the percentage of highly effective teachers, based on student	% of trained CMs who serve concentrations of high-need students & are highly effective or effective in their first year of teaching	2017-18: 25% 2018-19: 27%
	% of trained CMs who serve concentrations of high-need students and are highly effective in their second year of teaching	2017-18: 65% 2018-19: 67%
	% of trained CMs who serve concentrations of high-need students and are highly effective in their second year of teaching	2018-19: 30%

growth ²⁰	% of trained CMs who serve concentrations of high-need students & are highly effective or effective in their second year of teaching	2018-19: 70%
SEED program performance measures	% of teacher participants who serve concentrations of High-Need Students	2017-18: 100% 2018-19: 100%
	% of participants who serve concentrations of High-Need Students and are highly effective	2017-18: 30% 2018-19: 32%
	% of participants who serve concentrations of High-Need Students, are highly effective, and serve for at least two years	2017-18: N/A 2018-19: 25%
	cost per participant who serve concentrations of High-Need Students, are highly effective, and serve for at least two years	2017-18: N/A 2018-19: \$31,970 ²¹
Scale up a redesigned training model to all national institutes		
Objective	Measures	Goals
Scale up our redesigned institute model to better prepare CMs to be effective teachers	# of national institutes at which we implement the redesign # of CMs trained with the redesigned training	2017: 5 national institutes, 2,025 CMs 2018: 5 national institutes, 2,180 CMs
CMs develop the knowledge, skills, and mindsets needed to be effective beginning teachers	% of CMs with classrooms engaged in rich and relevant problems, texts, and/or questions % of CMs with classrooms engaged in critical thinking and meaningful discourse throughout the lesson cycle % of CMs with classrooms using evidence to make and justify arguments	2017: 75% 75% 75% 2018: 77% 77% 77%
Develop and pilot a “hand-off” of redesign principles to regions		
Objective	Measures	Goals
Pilot hand-off of redesign to regions to strengthen CM development and foster effective teaching	# of regions that pilot the hand-off # of CMs whose ongoing support and development in the region reflects the redesign.	2017: 0 regions, 0 CMs 2018: 5 regions, 250 CMs
Rigorously evaluate impact of the hand-off	MDRC, our independent evaluator, executes rigorous evaluation (see Section E)	Report complete and publicly available in June 2020
Design, plan, implement, and evaluate regional institutes		
Objective	Measures	Goals
Support regional institutes	# of regions with regional institute # of CMs participating in regional institutes	2017: 12 regional institutes, 1,387 CMs 2018: 12 regional institutes, 1,480 CMs

²⁰ Goals listed here represent the percent of highly effective and effective CMs out of the set of CMs for whom we are able to obtain sufficient student achievement data. Our goal is to have sufficient data for at least 85% of our corps.

²¹ We calculated this target by using the total cost of all institutes in 2017, which is \$27,973,974.

Evaluate impact of regional institutes on corps strength	% average CALI score across all regional institutes compared with the % average CALI score from the prior year.	2017: Regional institute CALI increases by 1% from prior year CALI in 2016 2018: Regional institute CALI increases by 2% from prior year CALI in 2017
Design, plan, launch, and evaluate a new Rural Cooperative Institute (RCI)		
Objective	Measures	Goals
Support the development and implementation of RCI	# of regions that participate in RCI # of CMs who are trained at RCI	2017: 5 regions, 188 CMs 2018: 6 regions, 240 CMs
Evaluate impact of RCI on corps strength	% CALI score for the RCI as compared with the % average CALI score across all RCI regions from the prior year.	2017: RCI CALI increases by 1% from the prior year average CALI in 2016 2018: RCI CALI increases by 1% from the prior year CALI in 2017
Reduce cost per CM of institute for participating regions	Cost per CM of RCI relative to cost per CM of national institutes	2017: RCI cost per CM is 2% less than national institute cost per CM. 2018: RCI cost per CM is 4% less than national institute cost per CM.

Summer Training Institutes: After successfully completing a rigorous selection process, but before being placed as teachers in high-need schools across the country, TFA CMs must complete an intensive, experiential, and outcome-oriented teacher training program. This program currently spans five to eight weeks (there is some variation at regional institutes) and places participants on the path to becoming effective teachers, as demonstrated by the studies in Section A.

In summer 2017, TFA will run three types of institutes: 1) national institutes, where we bring together CMs from several different regions and provide centralized training across the country; 2) regional institutes, where we train a single region’s CMs; and 3) our first-ever RCI where we will bring CMs from five rural regions together to build an understanding of teaching within the unique contexts of rural communities. All 2017 institutes are listed in Appendix C.

The majority of our CMs attend one of five national institutes. Those CMs participate in four distinct components of TFA’s training program: 1) Institute Pre-Work—once accepted into TFA,

CMs receive a package of pre-work comprised of readings, videos, classroom observation guidance, and reflection exercises designed to support CMs' readiness to engage with training activities at institute; 2) Induction—prior to attending a national institute, CMs spend anywhere from a weekend to a full week engaging with their regional program staff, usually in their region, to learn about the communities in which they will teach; 3) Institute—CMs attend a rigorous, five-week, residential training institute to prepare them to teach in low-income schools; 4) Orientation—CMs return to their regions and, building on their institute training, prepare for the upcoming academic year and begin building relationships with colleagues, families, and students, with support from regional staff. These elements allow CMs to be prepared to move their students forward on the first day of the school. This same structure applies for those CMs attending the RCI. For CMs training at our regional institutes, induction, institute, and orientation are not discrete elements, but are woven into a cohesive seven or eight-week training experience, reflecting a more connected continuum of training. While this SEED grant focuses on the institute experience, we are also using funds to find ways to increase the impact of the institute experience by cultivating a stronger development continuum during a CM's two years in the classroom.

Institute has two main components: ongoing cycles of teacher training and summer school teaching.

Teacher training sessions. At institute, we pursue a defined set of student and CM-level outcomes aligned with our Teaching As Leadership (TAL) theory. Institute CM coursework is designed to help CMs establish a vision for their summer school classes and learn essential teaching frameworks, curricula, and skills. Curriculum topics include instructional planning and delivery; classroom management and culture; literacy development; and strategies for promoting diversity, community, and achievement.

The entirety of our pre-service training is generally geared toward developing the following key

mindsets, skills, and knowledge, which we believe prepare CMs to be successful teachers:

Table 2. Key Mindsets, Knowledge and Skills Developed by TFA Institutes

Mindsets	Knowledge and Skills
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Goal-oriented planning is critical to successful instruction ● Classroom culture in which students are passionate, urgent, and joyful is important to my students’ academic success ● Holding high expectations – academic and behavioral – for all students is critical ● I am responsible for my students’ success ● I feel a true connection with and caring for students and their families ● Examining the internalized archetypes and biases that influence my judgments is an important practice for effective teaching ● I cannot teach students content if I do not see them and their families and home cultures through an asset-based lens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Able to design content, processes, and products to support student learning ● Able to use data to inform instruction ● Able to communicate and maintain high expectations for behavior ● Able to differentiate instruction ● Able to invest students in goals and vision for academic and personal growth, academic content, etc. ● Able to continuously improve through disciplined reflection based on data ● Pedagogical knowledge ● Understand how to help students develop strong belief in their own abilities (“I can”) and a strong desire to pursue academic and personal growth (“I want”)

Summer school teaching. Teaching in summer school classrooms provides CMs with an authentic teaching environment similar to the classrooms in which they will independently teach in the fall. CMs work collaboratively in teams of two to four to lead an entire class to master academic content (taking turns teaching and engaging in team teaching), while developing their own skills in implementing lessons that support rigorous student thinking, building trusting relationships with students, and fostering a strong classroom culture.

All CMs receive essential performance-support toolkits to help CMs prepare lessons that foster students’ academic growth during the summer. These toolkits are aligned with CCR standards; are grade- and content-area specific; and include student achievement goals for summer school, a unit plan or guidance on creating a unit plan, diagnostic and final assessments with answer keys, tools to track student performance, and sample lesson plans or instructional activities.

CMs are closely supervised and regularly observed by TFA staff members. These staff members play a key role in CM growth and development by observing each CM several times a week and

providing feedback to develop pedagogical knowledge and skills. Veteran teachers from local public schools also monitor CMs working with students, and provide regular feedback during the summer.

While the primary structure of our pre-service training remains consistent year-to-year, we continuously strive to increase the impact of institute training on CM instructional practice, especially as teachers adapt to new CCR standards. This project supports the design and implementation of our full ecosystem of institutes: 1) redesign scale-up to national institutes and hand-off pilot of redesign principles for regions to fold into their ongoing CM support and development; 2) regional institutes; and 3) the new RCI.

Scaling Up Redesign to National Institutes. The redesign grew out of smaller scale pilots at national institutes and in regions where we have tested alternative approaches to CM development. These initiatives provided us with emerging insights about training CMs so they have a deeper understanding of CCR-aligned instruction. Specifically, reform of our training approach had to incorporate: content-specific training for teachers; research-backed adult learning andragogy; and a focused set of content-agnostic teacher “actions”.

With the support of a previous SEED Grant, TFA and the University of Washington’s College of Education (WCOE) faculty partnered to redesign our institute model based on research from WCOE’s Teacher Education by Design (TEDD) project,²² which we piloted at our Chicago regional institute in 2014. This included working closely with WCOE to implement the learning cycle (see Appendix D) in the institute context. This learning cycle embeds a full cycle of preparation, enactment, and analysis of complex teaching skills that allow CMs to internalize instructional practices effectively. The model also included more learning and feedback as a group than our traditional model. Based on research by the Core Practice Consortium, we also infused into our

²² Teacher Education by Design. (2014). *The Design*. Chicago: The University of Washington's College of Education. Retrieved from <http://tedd.org/the-design/>.

training the idea of “core practices”—big-picture, content-neutral themes that should drive every instructional activity. These practices support novice teachers to build the fundamental skills for teaching to ambitious goals and to apply these skills in a multitude of content areas and contexts to reach instructional objectives.²³

The Tulsa national institute pilot in 2016 retained many of the elements embedded in the Chicago pilot, but adapted some important changes such as: 1) increased efforts to bring culturally-responsive pedagogy (CRP), a pedagogical framework that is grounded in social justice, equity, and multicultural education, to the center of our training model and 2) use of part-time staff as the teacher educators at institutes (in Chicago, we relied on UW faculty to educate and support CMs at institute), which meant that we were faced with the new task of hiring and training teacher educators to facilitate the new CCR-aligned training approach.

Both the Chicago regional and the Tulsa national pilots showed tremendous promise. TFA staff conducting observations noted that the learning cycle and training andragogy resulted in significant “transfer”—i.e., CMs “taking up” what they learned and applying it to their classrooms, resulting in more effective teaching. The redesign culture focused on putting CM practice and analysis of student actions and learning at the center of the institute experience. This resulted in students spending more time on task, reporting a greater sense that what they were learning was relevant, and stronger classroom culture. Using WCOE’s content-specific instructional activities as the “vessel” through which CMs learned to teach in sufficiently rigorous ways allowed novices to implement more CCR-aligned pedagogy (as opposed to practices like rote drill or direct instruction) with success. Further, we saw evidence of CMs viewing their students as competent sense-makers, building stronger relationships with students, and creating inclusive and productive classroom environments.

²³ Core Practice Consortium. (2017). *Core Practice*. Retrieved from <http://corepracticeconsortium.com/core-practice>.

Because of the promising returns from our two pilots, we plan to scale up the redesign to all of our national institutes in summer 2017, training a total of 2,025 CMs from 36 regions on how to deliver strong CCR-aligned instruction. We developed a redesign model that makes thoughtful shifts to the structure, content, and methods of CM training. Though our core concept of TAL remains foundational to our training approach, we are significantly increasing efforts to equip CMs with the mindsets, skills, and practices they need to become emerging practitioners of CRP. Table 3 describes how the 2017 redesign model at scale differs from our business-as-usual approach:

Table 3. How the 2017 Redesigned Institute Differs from Traditional Institute Model

Design Feature	How different from our traditional model?
Orientation to Content	Training teachers <i>through</i> their content and helping them incorporate general and content-specific knowledge and pedagogy.
Lesson Design	Teaching instructional activities, complete “plays” that maintain the intellectual rigor and complexity of the act of teaching—and make ambitious teaching feasible for novices. Instruction and classroom culture integrated.
CM Scope & Sequence	The learning cycle with embedded scaffolds for learning. Includes modeling, rehearsal, teaching, and reflection. CM learning takes place within the practice of summer teaching, as opposed to learning best practices of teaching in sessions and then having to apply those to summer teaching with independence.
Advising	Primarily group-based. Teaching is a very public practice where CMs film themselves daily and CM groups study practice via video with an advisor. CMs also meet one-on-one with their advisor once per week to reflect on student and CM progress and align on focus points for further development.
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusiveness (DEI)	CMs meet in seminars led by DEI facilitators to develop a working knowledge of how anti-oppression and liberatory consciousness work should influence their practice, while also engaging in productive dialogue.
Staffing Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are more heavily investing in additional positions to lead DEI work; previously, instructional facilitators were responsible for both instructional and DEI development; in the redesign, we split these responsibilities so that we can attract more specialized talent and narrow the focus of our training. • Staff are trained as learners (e.g. they must implement what they learn in the classroom and then bring video for group reflection); this increases their empathy for the CM development experience and their readiness to lead it.
Curriculum	Less breadth, but more depth. Representative of pedagogical shifts required by CCR standards.
Technology	Features include video and lesson sharing tools.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP). As mentioned above, CRP is a pedagogical framework grounded in social justice, equity and multicultural education and based on three fundamental

components: academic achievement, cultural competence and socio-political consciousness. These components form the basis of a teacher's pedagogy and identity. CRP requires teachers to: hold high and transparent academic expectations; meet students where they are and scaffold their knowledge by building on their cultural and linguistic practices; understand their own cultural background and actively learn about those of their students; and view education as one pathway toward change by actively developing their own socio-political consciousness and that of their students.²⁴ This framework informed the choices we made about our training approach, particularly in the areas of CM and student curriculum such as: selection of which Core Practices (see below) to prioritize within the CM development sequence; design of the DEI Seminar; student summer school curriculum content; and hiring of staff who share our commitment toward teaching for equity. At the same time, we do not expect CMs to become culturally responsive practitioners during institute, but instead, to put them on a path towards embedding CRP in their instruction over the long-term.

Approach to CM Development. Our training model is operationalized through three main aspects: the content, andragogy methods, and structure of CM learning.

CM Content and Curriculum. TFA built the first three elements of the CM curriculum outlined below by drawing primarily on research from the TEDD project and the Core Practice Consortium. Our DEI curriculum stems from our own internal learnings from various pilots.

- **Core Components of Instruction.** As mentioned above, the Core Components of Instruction are broad, content-based instructional components that CMs are charged with engaging in pursuit of student outcomes. The Core Components drive a teacher's vision for student growth in their specific content area that is aligned with the CCR standards and guide a teacher's content-specific instructional decisions.

²⁴ Ladson-Billings, G. (1995) Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.

- **Core Practices of Instruction.** The Core Practices of Instruction are the key instructional practices that position students for success in any content area. We chose to focus on four specific Core Practices driven by our theory of CRP: creating and maintaining a productive learning environment; teaching towards an instructional goal; positioning students as competent sense-makers; and eliciting and responding to student thinking. These Core Practices can be thought of as a “common thread” that links all of the various learning blocks and development structures in a CM’s day.
- **Content-Specific Instructional Activities (IAs).** These IAs are segments of lesson plans that are intentionally structured to lead CMs to engage in the Core Components and Core Practices. They support CMs in delivering rigorous instruction aligned with the CCR standards.
- **DEI Seminars.** DEI Facilitators will guide CMs to develop a working knowledge of how anti-oppression and liberatory consciousness work should influence their practice. CMs will begin their journey as CRP practitioners, and internalize how DEI undergirds this journey via: identity development, cultural competence, and socio-political consciousness.

Andragogy Methods. The redesign model utilizes a learning cycle to develop CMs. The learning cycle contains embedded scaffolds for teacher learning, so that CMs learn to teach a content-specific IA by: seeing it modeled, acting as learners or watching video representations; planning and rehearsing that activity with their peers in a supported context; enacting it with students; and reflecting upon their enactment through analysis of video footage or student work. The purpose of the learning cycle is to provide CMs with a conceptual understanding of IAs while moving them toward readiness for classroom implementation. The cycle also aims to help novices develop their analytical muscles so that they view teaching as a series of classroom judgments and become increasingly aware and reflective about these judgments. By enacting this in a communal space

rather than in a 1:1 relationship between a coach and CM, it also emphasizes “making practice public,” drawing on the power of the collective to foster development.

Structure. The typical day for a CM under the redesign model includes the following blocks:

- **Lead Teaching (120 minutes).** For a portion of each day, CMs teach students enrolled in summer school courses (for academic enrichment or, at the secondary level, credit recovery). CMs share this responsibility with one to three other CMs, though the bulk of their teaching time is solo.
- **DEI Seminars (90 minutes).** See above.
- **CM Choice (30 minutes).** For a small portion of each day, CMs have an opportunity to determine how best to spend their time in support of their growth and development. Choices range from engaging in independent or collaborative planning to preparation for an upcoming lesson to meeting with a Teacher Education Advisor (TEA).
- **Daily Lead Teacher Educator Block (180 minutes).** This block serves as the primary engine for CMs’ teacher education development related to their instructional practice. Teacher Education Facilitators (TEFs) plan and lead this time in close collaboration with TEAs who work closely with CMs. These are the content-specific development blocks during which staff and CMs move through the learning cycle.

Redesign Hand-off to Regions. It is our theory that this pre-service training, while high-quality, does not form a complete model of support and development for CMs. This challenges our efforts to ensure that our CMs can further foster and sustain their CCR-aligned instructional practice taken up at institutes. Our vision of CM support and development requires a two-year continuum of training. TFA supports CMs throughout their two years in the classroom by providing each of them with a well-trained instructional coach, access to high-quality online resources, and local learning communities. The level, depth, and quality of that support vary across regions, and it is commonly

tailored to the region's local context and priorities. That may mean that ongoing CM support and development, once in the classroom, is not necessarily aligned with what CMs internalized at institutes, which would disrupt the transfer of summer training to the classroom during the school year, detracting from the potential impact of our research-based redesigned training model.

We aim to address this disconnect in a CM's training as they transition from institutes to the region by creating a training continuum to ensure that what CMs learn at the redesigned institutes is reinforced and sustained during their first two years of teaching. We will work with five pilot regions to build a local ecosystem of support for 250 CMs during their two years in the classroom. For each pilot region we will identify the individuals, “teacher educators,” who are best positioned to provide instructional support for CMs; this is likely to include a mix of the staff teacher coaches as well as veteran classroom mentor teachers and staff from our university partners. These educators will become experts in our redesigned model, including providing CCR-aligned instruction, and during the school year, these trained teacher educators will use this framework in their ongoing training and support of CMs, with attention to reinforcement of aspects of summer training deemed most crucial to effective early CCR-aligned teaching practice.

Teacher Educator Training. The primary vehicle for providing teacher educator training would be through staff training during Spring 2018 for roles at national institutes, in particular, the Teacher Education Facilitator (TEF) and Teacher Education Advisor (TEA). A TEF leads CMs through the learning cycle to ensure that CMs develop the necessary knowledge and skills by the end of institute while a TEA is the primary coaching advisor for CMs. Both of these staff work with CMs day-in and day-out on developing and facilitating improvement in their practice within the redesign framework. The other method by which we would deliver teacher educator training would be through concurrent training co-located at national institutes while CMs train during Summer 2018.

Our approach to training teacher educators is grounded in building understanding and skills

through experience and practice. First, we structure training so that teacher educators experience the instructional activities (IAs) as actual learners, similar to how students would experience it. Then, participants internalize the learning cycle, experiencing the teacher educator pedagogies as CMs would, and ultimately, engaging in opportunities to lead pieces of the pedagogies. In addition, teacher educators are encouraged to teach pieces of the student curriculum, specifically the IAs, so that they can deepen their understanding of them. While teaching IAs, they are encouraged to tape themselves and analyze their tape, similar to how CMs would within the learning cycle.

As these teacher educators use this new framework in their ongoing support of CMs during the school year (and improve their own teaching practice, in the case of alumni teachers), they will have the opportunity to reflect on their own development and practice and reinforce their training by participating in quarterly virtual training sessions. These supports will allow teacher educators to further refine their coaching knowledge and skills in the pedagogies necessary to enable high-need students to meet the demands of CCR standards.

Regional Training Institutes. Until 2013, TFA institutes were designed and managed entirely by the national team, serving several cohorts of CMs trained to teach in low-income communities across multiple states and regions. With the support of a previous SEED grant, we piloted two regional institutes, where individual regions trained only those CMs assigned to their communities. Based on the success and promise of those pilots, more regions made the choice to launch their own institutes, and in 2016, twelve regions operated a regional institute, collectively training nearly 900 CMs. With the support of this SEED grant, we will continue to refine existing and open new regional institutes in 2017 and 2018, implementing 12 in 2017 (with new regional institutes launching in the Miami-Dade and Milwaukee regions)²⁵ and planning for 12 in 2018.

²⁵ TFA's Oklahoma City and Twin Cities regional institutes, which operated in 2016, will not operate in 2017.

In some regional contexts, the regional institute model could lead to improvements in corps culture and cohesion, greater CM understanding of their community and teaching context earlier in their training experience, and stronger relationships with partners such as local LEAs, universities, and community organizations, all of which should ultimately benefit students. Additionally, this model allows for the easier implementation of innovations which, for 2017, include:

- The **Miami-Dade** region is revising its approach to classroom culture, moving away from a focus on compliance to one that is grounded in CRP. This new approach will allow CMs to develop mindsets about the role of the classroom environment in promoting access, equity, and voice, as well as the skills to create and maintain such an environment.
- Our **Chicago-Northwest Indiana (CHI-NWI)** will partner with Relay Graduate School to integrate its Culture Model observation tool into institute staff training to enable stronger CM support in fostering a classroom culture. The region will also plan and implement a Community Day in order for CMs to gain a greater understanding of the CHI-NWI region and community.
- The **Memphis** region will staff its institute with its full-time instructional support staff (who support CMs during the school-year) in order to create a seamless transition from summer to fall, as it relates to CM support. The region has also integrated culture competence development with instructional content to make connections between daily teaching and social justice in ways that are coachable and actionable.

By design, no two regional institutes will look the same, as one goal of this approach is to provide regions with the autonomy and flexibility to develop a model that is uniquely tailored to their local context. All regional institutes, however, will share the following foundational elements that underpin our national teacher preparation model:

- At least 30-35 hours of pre-institute work, followed by an intensive teacher training institute;

- CMs teach summer school students under the supervision of TFA staff, who provide feedback and coaching and help ensure quality performance;
- CMs attend course seminars and workshops to build and apply knowledge, and have time for reflecting, reviewing student work, planning, and practicing new skills; and
- Training curriculum is grounded in rigorous CCR standards that are most relevant locally, and designed to integrate seamlessly into the overall TFA program model.

At the same time, regional institutes will differ from national institutes in the following ways:

Table 4. How Regional Institutes Differ from National Institutes

Participants	All institute participants will teach in that same region when the school year begins.
Partnerships	Regional leadership is responsible for developing and executing strong partnerships with the local host university and the school(s)/LEA(s) where participants teach summer school.
Vision and Design	Host regions are responsible for developing a clear vision for a regional institute that is grounded in the local community context and aspirations for students and schools. Regions also ensure delivery of an instructional program that builds on proven practices while making adaptations that fully integrate training with the two years of ongoing CM support and equips CMs to teach and lead effectively in their schools and communities.
Staffing and Execution	Host regions are responsible for developing and executing a staffing model and operational plan to deliver the highest quality training experience.

Participating regions are responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating their regional institute with support from our national Legal, Finance, and Human Assets teams in key aspects of their operations, and can opt for additional programmatic support. The Regional Operations team manages each region to ensure strong execution of regional institutes, as described in Section C.

Rural Cooperative Institute (RCI). In Summer 2017, five of our regions that serve rural communities in the Southern U.S. will work together to launch and operate our first-ever RCI in the Mississippi Delta community. While the RCI will retain the same structure of our foundational institute model (described above under “Summer Training Institutes”), having an institute that is administered by rural regional staff that understand the unique needs and assets of rural communities and that is dedicated to providing a deeply contextualized CM training experience will allow CMs

to serve rural students more effectively and become more engaged and invested members of their communities. Over two years, the RCI will train 428 CMs from Arkansas, Appalachia (Kentucky), the Louisiana Delta, Mississippi, and South Louisiana. A priority for the RCI is orienting CMs toward a better understanding of their community context to more readily foster stronger partnerships throughout their communities; some of the innovations planned as part of the RCI to address this priority, as well as contribute to the Mississippi Delta's enrichment are:

- Enable student leadership by organizing community service projects to empower students to problem-solve with the goal of improving their community under the guidance of CMs. This will also enable CMs to develop a mindset for what it means to live in a rural community.
- Improve teacher effectiveness by offering a 1-2 week residency program at the RCI for alumni and other district teachers that would provide differentiated professional development from regional staff and/or external experts. The RCI views these kinds of development as a critical need in the Mississippi Delta and the rest of the rural South.

Another benefit of the RCI is that it continues to provide summer school in communities that would otherwise not be able to offer it absent the RCI so that students can continue to seek credit recovery or engage in summer enrichment programming to mitigate summer learning loss.

B2. Comprehensive Effort to Improve Teaching and Learning

TFA program as a comprehensive effort. Alongside many other organizations, TFA is growing the movement of effective teachers and leaders working to ensure that students growing up in poverty receive an excellent, academically rigorous education. We pursue this mission by recruiting and selecting outstanding college graduates and professionals who commit to teach at least two years in low-income schools and become lifelong leaders in the effort to expand educational equity. We then train these CMs at our institutes, place them in full-time teaching positions in high-need schools, and provide them with intensive coaching, support, and professional

development throughout their two years as CMs. After those two years, we offer additional resources, professional development, and other opportunities to our alumni, including those who remain classroom teachers or pursue school and school systems leadership positions, in support of our mission. Thus, through the development of CMs into effective teachers and the broader support offered to our alumni, our comprehensive approach improves teaching and learning, and supports rigorous academic standards.

TFA expands the pipeline of teachers and leaders (at every level of the education system and within other sectors) who are committed to tackling educational inequity, improving teaching and learning, and supporting rigorous academic standards. We expand this pipeline by: 1) recruiting and developing teachers who likely would not otherwise have entered the classroom and 2) orienting our program efforts toward developing leaders who have high expectations for high-need students and commit their lifetimes to addressing educational inequity.

In the short term, TFA CMs have a greater impact on student achievement than other new teachers (see Section A3) and bring a sense of urgency to their classrooms and schools. In the long term, TFA alumni are a critical source of talent for schools, school systems, policy and advocacy organizations, nonprofits, the government, and other positions and organizations impacting P-12 education. Nearly two-thirds of alumni work full-time in the field of education (over half of those as teachers), and 84% of alumni work full-time in a job that impacts education and/or low-income communities. A recent study found that more founders and leaders of education organizations began their careers in TFA than in any other organization or program.²⁶

Shaped by their corps experience, alumni exert strong leadership to expand educational opportunity. Examples include: former DC Public Schools Chancellor Kaya Henderson, who led

²⁶ Higgins, M., Hess, F. Weiner, J., & Robison, W. (2011). Creating a Corps of Change Agents – TFA Alumni Project. *Education Next*, 11(3).

her district to historic gains on the NAEP; Kevin Huffman, former Tennessee Department of Education Commissioner, who launched the nation’s first statewide teacher evaluation system with student growth; Louisiana State Superintendent John White; and Dave Levin and Mike Feinberg, Co-Founders of KIPP, one of the largest and highest impact charter networks in the country.

TFA’s approach is enduring and comprehensive in scope, producing teachers and leaders who influence educational practice and policy at all levels and create a context for P-12 education that fosters high expectations, effective teaching and learning, and academic rigor.

The SEED project’s role in TFA’s comprehensive approach. TFA’s teacher training efforts are a key component of our overall program continuum—from recruitment through alumni development—that underpins our comprehensive approach to expanding educational opportunity. Without capacity to design and deliver high-quality pre-service training, we could not recruit the same profile and caliber of participants; nor would schools and LEAs seek to hire our CMs. Institute is a critical foundation, necessary for instilling the key mindsets, knowledge, and skills that position CMs to be effective in their classrooms, including in delivering instruction aligned with CCR standards. Institutes also place CMs on the path toward becoming lifelong advocates for educational equity, and understanding how to be an effective teacher is the first step. Furthermore, institutes provide a valuable professional development experience to institute staff who pursue or hold school and teacher leadership positions (principals, instructional coaches, deans of students, etc.). Thus, by supporting institutes, the proposed SEED project is an essential piece of TFA’s comprehensive effort to improve teaching and learning and support rigorous academic standards for students in high-need schools.

B3. Sufficient Quality, Intensity, and Duration of Training

TFA’s institutes, which are the centerpiece of this SEED project, are foundational to TFA’s proven approach to developing effective teachers. While we are deeply committed to continuously

improving CM and staff training experiences, we have some evidence to demonstrate that the quality, intensity, and duration of our institutes is sufficient based on the proven effectiveness of our CMs. As mentioned in Section A, state studies of teacher preparation pathways consistently show that TFA is among the top teacher providers in terms of student achievement, signifying the effectiveness of TFA’s selection model and teacher training program across various school settings, grade levels, and subject areas. In addition, principals express strong satisfaction with CMs and the program. In our most recent survey of the principals who hire and work with CMs, 77% reported that CMs make a positive difference in their schools. They reported that CMs are better prepared than other new teachers and that they would hire another CM if there was another vacancy, both of which speak to the quality of our training program.²⁷

In addition, the newer efforts described in this project—scaling a next-generation institute model; developing and piloting a “hand off” of principles embedded in the new institute model to regions; opening new and refining existing regional institutes; and implementing a new RCI—will improve upon quality, intensity, and duration by fostering a stronger continuum of CM development and thus, allowing CMs to internalize their training better and to strengthen their practice, especially in a new era of CCR standards.

B4. Preparing Personnel for Shortage Fields

We prioritize the needs of our partner LEAs and schools, which means that we prepare a disproportionate number of our teachers for placements with demonstrated shortages. Of the 7,500 teachers we will prepare through this project, the majority will be prepared to teach in shortage areas. Based on our historic corps placements, we project that 19% will be prepared to teach math, 15% science, 14% special education, 5% bilingual or ESL classes, and 3% foreign languages—with

²⁷ Rudnick, M., Edelman, A., Kharel, U., Lewis, M. (2015). *Results from the Teach For America 2015 National Principal Survey*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation.

many of our other placements in other shortage areas specific to our partner LEAs and schools.

B5. Serving Disadvantaged individuals.

The vast majority of students served by this project are disadvantaged. Specifically:

- **Students who are living in poverty and served by high-poverty schools.** As stated in Section A, CMs teach in schools where 84% of students receive free or reduced-price lunch.
- **Students served by rural LEAs.** Over 6% of our CMs teach in rural LEAs²⁸ in 12 states,²⁹ and over 14% teach in the 15 TFA regions we consider predominantly rural. CMs from eight of these regions, comprising 10% of our total corps, will undergo institute training in rural communities. This includes, as mentioned above, the RCI which will provide a deeply contextualized training experience to allow CMs to serve rural students more effectively and be more engaged and invested members of their communities.
- **Students with disabilities.** 14% of our CMs teach in a special education classroom.³⁰
- **English learners.** 5% of our CMs teach in some type of English as a Second Language or Bilingual classroom.³¹
- **Students who are members of federally-recognized Indian tribes.** On average across the schools in which we teach, approximately 1% of the students identify as Native.³² Two of our regions, New Mexico and South Dakota, primarily serve students who are members of federally-recognized Indian tribes. At our Phoenix summer institute, we partner with local tribal schools to have those CMs provide academic instruction to students, while also

²⁸ LEAs that are eligible under the Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) or the Rural and Low-Income Schools (RLIS) programs.

²⁹ Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington.

³⁰ We do not collect student-level data; however, the percentage of students with disabilities that we reach is likely higher given that these students are likely in other CM classrooms as well.

³¹ We do not collect student-level data; however, the percentage of English Learners that we reach is likely higher given that these students are likely in other CM classrooms as well.

³² American Indian or Alaska Native as defined by NCES.

training them to be effective, culturally responsive teachers to Native students.

C. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

C1. Qualifications of Key Project Personnel

This project will be managed and executed primarily through the collaborative efforts of three National teams—the Teacher Leadership Development team (TLD) (including three sub-teams: Teacher Preparation team (TPT), Knowledge and TAL team (KTAL), and Coaching team); the Org-wide Learning and Strategy team (OWLS); and the Regional Operations (RegOps) team—working closely with institute staff and TFA regional leadership.

The TPT team is the national team that is ultimately responsible for effective implementation of the SEED project. TPT provides guidance and oversight to national institutes to ensure they effectively plan and execute the institute experience and outcomes outlined in Section B. Each national institute has a full-time, four-person Institute Management Team (IMT) that sits on the TPT team, and is charged with: setting the vision for that institute; working with school partners and KTAL and Coaching teams to design curriculum and sessions; and working with the Finance team to ensure strong fiscal compliance. The IMT oversees the hiring, management and professional development of approximately 80 full-time and seasonal staff members (per institute) to ensure that they are prepared and working effectively with CMs. Within TPT, there are two central support teams, Talent and Operations and Institute Program Support, that work in partnership with the IMTs and other national teams to support the development and execution of the redesign.

The KTAL team draws on content expertise to develop student-facing curriculum used in summer schools and to design content-specific training for teachers, working in partnership with TPT to train summer staff on the CM curriculum. The KTAL team also designs DEI teacher training and trains DEI facilitators. The Coaching team has expertise in leadership development, specifically, in the use of coaching to support staff and CM development. They are partnering with the TPT team

to redefine the TEA role and develop a new approach to training TEA staff. The Org-Wide Learning and Strategy (OWLS) team is a 40-person team that provides resources necessary to support our internal learning objectives and facilitate a significant portion of the project evaluation.

In addition to full-time staff, we also hire seasonal staff who work at and manage each summer school site. They are collectively responsible for training CMs and running the summer school program. Seasonal staff members are recruited, selected, trained, and employed by TFA. They are directly managed by the IMT (for national institutes and RCI) or regional leadership (for regional institutes). Key positions include: School Directors (SDs)—the leaders of each school site that partner with LEA administrators on instruction, discipline, and operations (typically one SD per 50-60 CMs); TEAs³³—the primary advisor for CMs; they observe CMs teaching, provide feedback, and conduct training sessions on instructional strategies (one TEA per 14 CMs); TEF—lead CMs through the learning cycle to ensure that CMs develop the necessary classroom judgment, knowledge, skills, and mindsets by the end of institute (one TEF per school site); School Operations Managers (SOM)—ensure the school site runs smoothly in partnership with the LEA administrator (one SOM per school site).

To ensure successful management and implementation of regional institutes, national institute teams work closely with regional leadership. Regions can seek out the following supports from national teams: access to design and execution resources; opportunity to participate in retreats, conferences, and other in-person experiences that allow regions to share resources and insights and to further develop their vision for pre-service; and consultation with national team experts. Each regional institute team is managed by the region's Executive Director (ED), who in turn is managed by RegOps. RegOps will provide support and oversight to ensure the quality of training at regional

³³ We call them corps member advisors at the RCI. Nomenclature can vary at regional institutes, but teacher coaches are a key component of all institutes.

institutes. Regions interested in pursuing a new regional institute must submit a proposal in which they describe how an institute would advance their vision for ensuring educational excellence and equity of all children, as well as evidence of strong partnerships with a local university and school/LEA partners. RegOps reviews and approves all requests.

The RCI’s management approach is a hybrid between the national and regional institute models. Locating the RCI in the Mississippi Delta requires drawing on existing local partnerships and knowledge; the Mississippi regional team will act as the broader management team on behalf of participating regions by providing leadership and expertise in designing and executing the RCI.

Key personnel for this project are listed in Table 5. Individually and collectively, they have a wealth of experience with TFA’s training program, curriculum development, and large-scale project design and management (see Appendix F for resumes). (Note: time commitments listed below represent time committed to the actual project—the planning, design, execution, and evaluation of institutes. These percentages do not necessarily match the percent of effort for each individual included in the budget because the total costs of this project exceed the grant request (see Section D). The balance of project costs, and thus of personnel’s dedicated time, will be covered by private philanthropy and in some instances state funding or district fees.)

Table 5. Key Project Personnel

Name & Title	Project Responsibilities & Time Commitment	Relevant experience
Hana Merkle, Vice President, Institutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Director • Manages all national institutes and support for regional institutes • 100% of effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 years of experience with TFA’s training and development efforts • Founding head of Massachusetts Regional Institute • 2008 Bay Area CM
LaNiesha Cobb Sanders, Senior Vice President, TLD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads TLD • 5% of effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9 years of experience with TFA’s training efforts, including head of Atlanta national institute • Founding board member of Latin Academy Charter School in Atlanta

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2003 Atlanta CM
Jenee Henry, Vice President, KTAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads Knowledge & TAL • 15% of effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 years of experience in developing and refining TAL framework • 2009 Atlanta CM
LesLee Bickford, Vice President, Coaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads Coaching team • 15% of effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 years of experience working with CMs across their entire development continuum from recruitment into the corps to training and support • 2003 Philadelphia CM
Steve Colón, Senior Vice President, OWLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads the OWLS team • Will manage research engagement with MDRC • 5% effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 years of experience using research and evidence to design innovations. • Former Vice President of the College Board • 10 years as an Adjunct Professor at St. Joseph’s College
Omari, Todd Regional Field Executive, Senior Vice President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-leads RegOps team, which manages and supports all TFA regions, including those with regional institutes • 5% effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 years of experience supporting regions in their operations • Five years as Executive Director of the TFA-Baltimore region • 2000 Baltimore CM
Barbara Logan-Smith, Executive Director, TFA-Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage Rural Cooperative Institute • 30% effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 years providing school services and training at the Efficacy Institute • 7 years in schools as a teacher and assistant principal • PhD in Leadership, Learning, and Service
Rita Zota Managing Director, Federal Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads TFA’s efforts to secure and execute federal grants • 20% effort on project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manages federal grants for TFA, including previous SEED grant • 5 years working on U.S. Dept. of Ed. programs at Office of Management and Budget • 2004 Houston CM

C2. Management Plan

Successful execution of this SEED project means that TFA will effectively implement 2017 and 2018 summer training for all CMs by: 1) scaling the redesigned training model at all of our national institutes; 2) developing and piloting a “hand-off” of the redesign principles to regions; 3) opening new and refining existing regional institutes; and 4) launching a new Rural Cooperative Institute. The first objective in our Management Plan below describes the common set of actions that each institute’s owner will take to ensure strong execution. The remainder of the management plan then outlines

the actions specific to each of the four key objectives above, beginning with an expected award date in Summer 2017.

Table 6. Management Plan

Objective	TFA successfully implements and evaluates summer training in 2017 and 2018 (national and regional institutes and the Rural Cooperative Institute)		
Owner(s)	Hana Merkle, Omari Todd, Barbara Logan-Smith, and Steve Colón		
<i>Responsibilities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Milestones</i>	
Ensure CMs are developing the key mindsets, skills, and habits of successful teachers	June – Aug 2017 June – Aug 2018	Regularly roll up TEA observational analyses of CM classrooms throughout institute	
Ensure CM satisfaction		Mid-institute and End-of-institute surveys	
Provide institute experience that is a critical component in CMs’ becoming successful teachers		End-of-institute CM survey	
Ensure desired retention rates throughout institute and through first day of school	June – Sept 2017 June – Sept 2018	Weekly retention reports	
Gather, synthesize, and share information from external stakeholders (LEAs, principals, veteran teachers, etc.) on their reflections about institute	June – Aug 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End-of-institute principal and teacher survey • Regular conversations with LEA staff 	
Gather, synthesize, and share information from internal stakeholders on their reflections of institute—seasonal staff, full-time staff, CMs	June – Aug 2017 June – Aug 2018 Aug 2017 Aug 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-institute and End-of-institute CM surveys • End-of-institute seasonal staff survey • Internal learning agenda insights 	
Conduct on-going analysis of student achievement data/teacher effectiveness during school year	Sept 2017 – June 2018 Sept 2018 – June 2019	Ongoing reporting and review of student achievement data for CMs	
Objective	TFA successfully implements a redesign scale-up at all of our 2017 and 2018 national institutes.		
Owner	Hana Merkle		
<i>Responsibilities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Milestones</i>	
Implement redesign with 2,025 CMs at 5 national institutes	May – July 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMs regularly follow the steps of the learning cycle • CMs deliver CCR-aligned instruction • Gather data for learning (see above) 	

Determine vision for institute (curriculum, sessions, and structure)	Aug 2017 – Jan 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institute-specific IMT conferences to conduct vision setting National conferences and leadership journeys (TPT and TLD) to conduct vision setting
Refine redesign scale up for 2018	Oct 2017 – Jan 2018	Make adjustments to the model based on what we learn in 2017
Hire staff	Oct 2017 – April 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Launch applications (Oct) Conduct interviews (Dec-March) Hiring finalized (Feb-April)
Secure and execute University contracts (for food and lodging)	Oct 2017 – May 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Set strategy and begin negotiations (Oct-Feb) Draft and finalize contracts (Jan-Apr) Contract execution (May)
Train and prepare staff to provide effective training to CMs	Jan – June 2018	Institute-specific IMT training conferences for institute staff
Prepare CMs to attend national institutes	Nov 2017, Jan 2018, March 2018, May 2018	CMs assigned to institute and receive pre-work after each application/selection window
Refine vision for and implement redesign with 2,160 CMs at 5 national institutes	May – July 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CMs deliver CCR-aligned instruction Summer staff well-prepared and supported to serve their training function, in particular, in learning cycle leadership, advising, and DEI facilitation Gather data for learning (see above)
Objective	TFA successfully develops and pilots a redesign hand-off for regions to fold into ongoing CM support and development during the 2018-19 school year	
Owner(s)	Hana Merkle, LesLee Bickford, and Steve Colón	
<i>Responsibilities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Milestones</i>
Recruit regions to participate in the hand-off, and conduct random assignment to determine pilot and control regions	May – Aug 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Announcement made to regions Regions fill out survey to opt in to receive hand-off support (recruit additional regions if necessary) MDRC randomly assigns 5 regions to the program group, and the remaining will be in the control Treatment and control regions complete assurances on hand-off and evaluation participation
Consult with regions to determine primary teacher educators in each region who will receive training	Nov – Dec 2017	All regions identify participating teacher educators and roles are clarified for CMs
Regional teacher educators (staff and external partners) receive comprehensive training on redesign	Spring or Summer 2018	Teacher educators will either receive training in spring to staff institutes or visit national

model with a focus on CCR-aligned instruction		institutes in the summer where they will participate in training sessions concurrently.
Regional teacher educators (staff and external partners) work 1:1 and in small groups with CMs to reinforce and continue developing critical skills	Aug 2018 – June 2019	Regular observations of training supports/sessions
Ongoing training and support for regional teacher educators as needed to reinforce training	Aug 2018 – June 2019	Quarterly virtual training sessions
MDRC completes external evaluation of hand-off	Aug 2017 – May 2020	Formative data available to TFA in time to inform 2019 planning (Dec 2018) Full evaluation report complete June 2020
Objective	TFA successfully implements regional institutes	
Owner	Omari Todd	
<i>Responsibilities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Milestones</i>
Implement 12 regional institutes in 2017	May – Aug 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular observations of CMs teaching summer school CMs attend teacher training sessions Gather data for learning (see above)
Facilitate regional leadership stepping back with RegOps and TPT to reflect on successes and challenges	Sept – Oct 2017	Analysis of regional institutes by reviewing institute coaches' analyses, surveying staff, and analyzing Corps Member and Alumni Learning Index (CALI)
Provide guidance to regions considering submitting proposals to senior leadership to run a regional institute in summer 2018	Aug – Sept 2017	RegOps reviews proposals with region to determine viability
Determine regional institutes for 2018, with input from RegOps, TPT and organizational leadership	Sept 2017	
Regions work with RegOps, TPT and other national teams, as needed, to flesh out vision for and plan for implementing institutes	Oct 2017 – Jan 2018	Regions attend training conferences and IMT retreats to grow knowledge base
Regions work internally to develop CM curriculum, staff training, and operation plans to realize regional institute vision	Jan – May 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend planning and training conferences Interview and hire staff, as needed Train new hires Determine and execute contacts with university partners Determine placements with schools/LEAs Communicate with CMs
Implement 12 regional institutes in 2018	May – Aug 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular observations of CMs teaching summer school CMs participate in teacher training sessions Gather data for learning (see above)

Facilitate regional leadership stepping back with Reg Ops and TPT to reflect on successes and challenges	Sept – Oct 2018	Analysis of regional institutes by reviewing institute coaches’ analyses, surveying staff, and analyzing CALI
Objective	TFA successfully launches a new Rural Cooperative Institute (RCI)	
Owner	Barbara Logan-Smith	
<i>Responsibilities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Milestones</i>
Implement RCI in 2017	May – Aug 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular observations of CMs teaching summer school • CMs attend teacher training sessions • Gather data for learning (see above)
Incorporate learnings from summer training 2017	Aug – Sept 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine end of institute survey data from CMs and all stakeholders. • Conduct CM classroom visits during the first 8 weeks of teaching to better understand progress and gaps. • Conduct focus groups with CMs to better understand institute experience
Finalize vision and plan for 2018 RCI	Sept 2017 – March 2018	Create and refine CM training sessions
Train and prepare staff to provide effective institute training for CMs	Feb – May 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In person and virtual conferences. • Ongoing training calls and independent practice
Implement RCI in 2018	May – Aug 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular observations of CMs teaching summer school • CMs attend teacher training sessions • Gather data for learning (see above)

C3. Sufficient and Reasonable Resources

We are confident that the proposed management plan includes the resources necessary to effectively carry out the proposed project, as it relies on existing staff structures and strategic engagement of contractors and partners. These efforts are grounded in an overall environment of cost effectiveness, efficiency, fiscal transparency, and reporting quality. Charity Navigator has given TFA 14 consecutive perfect 4-star ratings; fewer than 1% of all nonprofits nationwide have received this many consecutive 4-star ratings.

Grounded in 27 years of experience planning, designing, and implementing institutes, we developed a staffing structure for national institutes that utilizes full-time and seasonal staff in a way that ensures appropriate and adequate time commitments, sufficient and reasonable resources, and

overall program effectiveness. Seasonal staff members (mostly TFA alumni) spend a finite amount of time on staff, every hour of which is maximized—they attend all day, weekend trainings sessions and engage in independent pre-work in the spring to prepare to hit the ground running at institute; they provide short-term, high-intensity training and coaching to CMs throughout the five weeks of institute. Our regional institutes use a mix of full-time regional staff who provide ongoing support to CMs throughout the school year and seasonal positions to staff institutes. The RCI is taking a different approach by creating full-time positions to staff the IMT and using existing staff to execute training. Additionally, TPT, a national team, is solely dedicated to ensuring the effective management of institutes. Staff members work throughout the year and dedicate their expertise to improving institutes by analyzing lessons learned year-to-year.

While we continue to innovate institutes to improve CM impact, such adjustments—redesign scale-up at national institutes and hand-off to regions, regional training institutes, and the RCI—are supported in large part by this existing framework. Any new expenses, however, are thoroughly vetted by organizational leadership to ensure the most effective and efficient use of resources and their explicit link to increasing the impact of our CMs.

Based on the totality of our programming, we are confident that our plan includes sufficient and reasonable resources to effectively carry out the proposed SEED project.

D. Sustainability

This project develops and implements institutes, particularly focused on strengthening the CM development continuum, and thus, will have a demonstrable impact on CMs' ability to become effective and highly effective teachers. It has been designed to be both financially and programmatically sustainable—contributing to our long-term vision for CM development which will also inform the field about new teacher development. Thus, this project is designed to build

capacity and yield results, including disseminating important information, findings, and products about the results and outcomes in meaningful ways.

D1. Building Capacity and Results Beyond the Grant

This SEED project is designed to build capacity that will yield important information (for both TFA and the broader education community) that will endure beyond this grant project period.

Building long-term financial capacity. Throughout the project period, the total estimated cost of developing and implementing 18 institutes in 2017 and 2018 (including pre-institute work, new regional institute models, and efforts to create a lasting training continuum) is approximately \$56 million. A \$17 million SEED grant will cover a meaningful portion of project costs while ensuring that we do not become too reliant on any one funding source.

Federal funding reduces TFA’s overall fundraising burden in two ways. First, federal funding is a critical source of support, contributing to a diversified base of support— comprised of 70% private funding (31% individuals; 31% local and national foundations; 8% corporations; 1% fundraising events) and 29% public dollars (10% public school partners; 19% local, state, and federal partners). We could not invest the same level of resources in teacher preparation and continuous improvement if we relied only on local funding sources. Second, receiving federal funding speaks to the health of our organization in a way that will allow us to continue to leverage a substantial amount of private funding for every public dollar invested. SEED support will enable TFA to attract additional financial support by helping us further demonstrate that we are an innovative program engaged in rigorous, recognized research.

Building long-term programmatic capacity. The learnings produced throughout this project will build long-term programmatic capacity for TFA. Evaluation methods (see Section E) provide ongoing feedback on the effectiveness of various aspects of our institutes. This feedback will provide insights and inform improvements to strengthen our design and delivery of institutes and

allow us to build on past lessons. For example, our study of the redesign scale-up will help us to sharpen our methods for training staff to implement the principles of the redesign with fidelity. Further, the rigorous external evaluation of our hand-off pilot will inform our understanding of what a complete CM development continuum looks like at a national scale and how we approach CM development more broadly. The SEED project builds program capacity by testing and refining new approaches, and making the learnings, tools, and resources widely available to the TFA community.

Enduring results. As discussed in Sections A3 and B2, this project will yield enduring results for TFA and the broader education community. Institute is the first step in building the long-term capacity of TFA CMs to become highly effective teachers and education leaders who, years after their institute experience, will continue to positively influence their fellow teachers, schools, and students. Over 12,000 alumni teach, 1,010 lead schools, 290 are school systems leaders, and 125 are elected union leaders. Support for our institutes fuels this critical leadership pipeline.

This project also supports extensive training and professional development for institute staff, which includes approximately 350 teacher coaches per year. This training helps further their practice by developing their ability to effectively train and support new CMs. Their experiences with institute staff training and CM coaching and development translates to their own improved teaching and leadership skills as they continue their work in education following institute, ultimately leading to stronger outcomes for high-needs students more broadly.

More specifically, the institute redesign coupled with the hand-off will set the stage for what promises to be a major step forward in the evolution of our approach to teacher development. Additionally, regional institutes represent an opportunity to develop more robust, year-round partnerships with schools and LEAs that are more strategic and less transactional, and thus more sustainable, enduring, and impactful.

D2. Findings and Products for Other Agencies and Organizations.

This SEED project will produce research findings and new tools and resources for teacher preparation and development, while also enabling us to deepen existing partnerships and foster new ones. At the heart of this grant is developing a teacher preparation and development model that reflects a full continuum of training and supports (i.e. preparation providers do not stop supporting teachers their first day in the classroom) and a deeply contextualized pre-service experience. Schools of education still have significant room for growth;³⁴ the learnings produced from this project will provide important insights for the teacher preparation field, LEAs, and states on a different preparation model and the types of programmatic components necessary to foster effective CCR-aligned teaching in high-need schools. This will happen throughout this project via three key avenues: the tools and resources, including staff training, developed through the scale-up of our institute redesign; the evaluation of implementing a complete continuum of CM development through the hand-off of redesign principles to regions; and the deepened school and LEA partnerships via regional training institutes.

National Institute Redesign Scale Up. Our first SEED grant allowed us to pilot the redesign at one of our national institutes in 2016. While we just tested the waters with this approach, we saw enough potential to scale the model up to all five of our national institutes. This project will allow us to significantly sharpen our implementation of this new model while continuing to learn about and improve our execution of it. As a result, we will develop a better understanding of the staffing approach that is most effective and the staff training model that will allow institute staff to fully internalize and implement the redesign principles with fidelity, and to polish the tools and resources that we provide to CMs during institutes and that they continue to use throughout their two years in the classroom. Further, the rigorous external evaluation of the hand-off will also include a detailed

³⁴ Lubell, S., Putnam, H. (2016). *NCTQ Landscape in Teacher Preparation*. Retrieved from <http://www.nctq.org/teacherPrep/findings/landscapes.do>.

description of the redesign components. All together, these resources could be meaningful for the teacher preparation field as we collectively strive to better understand how to develop effective teachers well-trained to deliver CCR-aligned instruction in high-need schools.

Regional Hand-off of Redesign Principles. A rigorous external evaluation of the hand-off pilot will enable us to better understand the impact of institute training when it is aligned with regional support during the school-year, and the necessary conditions to foster effective CCR-aligned teaching in CMs. Pivoting to a continuum model where pre-service training is aligned with supports in the first two years of teaching is a novel approach to teacher preparation. The formative and summative data and findings from this evaluation will not only inform TFA whether to scale this approach up to more regions in subsequent years, but will also inform the teacher preparation field about the promise of using a continuum of supports for new teachers. Further, through teacher educator training of participating university faculty from partner teacher preparation programs, schools of education will have a direct line of sight into how a training continuum is operationalized.

Regional Institutes and Local Partnerships. Our longer-running regional institutes have established programming that addresses partner LEA needs. Not only are some of these regional institutes stemming summer learning loss, they have fostered academic growth and an avenue for credit recovery for low-income students. Last summer at our Nashville regional institute, elementary students grew an average of 2.8 months in reading and high school students grew 2.2 months in math and recovered an average of one credit needed to graduate high school on-time. As a result, Metro Nashville Public Schools has requested that the TFA Nashville region scale their institute to double the number of students they serve in Summer 2017, and will finance a significant portion to facilitate the scale-up at both district and charter school sites, reflecting true public-private and TFA-district-charter partnerships.

Further, LEA and charter faculty who serve as local advisors at institutes get very strong teacher

training and leadership development through their participation. In 2016, our survey of faculty of advisors found that 79% thought their work at institutes was beneficial to their professional development and 90% would participate again. Not only will their learnings impact their classroom effectiveness, but they will also function as knowledge bridges, bringing additional knowledge and practices to our institutes and also conveying the best practices, tools, and resources used at institute back to their home institutions. As our institutes expand and innovate with SEED funding, we expect these knowledge-sharing efforts to accelerate and deepen, especially for regional institutes where local TFA regions partner closely with host schools and LEAs—jointly designing the summer training curriculum, co-developing resources, and more intentionally integrating the summer experience into local teacher development efforts, including those related to CCR-aligned instructional shifts. These partnerships create and refine processes, tools, and resources that partner schools and LEAs could translate to their own efforts of broader teacher development.

D3. Dissemination Plans

We envision two main paths for disseminating information – one aimed primarily at the TFA network, and the other directed toward partners and the broader field.

Internal network. We are intent on sharing information about outcomes of this project, and especially, insights gained through the institute redesign scale up, regional hand-off pilot, regional institutes, and the RCI across our national network. This will enable all 53 regions as well as our national TLD team to benefit from the lessons learned. TPT dedicates capacity to both pursuing and socializing learning. This includes working in partnership with the OWLS team to optimize learning in teacher preparation by providing support to teams as they think through implementing innovations and planning for information/data collection on the front end. Subsequently, they also harvest and disseminate learnings from institute pilots across the country, ensuring that the most promising practices are replicated while improving upon or replacing less promising ones. Other knowledge-

sharing mechanisms include: 1) Innovation knowledge-sharing space—making information about innovative practices and resources on pilot design and evaluation easily accessible for all TFA staff on internal team websites, communications channels, and organization-wide social media platforms. For example, we would highlight learnings in the TFA Quarterly which publishes innovative, impactful, and action-oriented insights, including the latest research findings, historical research with current relevance, emerging regional pilots, and interviews with internal and external content experts (see Appendix M); 2) Innovative practices and metrics tracking—identifying and cataloguing regional, national, and external innovations, as well as gathering and analyzing survey results and other metrics to inform ongoing innovation design and delivery.

External network. Dissemination of best practices, resources, and insights primarily happens through partnership with universities, schools, and LEAs (as outlined in Section D2). For example, in 2016 we hosted structured learning visits to the redesigned institute pilot in Tulsa for our partners (university and teacher preparation faculty, LEA staff, and other interested parties) to provide an opportunity for them to observe the redesign in action. This is something we have historically done with previous innovations and will continue to do through the redesign scale-up to broaden the reach of our theory of action and lessons learned.

TFA also hopes to share its learnings by providing technical assistance to an interested state or LEA through a SEED Mentoring Partnership, organized by the Department of Education. We believe that the work of the redesign institute coupled with the hand-off will offer important lessons about how to effectively prepare and train teachers to deliver CCR-aligned instruction. Such a mentorship will allow TFA to directly support an LEA or state in decisions about how to best structure training and professional development opportunities to maximize teacher learning and foster effective CCR-aligned instruction. Through an opportunity to participate in a Mentoring

Partnership, we can develop systems, resources, and tools to enable us to provide the same kind of technical assistance more broadly to other LEA and university partners.

In addition to collaborating with LEA and university partners, TFA will harness its community outreach and marketing efforts to communicate learnings, including the final external evaluation report, to the field and general public through traditional print vehicles and social media (e.g., through TFA’s magazine, *One Day*, which is widely distributed to our constituents). In the next 1-2 years, we are also seeking to expand the TFA Quarterly (see above) into an external-facing, peer-review journal to provide another vehicle for disseminating our evaluation results. Additionally, MDRC will proactively share the final report through their website and social media outlets. Through our broad set of K-12 and higher education partnerships, and outreach to the broader field and general public, we are eager to share our learnings from our work in teacher preparation.

E. Quality of Evaluation

TFA will evaluate the following components of this project: planning and delivering institutes for all of our CMs, and four sub-initiatives: scaling up the institute redesign to all national institutes, piloting a “hand-off” of supports to CMs during the school year; implementing of regional institutes, and launching the RCI. The highly-respected research firm, MDRC, will conduct a rigorous, independent evaluation of the redesign and hand-off, while all other aspects of the project will be evaluated by the OWLS team.

External Evaluation of the Full-Scale National Institute Training and the Hand-Off

MDRC, a leading third-party evaluator of educational interventions, is currently conducting a study of the implementation of TFA’s 2016 redesigned training and its promise for improving the outcomes of teachers and their students, as part of an earlier SEED grant. (Findings are not yet available because CMs are still in their first year of teaching.)

In this SEED grant application, TFA is proposing to scale up the redesigned training to all

national institutes in summer 2017. TFA also plans to supplement the new summer training by providing supports to CMs during the school year (“the hand-off”), beginning with the 2018 cohort. A rigorous random assignment research design will be used to examine the impact of the hand-off, and a mixed-methods implementation study will be used to explore the features of the scale-up and of the hand-off. The evaluation will examine the following questions:

- How was the redesigned training implemented during its expansion to all TFA national institutes?
- How was the hand-off implemented and how does it differ from the typical supports provided to CMs during the school year?
- What is the impact of the hand-off on CMs’ instructional practices and self-efficacy related to culturally responsive pedagogies (CRP) and classroom management strategies?
- What is the impact of the hand-off on CMs’ perceptions of the training and support received from TFA, their perceptions about teaching, and their retention rates?
- What is the impact of the hand-off on the students’ performance on state assessments?

MDRC will continue to serve as the independent external evaluator for this new phase of TFA’s efforts to strengthen its teacher preparation and training.³⁵

E1. Thorough, Feasible, and Appropriate Evaluation Methods

A cluster random assignment research design will be used to examine the impact of the hand-off on the outcomes of CMs and their students. In early 2018, TFA will recruit at least 10 regions that are willing to implement the hand-off with the 2018 cohort of CMs (starting in the summer of 2018). Among these regions, five will be randomly chosen to pilot the hand-off with their CMs during the 2018-19 school year (the program regions), whereas the remaining regions (at least 5)

³⁵ See Appendix G for CVs of key MDRC personnel who will be leading the evaluation work.

will continue with “business as usual” school-year supports (the control regions).³⁶ Because random assignment will be used to select the program regions, any difference between the outcomes of the CMs and their students across the program and control groups will be attributable to the impact of the hand-off (over and above the “business as usual” school-year supports provided by TFA). To confirm that random assignment created two equivalent groups, the baseline characteristics and perceptions of teachers in the program and control regions—and the baseline performance on state tests of their students—will be compared. Baseline equivalence will also be confirmed by comparing the outcomes (perceptions, retention) of a prior cohort of CMs in the program and control regions, using data obtained as part of MDRC’s current study of the national redesign pilot in Tulsa.

One of the goals of the study will be to look at the impact of the hand-off on several teacher outcome domains. This will include teachers’ perceptions of TFA and teaching (from surveys that are regularly administered by TFA to all CMs nationally); their retention rates (from TFA records); their self-efficacy related to CRP and classroom management strategies (from a separate teacher survey); and their instructional practices (from teacher logs). The statistical analysis will be based on a two-level model that will account for the clustered nature of the study design, with teachers (Level 1) nested in regions (Level 2).³⁷ The dependent variable in the model will be the teacher outcomes of interest. The key independent variable will be an indicator at Level 2 for whether a region was assigned to the program group or the control group. The coefficient on this variable will represent the estimated impact of the hand-off.

Because of random assignment, strictly speaking it is not necessary to control for the

³⁶ For cost-efficiency reasons the hand-off will be implemented at the region level. Therefore, the random assignment of regions is more suitable than the random assignment of CMs. (To randomly assign CMs to the hand-off, CMs would need to be randomly assigned to regions, which is not logistically possible.)

³⁷ It is likely that many CMs will be alone in their school, making it unnecessary to account for the clustering of CMs in schools. If in fact there are multiple CMs per school, the model will include another level for schools.

characteristics of teachers to achieve an unbiased estimate of the impact of the hand-off. However, controlling for teachers' baseline characteristics and prior outcomes will improve the precision of the estimated effect of the hand-off, thereby making it possible to statistically detect smaller effects. Thus, the model will also control for several baseline CM characteristics that may be correlated with their teaching outcomes, such as: their demographic characteristics; education and prior work experience; their scores on the nine skill and character scales used by TFA to select teachers (leadership skills, organizational ability, perseverance, etc.); and their perceptions of TFA and of teaching at the end of the summer training (before the hand-off).

To improve the precision of estimated effects, random assignment will also be blocked. That is, regions will be grouped based on their "similarity" and random assignment will be conducted for each group. At minimum, random assignment will be blocked by state if there are two or more regions from the same state; at maximum, regions could be grouped into similar pairs. To determine the optimal number and size of blocks for improving precision, MDRC will utilize data from the current TFA SEED grant study, and more specifically data for the 2016 cohort of CMs in the 10 study regions. MDRC will try different strategies for blocking random assignment, and the "effect" of the hand-off on 2016 CMs' outcomes will be estimated. Estimated "effects" will be null because the 2016 cohort pre-dates the hand-off; however, this exercise will provide information about the relative precision of estimated effects under different blocking scenarios. MDRC will also examine whether controlling for the average region-level outcomes of prior cohorts of CMs (in this case the 2015 cohort) further improves precision. The blocks (and resulting program-control group assignments) that produce the most precise estimated "effects" will be the program and control groups for the study. At this point, MDRC will inform TFA of which five regions were selected for the hand-off, so that the intervention can be implemented in these regions. When estimating the impact of the hand-off for the 2018 CMs, the model will include a set of indicator variables for the

blocks, as well as the region-level mean outcomes of prior cohorts of CMs, if this is deemed helpful for improving precision.

In addition to looking at teacher outcomes, the evaluation will also examine the effect of the hand-off on students' performance on state assessments. Student-level state test scores linked to teachers will be obtained from the school districts where CMs in the study regions are teaching. Some TFA regions cover multiple school districts, so it would be cost- and time-prohibitive to collect state test scores from all represented districts. In a cluster random assignment study, the most important factor determining statistical power is the number of clusters (regions). Therefore, student data will be requested from 10 school districts—one randomly sampled district from each study region. The impact of the hand-off on students' performance on spring state tests will be estimated using a three-level model, with students (Level 1) nested in CMs (Level 2) nested in regions (Level 3).³⁸ In addition to controlling for blocks and teacher characteristics, the analysis will also control for students' demographic characteristics (i.e., age, gender, race-ethnicity, free-reduced-price lunch status, ELL, IEP, etc.) and their state test scores from the prior school year, to improve precision.

With respect to missing data, the evaluation will follow IES guidelines for cluster random assignment studies.³⁹ Missing outcomes will not be imputed, because missing data rates are expected to be similar in the program and control regions. However, to retain all teachers and students with outcomes data in the analysis, missing data on background characteristics will be imputed using an indicator variable approach. (Missing data will be imputed with a constant, and indicators of “missingness” for each characteristic will be added to the statistical model.)

The impact study will be well powered to detect the impact of the hand-off on teacher outcomes,

³⁸ The impact of the hand-off on instructional practices will also be based on a three-level model, because teachers will be asked to report on the practices used with several students in their classroom. See also footnote 3.

³⁹ Puma, M. J., Olsen, R. B., Bell, S. H., & Price, C. (2009). What to Do when Data Are Missing in Group Randomized Controlled Trials. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*.

which are the key outcomes of interest. Prior MDRC studies of professional development (PD) interventions have found effect sizes as high as 0.53 on teacher outcomes. In this study, the minimum detectable effect size (MDES) for the impact of the hand-off will be about 0.32 for teachers' perceptions of training and their retention,⁴⁰ 0.35 for their self-efficacy related to using CRP, and 0.41 for their instructional practices.⁴¹ Thus, the study will be able to detect effects of the size seen in other PD interventions. For impacts on students' test performance, a secondary outcome, the MDES will be about 0.48.⁴² The impact of PD-focused interventions on student outcomes is typically a third of the size of their impact on instructional practice; therefore, to produce an impact of 0.48 on student outcomes, the hand-off would need to have an impact of 1.44 on instructional practice, which is larger than the effects seen in prior studies. Therefore, impacts on student achievement will be exploratory, though the analysis will still provide useful information about the direction of effects on student achievement. All MDES are based on a 5% significance level and 80% power; it is assumed that there are 70 CMs per region and that consent/response rates will be the same as in MDRC's current TFA study.

The evaluation will also address the following questions related to the implementation of the redesign scale-up and of the hand-off: (1) What were the key structures of the redesign and hand-off? (2) What resources and materials were needed to implement the redesign and hand-off? (3) Were the redesigned training at institute and the training in the hand-off regions implemented with reasonable fidelity to the model as planned by TFA?

⁴⁰ This assumes a between-region intraclass correlation (ICC) of .02; that CM characteristics will explain 36% of outcomes variation at the teacher level and 31% at the region level. This is based on MDRC's current TFA study.

⁴¹ This assumes a between-region ICC of .02 and between-teacher ICC of .48; that CM characteristics explain 10% of the variation in outcomes at the teacher level and 10% at the region level. This is based on other MDRC studies.

⁴² This assumes a between-region and between-teacher ICC of .10; and that student and CM characteristics will explain 50% of outcomes variation at the student level, at the teacher level, and at the region level. This is based on parameters from Zhu, Pei, Robin Jacob, Howard Bloom, and Zeyu Xu. 2011. "Designing and analyzing studies that randomize schools to estimate intervention effects on student academic outcomes without classroom-level information." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* :0162373711423786.

To answer these questions, experienced MDRC qualitative researchers will visit three of the institutes during CMs' final week of training in the summers of 2017 and 2018 and attend hand-off training in the regions at key points during the 2018-2019 school year (beginning, middle and end). During the institute visits, structured interviews will be conducted with the institute staff who provided the redesigned training and a sample of CMs who received the training, to understand their perspectives on the redesigned training and its implementation, the support they received, challenges that arose, and responses that were developed to address them. These interviews will be supplemented by data from TFA's CM surveys, which will provide information about CMs' perceptions of the training and support received.

Observations will be conducted of both the institute and hand-off training and of teachers in their classrooms during the institutes (summer school) and during the school year for the hand-off regions. MDRC and TFA will work together to adapt an institute observation rubric and a teacher observation rubric being used in the current SEED grant. MDRC staff will use these data to identify key constructs that summarize the extent to which key structures of the redesigned training and hand-off are implemented with fidelity.

To gauge the differences between the program and control regions, phone interviews will be conducted in spring 2019 with the same program and control CMs that were interviewed at the end of the institute, to learn about any additional training or support they received, how prepared they felt to begin teaching, what barriers they faced, and what has facilitated their year of teaching. Teacher logs, described below, will also capture these differences.

E2. Quantitative and Qualitative Data from Objective Performance Measures

The qualitative data collected by MDRC will be used to understand: how well the redesigned training was scaled up in summers 2017 and 2018; how well the hand-off was implemented in 2018-19; and how the hand-off differs from existing school-year supports. Data sources will include: in-

person interviews with institute staff and CMs and follow-up phone interviews with CMs from the 2018 cohort; classroom observations of CMs during summer institutes and during the 2018-19 school year; observations of the hand-off training during the 2018-19 school year; and open-ended teacher logs to understand program and control CMs' use of CRP as well as separate open-ended logs to identify the training and support received by study CMs during the 2018-19 school year .

The quantitative data will be used to evaluate the impact of the hand-off on the outcomes of teachers and their students. These outcomes will come from four main sources (see Table 7). First, data provided by TFA will include surveys measuring CMs' perceptions of TFA and of teaching at four points in time—at the end of the institute (baseline), as well as the fall, mid-year and spring of CMs' first year of teaching. The TFA program data will also include whether CMs completed their first year of teaching (2018-19) and returned for their second year (fall 2019). Second, MDRC will field an adaptation of the teacher instructional logs developed by Brian Rowan and his colleagues at the University of Michigan. This log is a close-ended instrument that has been shown to differentiate effectively between instruction in program and control classrooms, and logs have been used successfully in MDRC's current study of TFA's redesign pilot. The logs in the proposed study will be similar to the ones being used in the current SEED-funded TFA study and will measure the instructional practices of CMs. A close-ended log will be sent to teachers every other week via email, which will only take a few minutes to complete.⁴³ Because the logs are content-specific, they will be sent only to CMs teaching the specific content areas targeted by the logs (ELA and math, representing about 70% of CMs). At baseline and spring 2018, MDRC will also field an online survey to these teachers about their self-efficacy related to using CRP. The survey will include items

⁴³ There will be three types of logs taken by program and control CMs: 1) an open-ended log to understand CMs' use of CRP, 2) open-ended logs to identify training and support received by study CMs during the 2018-2019 school year and 3) a close-ended log to understand differences in instruction. The close ended log will be used every other week and each open-ended log will be used once every 4 weeks, when the close-ended logs are not in use.

from two instruments developed by researchers at Texas Tech University: the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy (CRTSE)⁴⁴ and Culturally Relevant Classroom Management Self-Efficacy (CRCMSE).⁴⁵ Finally, data on students’ demographic characteristics and their scores on state tests will be obtained from school districts. MDRC will provide each district with a list of CMs and ask them to return de-identified data for the 4th to 8th grade students of these teachers. (These students will have taken the state test in spring 2019, as well as the prior school year.) To pool scores across states, students’ scores will be converted to proficiency levels based on state cut-offs, thereby making it possible to look at the impact of the hand-off on the percentage of students who are proficient or advanced based on the standards in their state. For states that have 2 or more study regions (at least 1 program and 1 control region), MDRC will also look at the effect of the hand-off on continuous state test scores as a secondary analysis. For this analysis, scores will be converted to z-scores by state and grade level, based on the mean and standard deviation for all students in the state; this is an appropriate strategy when there are program and control group participants in each state.⁴⁶ MDRC will obtain consent from teachers for participation in the logs and for permission to obtain de-identified data for their students.

Table 7. Teacher and Student Outcomes for the Impact Study

Measure	Data Source	Timing	Sample
Perceptions of TFA and of teaching	TFA surveys	End of 2018 summer training (baseline); Fall 2018, Early 2019, Spring 2019	All CMs in the study regions
Retention	TFA program data	End of 2019; Fall of 2020	All CMs in the study regions

⁴⁴ Siwatu, Kamau Oginga. 2007. Preservice teachers’ culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and teacher education* 23, (7)1086-1101.

⁴⁵ Siwatu, Kamau Oginga, S Michael Putman, Tehia V Starker-Glass, and Chance W Lewis. (2015). The Culturally Responsive Classroom Management Self-Efficacy Scale: Development and Initial Validation. *Urban Education*: 0042085915602534.

⁴⁶ Somers, M. A., Zhu, P., & Wong, E. (2011). Whether and How to Use State Tests to Measure Student Achievement in a Multi-State Randomized Experiment: An Empirical Assessment Based on Four Recent Evaluations. NCEE 2012-4015. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*.

Instructional practice	Close-ended teacher logs	Bi-weekly during 2018-19 school year	CMs teaching ELA or math
Teacher self-efficacy related to CRP	Teacher survey administered by MDRC	End of 2018 summer training (baseline); Spring 2019	CMs teaching ELA or math
Student scores on state tests	School records	Spring 2019	4 th -8 th grade students of CMs in one district per study region

E3. Performance Feedback and Periodic Assessment of Progress

MDRC will provide formative feedback and conduct virtual conferences with TFA leaders to assist in its assessment and planning during the project. In December 2017 and December 2018, MDRC will produce a feedback memo with findings from its observations and interviews conducted during the summer institutes in 2017 and 2018, respectively. In June 2019, MDRC will prepare a practitioner brief with findings from its observations and interviews during the summer institutes in 2018 and findings from phone interviews with the summer 2018 CMs after their first year of teaching. In March 2020, MDRC will produce a final report with the results from the implementation studies as well as the impact of the hand-off on CMs’ outcomes in their first year of teaching. In June 2020, MDRC will produce a policy brief about the impact of the hand-off on more distal outcomes, including student test scores and whether CMs are still teaching in their second year. As mentioned in Section D, to more broadly disseminate what is learned from the evaluation, these products will be made available to the public via MDRC’s website and advertised via social media.

E4. Meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Standards without Reservations

The evaluation of the hand-off will be based on a random assignment research design and it is expected that there will be “low” attrition as defined by the WWC.⁴⁷ At the region level, there will be no attrition by definition. At the teacher level, response rates on TFA surveys are high (~82%)

⁴⁷ What Works Clearinghouse. 2014. WWC procedures and standards handbook (version 3.0). Washington DC: US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

and the hand-off is very unlikely to create differential rates of response.⁴⁸ For the instructional logs, MDRC will make sure that the difference in consent and response rates does not exceed the allowable levels set out by the WWC (e.g., by following up with teachers who have not consented, or sending reminders to teachers to fill out the logs). At the student level, state test scores will be available for almost all students (>95% in prior MDRC studies) and differential attrition is expected to be very low (<2% based on prior studies). Finally, the key outcomes measures will be the same in =program and control regions and therefore not over-aligned with the hand-off. The measures are expected to have reliability of at least 0.75 (based on the data being used for MDRC's current TFA study) so they will meet the WWC threshold for reliability (Cronbach alpha of 60%). The validity of instructional practice measures will be demonstrated by correlating them with student test scores, which is a specific requirement for teacher training evaluations. To reduce concerns about multiple hypothesis testing, a primary outcome will be pre-specified for each of the five domains (i.e., teacher perceptions, retention, instructional practice, self-efficacy related to CRP, and student performance).

Evaluating effectiveness of TFA's 2017 and 2018 institutes.

As described in thorough detail above, we will use an independent evaluation to study the impact of the redesign and the hand-off sub-initiatives; however, given the scale and scope of the whole project, we do not have the budget or capacity to execute a similarly rigorous evaluation of the remaining sub-initiatives (regional institutes and RCI). Nonetheless, as a true learning organization, TFA is committed to data-driven continuous improvement as part of our broader internal learning agenda. Below, we describe the methods the OWLS team will use to evaluate the overall effectiveness of our 2017 and 2018 institutes using end-of-school-year quantitative measures of teacher effectiveness and qualitative measures of institute effectiveness in preparing teachers.

⁴⁸ With an average response of 82%, differential response rates between the program and control regions would have to be greater than 10.3% to not meet WWC standards without reservations, which is highly unlikely in this study.

Rigorous, Quantitative Measures of Teacher Effectiveness (All Institutes). We have developed a comprehensive system, grounded in student achievement data from rigorous assessments, to measure the percentage of CMs trained at institutes who are highly effective or effective during their first and second years in the classroom. While factors beyond institute training certainly contribute to first- and second-year CMs' effectiveness, we believe this measure is our best internal indicator of our teacher preparation program impact, of which institute is the cornerstone. Our context is unique in that our CMs teach more than 40 subject areas in 53 regions across 36 states. Nevertheless, for the purposes of measuring effective and highly effective teachers, we must be able to aggregate results to evaluate CM impact over time and across regions. We take several steps to ensure the quality of the assessments administered. We recommend, and in many cases provide, our CMs with access to rigorous and standardized assessments like the Northwest Evaluation Association's Measures of Academic Progress and Pearson's Developmental Reading Assessment. In addition, many CMs use their state standardized exams to measure impact, and we expect that number will grow as states utilize assessments aligned with CCR standards. Program staff also review and audit assessments for rigor and alignment. Experts from our OWLS team offer training to regional staff and our CMs on the properties of rigorous and aligned assessments, and our regional staff recommend assessments to CMs for use in common subjects and grades.

Where CMs have access to assessments that measure student academic growth in terms of grade levels, we will define "effective" as at least one year of growth and "highly effective" as at least 1.5 years of growth. Where assessments are not explicitly measured in grade-level growth we will utilize guidance from test creators (e.g., vendors, states, LEAs) to determine the bar for "effective" and "highly effective" that is of similar rigor (e.g. by using scale score growth norms from assessment publisher). Table 1 lists our goals for CM effectiveness for this project. We will calculate effectiveness data for all CMs. Because we are setting goals on the percentage of CMs who teach

STEM subjects, we will also calculate effectiveness for STEM CMs as a way of gauging the effectiveness of our STEM-specific training. Regional staff enter information on the effectiveness of CMs into an online Program Tracker (PT), which is then aggregated and analyzed by the OWLS team to determine the total number of effective and highly effective teachers.

Input, Output, and Process Measures (All Institutes). OWLS will measure the retention of CMs through institute and into the classroom, both for institute overall and for participants in each of the sub-initiatives included in this project, by using TFA’s central PT database. The PT contains information on all CMs, including their region, attendance at institute, teaching placement (school, grade, subject), and retention periodically throughout their two-year TFA commitment. Institute and regional staff enter data into the PT on an ongoing basis. The PT data allow the TFA to efficiently monitor and report on how many CMs attend summer institutes, and the percentage that begin teaching each fall. It is also a key tool in linking participation in different institutes or institute pilots to performance data, observations, survey results, etc.

Qualitative Measures of Teacher Practice and Institute Impact.

National Institutes. To gain additional insight into the impact of national institutes using intermediate indicators of performance, we also leverage qualitative, observational methods of evaluation. TEAs observe and analyze CM summer school classrooms to determine the extent to which they have developed the judgment, reflective practice, and foundational knowledge and skills they will need to realize our vision for students’ learning experiences. At our institutes, we will pursue four broader student outcomes aligned with our TAL theory: academic growth; personal growth; access; and social and political consciousness. These broader outcomes are grounded in CRP and many other aspects of our program design. More specifically, we will pursue six indicators associated with these broader outcomes (for the grant, we will only report on the three “Academic Growth” indicators);

- Academic Growth: 1) To what extent are students engaged in rich problems, texts, and/or questions? 2) To what extent are students critically thinking and engaging in meaningful discourse throughout the lesson cycle? 3) To what extent are students making and justifying arguments with evidence?
- Personal Growth: 4) To what extent are students contributing to a positive classroom environment through increased acts of leadership, empathy, and responsible decisions?
- Access: 5) To what extent are students growing relationships with their teachers, mentors, community leaders, and other influencers?
- Social & Political Consciousness: 6) To what extent are students strengthening and building an understanding of their own and others' social identities and life experiences?

Observational data are rolled up to the IMT and used to inform teacher training throughout institute. At the end of the summer, these data are further rolled up and used to inform the design and development of future institutes.

In addition, at about the midpoint of institute, CMs will administer a survey to students that aligns to these priority areas and is curated from research-based open sources (e.g. *Panorama*, *Transforming Education/CORE*). CMs and staff will analyze survey responses to gain additional insight about students' experiences to inform instructional and classroom leadership decisions.

Regional Institute and the Rural Cooperative Institute. The goal of regional institutes and the RCI is to provide regions with the autonomy and flexibility to develop a model uniquely tailored to their local contexts. The anticipated outcomes are stronger relationships between TFA and community partners (LEAs, charter networks, schools of education), a training regimen that is more streamlined and increases CM understanding of and commitment to driving change in specific communities. We will evaluate the impact of regional institutes and the RCI using TFA's corps member and alumni learning index (CALI), a set of eight survey questions designed to measure the

extent to which we develop and cultivate the mindsets/beliefs that we think are critical for CMs and alumni to acquire and/or strengthen in order to maximize their impact as CMs and alumni—such as conviction, self-efficacy, and sense of collaboration with students’ families and community members. We believe those CMs attending regional institutes and the RCI will show a measurable increase in CALI scores relative to the prior year. The OWLS team collects CM survey data and calculates CALI scores. (Appendix E details how CALI is computed.) Regional and RCI institute staff will receive these data at the end of the summer, as they begin planning for the following year, thus providing ample time to analyze, understand, and act upon results.

Conclusion.

At the conclusion of this SEED grant, 7,500 CMs will have received the foundational training needed to become effective and highly effective teachers working with high-need students throughout the country. The overwhelming majority of these CMs will remain in the classroom for at least two years and consistently advance their students’ achievement. As alumni, informed by this training and subsequent classroom experience, they will provide critical leadership in classrooms, schools, LEAs, and in the broader nonprofit, policy, and business community; they will drive innovations from inside and outside the education system—as political leaders and policymakers, social entrepreneurs, and civic leaders in all sectors—dedicated to expanding educational opportunity. We will have new insights into how key adjustments to the structure of institute impact CM preparedness—including in the area of CCR-aligned instruction— and will share our insights across the TFA network and the education community. As a result of these efforts, this project will have expanded the pipeline of effective teachers and leaders and created new resources and learnings for the broader community dedicated to improving outcomes for high-need students for many years to come.