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INTRODUCTION to CREATE

Our SEED-funded program Collaboration and Reflection to Enhance Atlanta Teacher Effectiveness (CREATE) is designed to powerfully impact historically marginalized students and communities. Our project design originally drew on proven strategies from two studies, Glazerman et al. (2006) and Clark et al. (2013), both of which meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations. Through a rigorous comparison group design, CREATE is on track to meet WWC standards with reservations (the highest rating for a QED).

CREATE merges an innovative 3-year, new teacher residency model with extensive within-school and cross-school opportunities for teacher and leader collaboration, reflection, and professional learning, as well as cross-organizational opportunities for systems level improvements. This broadened scope of programming supporting the new teacher induction practices of educators in the classroom, university, and district in a coordinated, synergistic fashion is part of what makes CREATE an exceptional approach to the Supporting Effective Educator Development grant program.

More specifically, CREATE is designed to meet three overarching goals (reviewed below). These goals were established to align with the SEED program’s call, including priority areas.

Alignment of project goals, objectives and outcomes with original grant priorities

CREATE programming focuses on the following priorities, drawn from the 2017 SEED APR:

Absolute Priority 1 [AP1] = improve teacher effectiveness and increase the number of highly effective teachers in schools with high concentrations of high-need students
  - [AP1a] = Recruiting and preparing prospective teachers;
  - [AP1b] = Providing professional development activities to current teachers that will improve pedagogy or content knowledge

Competitive Preference Priority 1 [CPP1] = Promoting Diversity in the Educator Workforce

Competitive Preference Priority 2 [CPP2] = Support for Personalized Learning Environment

With these priorities in mind at the start of the grant, CREATE designed its programming by establishing three overarching goals—with associated objectives and outcomes—that would impact students in ways that align with the Department’s priorities.

CREATE’s original goals and their alignment to the grant’s priority areas:

1. **Goal 1: RECRUIT, PREPARE, SUPPORT and RETAIN NEW TEACHERS.**
   Through a school-district-university partnership, create a new, sustainable, collaborative teacher pipeline by establishing a 3-year teacher residency program designed to recruit and retain effective and diverse teacher candidates [AP1a; CPP1; CPP2] committed to culturally responsive and sustaining classroom practices [AP1b] and the personalization of instruction [CPP2]

2. **Goal 2: SUPPORT EFFECTIVENESS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS.**
   Offer all teachers (including residents and veteran teachers at their sites) opportunities to engage within or across-school professional
development activities designed to positively impact overall school climate/culture and student achievement in high needs schools [CPP1; CPP2].

3. **Goal 3: DEVELOP A “THIRD SPACE” AIMED AT ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM.** Develop a shared, sustained system through which teacher preparation and induction organizations collaborate, reflect, and work together toward the re-imagination and reform of teacher education and support. [Establishing the conditions for sustainable and scalable work to further drive impacts in all of the above priority areas; AP1a; AP1b; CPP1; CPP2]

Figure 0.0a: CREATE Overarching Goals.

Reaching these goals will ensure that the high-needs schools in the CREATE consortium will increase their capacity to develop a highly effective, culturally-competent teacher workforce that is committed to working in high-needs schools and to increasing student achievement.

**Brief overview of CREATE programming activities:**

**GOAL 1: RECRUIT, PREPARE, SUPPORT and RETAIN NEW TEACHERS**

First Year (Y1) of residency: CREATE provides intensive, context-specific, school-based pre-service training, recruiting CREATE residents to enroll in Y1 of the residency program during their final year of university and school-embedded coursework (designed specifically for
CREATE residents) in Georgia State University’s College of Education and Human Development (GSU CEHD) teacher certification programs. Program courses blend theory and effective teaching methods with a strong focus on culturally responsive pedagogy and issues of race, class, and power in schools. Classes are taught in high-needs CREATE schools whenever possible.

In addition to coursework, Y1 residents engage in year-long teaching in classrooms of skilled teachers, where they are mentored by experienced university and school-based educators. Y1 residents also participate with their cohort resident group in monthly meetings to help them make connections between what they are reading (related to issues of race, cultural competencies, and personalized/deeper learning) and what they are seeing and experiencing in their classrooms.

Second Year (Y2) of the residency: Rising year two (Y2) residents participate in intensive, school-based, summer programming designed to build on completed GSU coursework and further develop residents’ cultural competencies around race. During this five-week summer training, residents are also taught to design safe, responsive, and personalized classroom spaces.

During Y2 of the residency, CREATE residents’ classroom supports shift substantially from conditions-as-usual, and rather than working alone in a classroom, pairs of Y2 residents now work together in a classroom as team-teachers of record. This model affords residents an increased degree of responsibility (as they become teachers of record for the first time) as well as providing consistent peer support (as two residents share one teacher’s responsibilities for lesson planning, instruction, parent contacts, etc.). CREATE provides residents with intensive mentorship during Y2 as they are coached individually and in pairs (for team-teaching guidance) for 90-120 minutes per week by a professional instructional mentor (IM). Y2 residents also meet 8 times per year for cohort learning modeled after what they experienced during Y1.

Third year of the residency program (Y3): Third year residents’ classroom roles shift again, as they are now eligible to be hired as solo teachers-of-record, independently responsible for a class of students, building on a scaffold of experiences and progressive classroom roles from Y1 and Y2. During Y3, residents receive an additional stipend for remaining in one of the CREATE high-needs schools. In addition, mentorship from both the school-based on-call mentor and the IM continues, further increasing the likelihood that CREATE’s high-quality, intensive, long-lasting and multi-tiered approach will lead to residents’ retention in high-needs schools and to continued improvement in their teaching practice. Y3 residents also meet 7 times per year for cohort learning.

GOAL 2: SUPPORT EFFECTIVENESS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS

CREATE supports current educators in CREATE schools by offering experienced educators professional development opportunities aimed at increasing their effectiveness, connectedness/social capital, and retention in high-needs schools. To these ends, experienced educators in CREATE schools are invited to participate in Equity-Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF) and Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT®) professional development that
is similar to that experienced by residents and then, if interested, to progress further in one or both areas as they serve as leaders in their schools, attend national conferences, etc. Some of these educators are specifically in training to be Cooperating Teachers (CTs) or School-Based Mentors (SBMs) who support the new teachers from within their schools. These experiences have a dual purpose to enhance mentors’ reflection and collaboration around their own culturally-based classroom practices \textit{and} to support them in their mentoring of CREATE residents in their schools.

Altogether, CREATE works extensively to develop consortium schools the communities in which the residents work into communities that practice inclusivity and equity. While supporting residents in taking on highly effective instructional practices, collaboration and critical reflection, CREATE simultaneously develops a similar skill set among the experienced educators that surround them, thereby synergistically increasing the likelihood that new teachers will be in alignment with and feel supported by their school communities; that experienced educators will support new teachers; that experienced educators will engage in increasingly collegial relationships and feel increasingly supported by each other (i.e., the development of social capital/connectedness in schools); and that overall school climate will improve.

\textbf{GOAL 3: DEVELOP A “THIRD SPACE” AIMED AT ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM}

Many have written about the gap between research and practice (Ebby, 2000) and, regrettably, universities and schools/districts are often framed as oppositional to one another (Flessner, 2014). With this in mind, a final goal of CREATE is to develop a “third space” aimed at organizational reform a space designed to engage teacher preparation and induction organizations in collective, sustained reflection in order to re-imagine and reform teacher education. To this end, CREATE brings together university faculty, district/school leaders, and community members involved in the education of students for sustained and deep (re)consideration of the work each does.

All of the activities engaged by CREATE -- including the extensive quantitative and qualitative research -- provides critical findings that help us monitor our progress, course-correct where needed in a timely fashion, share results locally and with the field, and continually work to increase effectiveness with the end-goal of increased student achievement always in mind. As shared in our responses below, these activities are also designed to build capacity and gather critical information about our and others’ opportunities to replicate and scale.
Part I, Question #1: Please describe how you effectively used SEED grant funds during years 1 through 3.

Introduction

Researchers consistently point to the teacher as the key factor for increasing student flourishing as well as to the complexity of factors that affect a teacher's ability to do their job well. The three goals of CREATE’s work -- detailed above and used to frame our response below -- each address a factor known to impact the trajectory of a teacher’s success: their training (Goal 1), the mindsets and actions of their colleagues (Goal 2), and the practices of the institutions for which they work (Goal 3). CREATE’s highly effective use of grant funds is demonstrated by the successful implementation and resultant impacts of the activities that target all three goals. As reported by the external evaluator, CREATE has successfully implemented every component of its program in the first three years of the grant and has observed preliminary impacts across several measures. For a more detailed list of all of CREATE’s goals, objectives and outcomes, see Table 1.1 a.

Summary of achievements of each goal during the three years of our grant

Goal 1: RECRUIT, PREPARE, SUPPORT and RETAIN NEW TEACHERS.

IMPLEMENTATION: We have recruited and prepared a diverse teacher workforce in high-needs schools.

- As reported by the external evaluator, CREATE’s successful implementation of every component of its program toward Goal 1 includes Cohort 1 in Years 1 and 2 and Cohort 2 in Year 1. Additional implementation data for grant year 3 will be available soon.
- We have met or exceeded our recruitment targets each year.
- We met all targets for the provision of and participation in residency training for all cohorts of new teachers. The 3-year training experience includes explicit instruction in equity, inclusion, and identity work to increase critical-consciousness and compassion training for highly effective relationship-building that together establish the conditions for student learning, and culturally-relevant pedagogy and other skills training for highly effective instruction.
- 75% of our residents are teachers of color
- 92% of our residents are placed in schools serving primarily high-needs students

IMPACT: Multiple ongoing research studies have been designed to understand the impact of CREATE as it relates to Goal 1 efforts. These impacts are further detailed in Part II, Q2.
- The study from Empirical Education is on track for meeting What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards with reservations (the highest rating for a QED). We proposed to examine confirmatory impacts with outcomes assessed on average three years after the start of the residency, including on teacher effectiveness, student ELA and mathematics achievement and the proportion of teachers retained in teaching three years following the start of residency. Initial evidence from Years 1 and 2 from the first SEED cohort shows that CREATE has demonstrated promise of positively impacting teacher retention,
particularly for Black educators. Analysis of impact on student achievement based on outcomes obtained through Spring 2019 for Cohort 1 is ongoing, with results expected in Fall 2020. Adding to this, annual surveys providing quantitative and qualitative data about residents’ experiences are scheduled to continue.

- Several qualitative case studies of residents’ experiences within the CREATE program are in progress, with early studies pointing to the importance of CREATE supports, in combination with university coursework and support from professors, as it relates to retention and the development of teachers’ critical consciousness. As one example, a recent in-depth case study of a Year 1 resident (engaged in GSU coursework, CREATE activities, and student teaching simultaneously) suggests the powerful influence of university coursework and residency-led professional development in helping this resident develop beliefs and practices aligned with theories of effective, culturally relevant, and critical pedagogy, yet also indicates that mandated curriculum at the resident’s placement school interferes with enactment of these beliefs and practices for the resident and may drive the mentor teacher’s practices away from creative, relevant, and critical pedagogy. This study illuminates the importance of the student teaching context, including curriculum and policy at the school site, and points towards the need for better university-residency-school connections to create a shared vision across different spaces. We take up this preliminary and important finding (among others from qualitative reports) in modifications made to our overall programming, described in Part I, Q2, and Part II, Q2.

In addition, data is collected by the CREATE programing team each year, and results indicate that:

- district and school leaders report an improved supply of diverse, effective, connected, and committed educators for their schools who are positively impacting students and their achievement
- 72% of our first and second year teachers have been evaluated and determined to be actively using culturally-responsive pedagogy, a measure that exceeds our target
- CREATE’s new teacher residents are reported by principals to be noticeably more effective than non-CREATE new teachers, and the cohorts have been rated in recent years as 95-100% effective through the Georgia teacher evaluation system. [Note: we have no data for 2019-20 due to COVID-19].

**Goal 2: SUPPORT EFFECTIVENESS AND SOCIAL CAPITAL OF EXPERIENCED TEACHERS.**

**IMPLEMENTATION:** We met all targets for the provision of and participation in trainings for all groups of experienced teachers (such as Mentors, Cooperating Teachers, Administrators in the schools in which residents are placed, and Central Office District Personnel)

- CREATE developed and expanded its programming for Experienced Educators considerably in Year 2 of the study. As a result, the evaluation grew from 33 participants across 2 PD events in Year 1 to 89 new participants across 16 PD events in Year 2. There were additional PD events in Year 3 with surveys being sent out in May of each year.
• We have met or exceeded all targets for the provision of opportunities to engage training designed to increase effectiveness and social capital.
• We have met or exceeded all targets for participation of experienced educators in 4-day equity training and compassion-based meditation institutes (with the exception of spring 2020 due to COVID-19).
• All Mentor training workshops have met participation targets with the exception of a training in Dec., 2019 (as a result of a scheduling error). We quickly course-corrected and held a training in February, 2020 that yielded 100% attendance.

**IMPACT:** This research is in process, with early analyses yielding promising results.
• Empirical Education’s most recent annual research report from Nov, 2019, linked here in Report 1.1b, indicates that the expansion of both CREATE programming and the evaluation of it have yielded promising findings in the realm of self-reported increases in social capital, improved relationships with students and colleagues, and overall effectiveness in the classroom.
• A critical ethnography is in its 2nd year of a 3-year design to examine the culture of CREATE and give feedback to leaders in school and university spaces regarding the ways in which their actions and words either support or potentially undermine the mission and vision of CREATE, especially around criticality and equity. This ethnography takes a deep dive into several professional development activities designed for experienced educators, with an eye towards program improvement and dissemination. The first manuscript emerging from this work found that Cognitively-Based Compassion Training® was an effective tool to reduce stress among teachers and prepared teachers to engage in challenging racial discourses. Missed opportunities for racial equity work were also identified, and program adjustments have been made. This training has been renamed Presence, Power, Impact to reflect these adjustments. By providing data related to the leadership’s alignment with equity goals, we believe this critical co-ethnography can enhance the experiences of residents and support retention goals. The most recent qualitative report from GSU’s internal research team, including updates from this study, can be found here in Report 1.1c.
• An April 2020 internal survey of Cooperating Teacher (CT) and School-Based Mentor (SBM) satisfaction, conducted by the CREATE programming team, indicates:
  o 96% of CREATE’s 37 CTs and SBMs reported that the CREATE training and their work with new teacher residents improves their practice as classroom instructors
  o 96% of CREATE’s 37 CTs and SBMs reported that they hope to continue developing teacher-leadership skills within this role next year

**Goal 3:** **DEVELOP A “THIRD SPACE” AIMED AT ORGANIZATIONAL REFORM.**

**IMPLEMENTATION:** The Induction Organizations Collaborative (IOC)—comprised of professors and staff from Georgia State University College of Education and Human Development, leaders from Atlanta Public Schools’ Department of Professional Learning and Department of Human Resources, and administrators and staff from CREATE Teacher Residency—have met monthly in large and small groups since the start of the grant to work
toward greater understanding of and continuity between our new teacher induction efforts. While this group’s make-up has shifted somewhat over time, many of the same 13 teacher educators have remained involved since the outset, and the group has met 24 times during the first 3 years of the SEED-funded CREATE grant, and presented on their evolving cross-institutional work at 2 local and 1 national conference.

**IMPACT:** A program component case study, focused on the experience of IOC members engaging in this work, found that teacher educators from different organizations exist within varied cultural and historical activity systems, and that when those systems interact, teacher preparation in all spaces seems to benefit from boundary crossing and new, generative learning. This work will be published this fall in *The Peabody Journal of Education*. As a result of enhanced understanding of each other's work and shared personal experiences, members of the IOC have spent more time in each other’s spaces, and are envisioning hybridized roles to continue the cross-organizational learning for a future work. A few specific impacts of the IOC work include:

- Collaborative sharing out/dissemination of important learning from this work with local, state, and national educational stakeholders at four conferences during grant years 2 and 3
- The development of important communication and support systems to collaborate effectively on new teacher induction
- Addition of a consistent community-based representative and scholar to the IOC.
- Redesign of CREATE’s Summer Resident Academy (SRA) in response to discussions between two GSU professors and the SRA Director about methods for developing teachers’ critical consciousness
- The commitment by Atlanta Public Schools Department of Professional Learning to contribute $50,000 (per year for two years) to support the time of one person to develop a Cooperating Teacher training protocol to be scaled across the district over the next 1-3 years, and facilitated collaboratively by CREATE staff/GSU professors and the Department of Professional Learning. This will be complemented by a contribution of $25,000 from the Department of Human Resources to develop principals’ understanding of the value of accepting student teachers in their schools and developing teacher-leadership (through Cooperating Teacher roles) for their most-skilled experienced educators.

**Conclusion:**

We close our answer to this question with a reflection on CREATE’s approach to educator development. All of the activities engaged by CREATE are monitored by quantitative and qualitative research which contribute critical findings that help us monitor our progress, course-correct where needed in a timely fashion, and continually work to increase effectiveness with the end-goal of increased student achievement always in mind. As a result of this extensive research and close communication between the programming and research teams, our complex programming has shown to meet the programs goals -- with those goals aligned to the priority areas of the grant program (see grant introduction) -- and is thereby deemed to be highly effective. Further details about the studies cited above are provided in Part II, Questions 1 and 2 of this grant proposal.
CREATE is also effective in how it attends to the individual teacher, the school culture and veteran teachers at residents’ sites, and in the ways it supports social capital through the 3-year cohort model and continuous access to professional development. CREATE helps teachers envision classrooms that move beyond the rote instruction found in many schools serving high needs children (Darling-Hammond, 2010), toward classrooms and schools that feature project-based learning, service learning, and personalized support for learning. As Pedro Noguera and his colleagues (2016) suggest, this more meaningful or “deep learning” is essential for closing the achievement gap and serving all students equitably. Additionally, CREATE programming aims to impact student achievement by continually developing teachers’ cultural competence, their “ability to move beyond obvious aspects of a culture in order to understand and appreciate the values, symbols, and institutions of other cultures” (McAllister & Irvine, 2000, p. 13). We know that when teachers work to improve their cultural competencies, they are better able to sustain students’ cultures, identities, knowledge, and experiences (Paris, 2012); help students explore social injustices and their own privileges, biases, and intersectionality (Conklin & Hughes, 2016); and consider how systemic inequities affect students (Matias, 2015). Most importantly, such curricula offer us our best chance at effectively impacting historically marginalized communities served by high-needs schools.

As one considers program effectiveness, and ultimately value -- its costs and benefits -- an important corollary question is, “What are the costs of not doing this work?” The high rate of teacher attrition from high-needs schools places a monstrous financial burden on these schools and their districts. Nationwide, the U.S. spends $7 billion annually to hire and train teachers to replace those who have either left the profession or changed schools (AFEE, 2014). This translates to a replacement cost of approximately $18,000 per teacher, significantly impacting the budget of the entire district and decreasing funds available for comprehensive and sustained professional development such as that offered by CREATE. Results of a NCTAF (2007) analysis of turnover costs in five major U.S. school districts further support the work of CREATE, suggesting that the hire-and-replace cycle in high-needs schools can be broken by following several steps to generate the greatest return on investment: targeting high-need schools; measuring and understanding the impacts of turnover; funding the recruitment and hiring of well-prepared teachers and supporting them with comprehensive induction programming; and sustaining these teachers as they become the experienced teachers in their school communities and as their schools transform into more generative learning organizations. By addressing new and experienced educator development simultaneously through a comprehensive, leave-no-stone-unturned approach to reaching teachers in all struggling schools of a region, CREATE provides a highly effective model that other large, urban, high-needs districts can replicate and that is likely to bring them significant financial benefit.
Part I, Question #2: What are the project’s significant milestones, accomplishments, and other notable aspects of its implementation during years 1 through 3? Where did those significant milestones, accomplishments, or other notable aspects of the project’s implementation exceed expectations or planned-for outcomes?

CREATE is designed to impact the careers of teachers, their students, the local community, and the broader field of teacher preparation. Across the first three years of SEED funding, our research teams measured our primary implementation components and impacts -- referenced above in Part I, Q1 -- yet many additional milestones, accomplishments, and other notables are described below. Following this list, we discuss briefly how these milestones, accomplishments, and notable programming elements move us toward our capacity to scale, sustain and disseminate this work.

Significant Milestones:

- **High levels of fidelity of implementation:** We have successfully implemented every component of our program in the first three years of the grant. Our ability to meet high standards for fidelity of implementation reflects high levels of commitment and effective programming structures. The implementation thresholds (detailed in Part II, Q1) and their close alignment to the programming goals of CREATE and SEED demonstrate that our evaluation is being used to produce data about programming activities that serves as important evidence. Having a body of evidence that describes what we did and how effectively we were able to meet our goals is critical for generating understanding of our ability to implement our program in the future.

- **Increased support for high-needs schools:** Each year of the grant we have established strong relationships with high-needs schools--defined as schools with high concentrations of students at risk of educational failure or otherwise in need of special assistance and support, such as students who are living in poverty, who are far below grade level, who have disabilities, or who are English learners-- and therefore increased the percentage of residents serving in these schools. For example, across the first 3 years of the grant, we partnered with schools in high-poverty communities and are increasing the numbers of residents placed in those schools [GY1 = 82%; GY2 = 86%; GY3 = 92%]. We have found that if Cooperating Teachers at those schools have mastered skills of culturally relevant and compassionate teaching, the residents placed in their classrooms have a powerful opportunity to build relationships with students in the communities they ultimately strive to serve. Scaling our placements in high-needs schools is considered a significant milestone.

- **Residents becoming cooperating teachers:** Five former residents were nominated by their principals in 2019-20 to serve as CTs or mentors for new residents completing their student teaching. It is our dream to have our program yield cyclical benefits of this sort, and this supports our effort to build evidence of CREATE impacts.
• New funding sources: We have earned $10,000 from payments (by educators beyond the CREATE consortium) who attended our equity-centered training institutes. Four educators traveled to Atlanta from far away states to engage in this work, and a number of metro Atlanta schools not otherwise affiliated with CREATE also sent paying educators. Although COVID-19 has impacted our ability to provide in-person training sessions during summer 2020, it is clear that the training experiences we offer are appealing to educators beyond CREATE schools and can serve as a mechanism for generating funds. This was a piloted approach to earning income and its early success positions us to scale this effort, as well as to build a more sustainable funding model.

• New district-level financial commitment to this work: Atlanta Public Schools (APS) has also made three significant contributions to the project, increasing its “ownership” of the research and programming. APS has (1) agreed to provide $250,000 to cover the second-year residents’ stipends if needed; (2) agreed to provide $50,000 toward a new part-time position to manage a scaled effort to train more CTs across APS; (3) agreed to provide approximately $25,000 to identify strong candidates for CT roles (capacity building) and to develop principals’ understandings of the value of hosting student teachers in their buildings; and (4) proposed involvement with capturing various impact measures for this expanded work. We are excited about APS’ interest in pursuing deeper partnership and increasing ownership of the project. This is a critical element for sustainability. Ultimately, research and programming are becoming a shared enterprise across all stakeholders and the value of new teacher induction supports is being embraced as a critical element of the district’s equity programming initiatives.

• Continued support by private foundations: CREATE has continued to generate interest within the philanthropic community, securing three recent awards from local foundations totaling $230k with an additional likely award coming that is valued at $300k. These contributions have allowed us to sustain contracts with all of our staff, despite the economic downturn due to COVID-19, and to continue to develop the critical consciousness and trauma-informed practices of our residents as they prepare to launch their careers at one of the most challenging moments for schools in US History.

Accomplishments:

• Teacher awards: Two of our Cooperating Teachers have received significant awards from the district and state and three of our residents received coveted awards from the university within the past two years, as follows:
  o CTs: [redacted] and [redacted] have both served as CTs for CREATE for several years; both have won Atlanta Public Schools Teacher of the Year awards (one in Pendley - 2019, Pettway - 2020), and Pendley went on to be named Georgia Teacher of the Year and a finalist for National Teacher of the Year. Both teachers cited CREATE as having helped them learn new instructional strategies and developed their critical consciousness.
  o Residents: One received the GSU Middle-Secondary Education Department’s Outstanding Student Award based on academic achievement, teaching expertise, community service, and commitment to excellence and two received the Bradford
& Patricia Ferrer Endowed Scholarship in Middle Level Education, based on financial need and a strong academic record in the Department of Education. These residents report that the support of CREATE contributed to their ability to achieve high levels of success. Their deep engagement with academics highlights added evidence of the impacts of the benefits of teacher training support.

- **District award:** In June 2019, Atlanta Public Schools (APS) was awarded the Georgia Association of School Personnel Administrators (GASPA) “Best in Class” award -- Gold level -- in the area of “strategic partnerships” for the CREATE teacher residency program partnership with Georgia State University, district traditional neighborhood schools, and district charter schools. As the district grows its understanding of the opportunities for partnership with the university/CREATE, our collective ability to serve more teachers -- to scale -- grows.

- **Increases in experienced educator participation and return rates:** Although it is almost always challenging to find time for professional development for teachers -- especially four days during the school year -- principals have been consistently willing to release teachers from their classrooms to attend CREATE’s multi-day training sessions. Across years 1 to 3 we increased the number of professional development offerings and filled rosters (often with waitlists) for over 90% of them. Retention in these trainings was also quite high: greater than 95% of those who enrolled completed the training. Additionally, the “return rate” -- the number of educators who return for more professional learning after having engaged one CREATE institute has been high - we frequently see an educator attend more than one training. Scaling our professional learning and maintaining high rates of participation is considered a significant accomplishment.

- **Redesigned cooperating teacher training to increase support and spread:** During the past year, we developed and piloted new programming for online group coaching sessions for Cooperating Teachers (CTs) so that we could check in with more of them more often than we originally detailed in our grant plan. Reviews of the programming were very positive and we will continue to provide this additional support, which can be offered at low cost to the program. We believe this new form of training will render the program more efficient and will continue to build a strong team of trained CTs for years to come; developing a “deep bench” of CTs is precisely the kind of capacity-building we knew we must do to prepare for scaling. The initiation of this programming was informed by the case study referenced in Part I, Q1 (see Goal 1, IMPACT section), and is therefore reflective of a benefit of the university-residency-school partnerships. As these relationships are further strengthened, CREATE’s programming achieves greater potential for sustainability.

- **Increased interest in joining CREATE:** A growing number of schools continue to request the opportunity to partner with CREATE. In early May, leaders of three nearby schools sent inquiry letters with the hope of becoming a “CREATE school”, and Atlanta Public Schools proposed that CREATE begin partnering with schools in another region of the district.
Notable Aspects:

- **Early indicators point to CREATE having a positive impact on retention, especially for Black teachers:** The percentage of CREATE teachers retained in the profession is 13/14 (93%) both after one year of residency (Y1) and after one year of being a full-time teacher of record (Y2). For the comparison group, the retention rates are 44/48 (92%) and 37/48 (77%) at Y1 and Y2, respectively. Even more encouraging is the impact of CREATE on Black educators with all six teachers retained at Y1 and Y2, compared to 8/9 (89%) and 6/9 (67%) retained at Y1 and Y2 in the comparison group. Given that teacher attrition is particularly high for teachers of color (National Education Association, 2004; Villegas & Lucas, 2004), this is a very notable aspect of programming so far, especially if that trend continues and is confirmed through Years 4 and 5 funding.

- **Preliminary results indicate high levels of satisfaction among experienced educators:** Qualitative findings from pre and post surveys of experienced educators who have participated in CREATE’s equity and compassion multi-day training institutes exceeded our targets for impact. The survey results indicating pre to post growth are presented in full in Report 1.1b with highlights listed below:
  - Educators report positive opportunities for collaboration aimed at improving effectiveness (target was 70%, achieved 90% as a result of pre-post-survey growth)
  - Educators report a support network at school (target was 70%, achieved 98%)
  - Educators report a positive sense of community (target was 60%, achieved 91%)
  - Large majority of teachers who engage CBCT® report
    - improved ability to “manage reactions in a healthy, constructive way when faced with stressful situations related to my job as a teacher”
    - improved ability to “enhance attention and concentration”
    - improved ability to “manage emotions more constructively”
    - CBCT® practices have the potential to reduce teacher attrition
  - Large majority of teachers who took Equity-Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF) report improved capacity to
    - “understand why it’s important to prioritize issues of social justice and racial equity in my teaching practice”
    - "understand how to prioritize issues of social justice and racial equity in my teaching practice”
  - Several of the educators surveyed for the data above also indicated they will remain classroom teachers longer as a result of these training experiences.

These findings are indicative of the project’s sustainability -- educators express interest in and impacts of the work, and as a result the district has reached out to support additional CREATE-led professional development. These findings are also possible indicators of teacher sustainability -- the reports of positive collaboration experiences and success managing emotional reactions are understood to be methods for increasing teacher retention.
• **Growing list of presentations and publications:** Since beginning our SEED grant, we have completed a series of publications and presentations of data at conferences. We are proud of our strong commitment to research and dissemination of the findings. Please see our complete list of presentations and publications linked here in Table 1.1c.

• **Attention from internationally renowned scholars focused on equity and teacher retention:** Due to our early successes -- in particular our high rate of Black teacher retention -- we have had the privilege of engaging consultation by [Redacted] and [Redacted] internationally renowned education researchers. [Redacted] has focused his research on the recruitment, support and retention of effective educators, and [Redacted] research is focused on efforts to interrupt inequities in schools and school systems. Both have been valuable thought partners and have offered to assist with fundraising, and [Redacted] has expressed interest in a future research partnership. In both cases, we are learning alongside and informing the work of experts who improve our understanding of methods for maximizing the impact of our research and dissemination of findings.

• **Newly funded Center to support the work of CREATE:** Based on the scholarship and service of Georgia State University’s College of Education and Human Development (GSU CEHD) faculty supported by the CREATE SEED grant, the leaders in GSU CEHD recently funded a Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education (CEJTE). Three of the four co-Directors of the CEJTE are researchers and course instructors on the CREATE grant and the initiative by the College to fund the Center is a direct result of their work with CREATE.
  - **CEJTE’s Mission:** Grounded in critical, humanizing, and culturally relevant theories, the mission of the Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education is to design, research, and reimagine teacher education, from university teacher preparation to veteran teacher development and support. We are dedicated to working with communities and partnering with districts to support equity and justice in teacher education research, policy, and practice.
  - **CEJTE’s Vision:** Justice-oriented, critically conscious educators who advocate for all students.

The CEJTE is positioned such that over time more GSU students can be served by CREATE, more students can be impacted, and the research on these impacts can in turn be disseminated widely to the benefit of teacher preparation programs and school districts across the country.

**Conclusion:** As detailed in the bullet points above, many of the significant project milestones, accomplishments, and notable aspects will help us sustain this work, especially as we move into the last two years of funding. Additionally, our focus on carefully designed and implemented research studies producing evidence of our positive movement toward project goals so far will support scaling and dissemination efforts moving forward. We take up these constructs of evidence building, sustainability, dissemination, and scaling in greater detail in Part II.
**Part I, Question #3:** What are areas where the project’s design or planned implementation have been delayed or are not expected to meet intended project outcomes? What efforts, if any, have been undertaken to address these challenges?

**Challenge #1:** Recruitment of Early Childhood Education residents. When we piloted our residency program in 2015, we had little to no difficulty recruiting applicants from the Early Childhood Education (ECEE) Department at Georgia State University’s College of Education, yet struggled to generate interest amongst those in the middle-secondary education (MSE) degree programs. We mitigated this challenge by (1) improving our recruitment materials, (2) making sure that professors in the MSE department, in particular, understood our program and were prepared to speak about it to their students, and (3) we worked with school principals -- with an extra effort focused on middle school principals -- to develop their understanding of the value of having student teachers in their schools and the particular needs of student teachers and new teachers, so to increase the odds of successful placements and the development of a positive reputation/word-of-mouth recruitment impact. Across the next two years, we saw notable increases in MSE applicant numbers, yet simultaneously saw a surprising drop-off of ECEE applicants. [Throughout this period we met overall recruitment targets, but our cohorts were lopsided favoring one level or the other.] We made an effort to mitigate the problem this year with efforts in the ECEE department that mirror the efforts made two years earlier at the middle level, but did not succeed; our incoming cohort is 80% MSE students and 20% ECEE students. This is particularly problematic because we have more early childhood education placement openings and because the ECEE also yields a high proportion of candidates with Special Education certification, an underrepresented certification area. We believe part of our difficulty in spring 2020 was an unfortunate set of events -- first, a hurricane on the evening of our primary in-person ECEE recruitment session; second, the COVID-19 outbreak, which prevented us from presenting in person during the ECEE classes; and third, when we moved the recruitment process online, a scheduling error resulted in a professor misunderstanding who needed to be on the video call and many potential candidates missed it.

**Effort to address the challenge:** Despite the range of possible causes of this problem, we have honed in on two changes we’ll make for recruitment of the 2021 cohort. First, we will work to generate “buy-in” by a GSU ECEE instructor who works with all of the teacher-candidates such that this instructor has a sound understanding of the program’s benefits and oversees the recruitment process. (We conclude that this cannot be done entirely through stand-alone recruitment sessions that may give the teacher-candidates the impression that CREATE is disconnected from the academic programming they are engaging.) Second, we need to improve the reputation of APS as a placement district. Particularly at the ECEE level, there have been some incidents at certain (non-CREATE) placement sites that have led ECEE teacher-candidates to speak poorly of APS; then when they’re offered a residency experience tied to a placement in APS, they turn down the opportunity. Our interest in improving the reputation of APS must start with making actual improvements across APS. This need instigated conversations between CREATE and APS (through our Induction Organizations Collaborative) that have led an exciting
commitment by the district to contract with CREATE to manage the development of a new CT training program beginning in Fall 2020.

Challenge #2: We have experienced difficulty identifying all of the CTs we will need for Fall placements by late spring, when CTs need to plan for summer training. For the most part, our difficulty stems from capacity challenges. This is time-consuming work and needs to be tended to with great care -- we hold a high standard of excellence for our CTs and are also committed to only pairing them with a student teacher if they have confirmed that they would like to have a student teacher assigned to them well in advance of the summer. (A widely cited frustration of CT candidates is when they are assigned a student teacher without being given the choice about whether to take on the work; also, they are also understandably frustrated by not being informed far in advance of the arrival of the student teacher.) This process is further complicated by the fact that last-minute changes in teaching assignment (of CTs) is not altogether uncommon, yet student teachers have a specific grade level and/or content area they must serve in order to complete their certification process and therefore if a CT is moved, we likely need to find a new CT for the student teacher, as opposed to having the Student Teacher follow the CT to the new assignment. If this occurs late in the summer (say, due to “leveling”, we need to begin anew with the process of finding a match for the student teacher in a rushed manner.)

Effort to address the challenge: There are several mitigation efforts at play simultaneously; these have for the most part resolved the issue, but we know we need to do more because we still often teeter on the edge of getting all student teachers assigned to fully trained and carefully selected CTs some years, and almost always, there is unnecessary stress involved and some people get offended along the way. Therefore, we seek to improve our process. Mitigation efforts in play already: 1) start early - the process of identifying teachers for the next year’s CT pool should begin in February at the latest; 2) survey all current CTs about their most recent CT experiences and ask them if they’d like to repeat the assignment the following year (in 2020, 100% said “yes”); 3) balance ECEE and MSE representation across our incoming cohort so as not to strain the CT pool at one grade bandwidth with too many student teachers; 4) observe teaching in schools to identify potential additional candidates for CT roles and build capacity as much as possible -- train more CTs than will be needed; 5) set CT July training dates so they can be shared early; and finally, 6) match the student teachers to those from the expected pool. The most important factors here include the early start and the training of more CTs than will be needed, explaining clearly all along the way that although they’re completing the training, we do not know if they’ll be matched. (We provide a daily stipend for the summer training -- independent of the stipend for doing the CT work during the semester -- so as to honor everyone’s time and draw more individuals to the training.) Further planned efforts--dependent on renewal funding--include training CTs from more schools across APS so we begin to build in more and more options of schools and CTs with whom we can place student teachers and a collaborative, cross-organizational redesign of CT training such that we maximize the impact the CTs can have on the learning of student teachers. (These redesign and “scale-up” efforts for CT training are explained in greater detail in several other places in this grant application, including Part I, Q4 (Significant deviations from original plan) below; Part II, Q2 (Quality of the Project Design); and Part II, Q3 (Scaling)).
**Conclusion:** In the case of both aforementioned challenges, we have experienced delays and struggles, but do intend to meet fidelity and intended project outcomes. Nonetheless, these are areas that require programmatic improvement and we are committed to fine-tuning our efforts every year. Overall, with the passage of time the problems also naturally lessen as educators come to know CREATE, word-of-mouth about the program is positive, and principals familiar with the residency become “champions” of the work and step up to “co-own” the CT identification process. Both of these challenges named above have been exacerbated by COVID-19 this spring, but we have been in close communication with the ECEE Department Chair about alternative recruitment opportunities and the CTs enthusiastic about repeating in the role and we believe we’ll again meet all projected outcomes, despite the pandemic.
Part I, Question #4: Please describe any significant, planned deviations from the project’s original, approved design that you intend to undertake in order to reposition the project for greater success if awarded additional funding.

Due to trending positive impacts of the overall CREATE model on new and experienced educators (explored more fully in Part II), we will keep the general structure of our program--with goals focused on resident development and retention, experienced educator growth, and organizational reform--largely intact. This will allow for completion of our impact study that will help us determine the full impact of our program on new teachers. However, we believe a few significant redesigns/enhancements of our work within goals 1, 2 and 3 will reposition us for even greater success. We describe those enhancements in detail below, and also include them in a chart in Part II, Q2 alongside all current and ongoing CREATE activities.

Significant enhancements within Goal 1 (recruit, prepare, support and retain new teachers):

- **Co-designed Cooperating Teacher (CT) Trainings:** Based on scholarly literature, and our own emerging findings from resident case studies (see more details in Part II), we understand the significant role of CTs in the preparation, support, and overall retention of new teachers in the schools where they complete their student teaching. This enhancement will be a collaborative, cross-organizational approach to a CT training redesign.

  We have learned that when the CTs in APS are generally strong, the district’s reputation as a site for student teaching improves, the district draws more student teachers, and a teacher pipeline into the district naturally develops. Likewise, the district struggles to draw student teachers following a year of poor student teacher experiences. With that in mind, we will partner with APS and GSU to redesign portions of our CT training sessions to improve the overall training, as well as ensure greater alignment across these organizations’ frameworks for teacher preparation. Fortunately, the district, university, CREATE and school leaders all indicate a strong and synchronous commitment to a direct focus on equity-centered practices. Equity programming appears extensively in CREATE spaces beyond CT training, in GSU coursework, and is a central focus of the district’s strategic plan, yet it has not--to date--been at the core of our CT training and support nor has it been central to the professional development of the district. Furthermore, by collaboratively redesigning the training, we:

  a. ensure a central consideration of context (i.e., some schools in APS have a long history of teacher training efforts - what do we need to consider that we may not yet know about these?);

  b. enhance the degree to which the training program is informed by theory (which is well-represented in courses at the university), and

  c. enhance the degree to which the training program is informed by practice (the realities of day to day work in schools)

- **Scale-up of Cooperating Teacher Training to be district-wide:** With both financial support and encouragement from the district, we will scale our CT training model to
include the training and support of 10-30 more CTs in APS schools who work with a Georgia State University student teacher, not just those who work with a CREATE resident. The redesign will occur across the 2020-21 school year and the first phase of the scale-up will occur in the 2021-22 school year.

**Enhancements within Goal 2** *(supporting effectiveness and social capital of experienced educators)*:

- **Inclusion of new Equity-based Facilitation Fellowship to support sustainability and capacity building**: Preliminary findings so far indicate that CREATE programming--specifically Equity-Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF) and Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT®)--has a positive impact on experienced educators. With an eye towards sustainability at the end of this renewal funding, we will scale-up a new equity-centered, year-long experience called the Equity Facilitation Fellowship (EFF) that was piloted this year with a racially diverse group of 18 educators across multiple CREATE schools. The curriculum for this fellowship also blends in key tenets of CBCT®. As further outlined in Part II, this new program helps us to move toward scale via “depth” and “sustainability”, as these Equity Fellows will be able to lead core components of CREATE equity work in their schools upon graduation from the fellowship. EFF was independently financially sustainable this year, and may be redesigned further to produce new income to support overall CREATE programming after this grant ends.

- **Black Male Educator Collaborative**: We are in the process of designing a Black Male Educator collaborative that will be supported by a combination of grant funds used for staff salaries and matching funds used for participant stipends and materials. The collaborative’s objectives are to: explore identity through narrative; build community; learn racial equity concepts; reflect on equity in education; present dilemmas of practice with peers; and examine systemic inequalities through the use of protocols. The collaborative will kick off with a multi-day intensive institute experience modeled after ECCF and is designed to contribute to the engagement, development, and retention of Black males—a severely underrepresented demographic in the teacher workforce. With educator institutes such as ECCF having been described by participants (residents and other experienced educators) as beneficial for their learning and retention in the field, we surmise that holding an institute and initiating an ongoing collaborative for Black male educators will similarly support their learning, especially as they have an opportunity to engage important racial affinity work. We believe this will enhance retention of Black male teachers in the field, and reposition our project for greater success with the promotion of greater racial diversity in the educator workforce [Competitive Preference Priority 1]. This will benefit all APS students and, in particular, Black male youth in our schools.

**Enhancements within Goal 3**: *(developing a “third space’ aimed at organizational reform)*

- **Development of new hybrid roles**: Based on preliminary results across several of our qualitative studies, with continued funding we will be conceptualizing and funding
several “hybrid” roles that are designed to encourage university-district-school boundary-hopping, where work responsibilities for educators across these spaces are redesigned to include work typically led or owned by other organizations. For example, with continued funding, university supervisor roles will be hybridized as CREATE IMs and university supervisors implement new co-designed, equity-centered observation protocols to support Y1 resident development. The CREATE Equity Coordinator role may also be hybridized to include some job responsibilities of a university supervisor for 1-2 semesters. Adding to this (and as referenced in several other places in this application), with continued funding, CT training will be co-led by a university-district team, with support from CREATE staff. All of these hybridized roles help bridge traditional institutional gaps, bringing together--as part of one person’s job--the perspectives of university, district, and school-based teacher training and support.

**Conclusion:** As described above, although the majority of our original model will continue to guide our work, we have repositioned our project for greater success through the enhancements and shifts described above. We are eager to complete the original WWC impact study as designed, and also look forward to making the improvements as described to bring more improvements to the learning experiences of Atlanta’s students.
Part II, Question #1: Quality of the Project Evaluation

What planned or ongoing efforts to study the impact of the approved project’s activities will you undertake if awarded additional funding?

In an effort to fully answer this question, we divide our response into the following 3 sections. In Section A, we introduce our research teams and provide a short overview of each study. In Section B, we take a deep dive into the studies conducted by each team, providing important details of the overall study designs, including data collection to date and how renewal funding will allow critical completion and/or expansion of each study. We also briefly mention emerging findings/impacts that we will expand upon in more detail in Part II, Q2. Finally, in Section C we provide closing remarks on the importance of renewal funding as it relates to producing high quality, quantitative and qualitative research results.

SECTION A: Research Teams and Overview of Research Studies

Research Teams

Empirical Education Inc. (Empirical), with extensive experience conducting large-scale, rigorous, experimental impact research as well as formative and process evaluations, is serving as the independent evaluator conducting the main impact and implementation studies for this project. Through this SEED grant, Empirical builds on its six-year partnership as the independent evaluator of CREATE through both an Investing in Innovation (i3) development grant and the first three years of the current SEED grant.

The internal Georgia State University research team (GSU research team), with over 35 years of collective experience in qualitative research, conducts additional exploratory research studies that add important detail to Empirical’s impact evaluation. Through their use of embedded case studies and critical ethnographies, the GSU research team works in close partnership with the CREATE programming team to share preliminary research findings that inform ongoing programming. A summary of the internal studies completed and in progress so far are summarized here in Table 2.1a, and explored more deeply in the sections that follow.

Taken together, these research teams have deep and extensive experience designing and implementing high-quality quantitative and qualitative research studies, and have produced more than 40 peer-reviewed publications of their individual and collective work.

Overview of Research Studies (and Connections to CREATE Goals and Outcomes)

As outlined in the introduction to our application and Part I, Q1, all CREATE programming aligns with 3 main goals focused on (1) preparing and retaining new teachers, (2) supporting effective practices of experienced educators, and (3) engaging in educational reform that aims to bring teacher induction organizations together in impactful ways. More details on each of our goals, objectives and outcomes, can be found above, or referenced again here in Table 2.1b. The following studies are in progress and relate to the goals of the project as follows:
• **Implementation Study / Goals 1, 2:** Led by Empirical, the purpose of the implementation study is to assess adherence to, and ongoing adaptation of, CREATE's logic model including key program components, activities/outputs related to inputs/services, desired outcomes, and attainment of thresholds for fidelity of implementation.

• **Impact Study of confirmatory and exploratory outcomes/ Goal 1:** The purpose of the impact study led by Empirical Education, which adopts a comparison Group Design (CGD) that can meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with Reservations, is to evaluate the impact of CREATE on residents’ retention and effectiveness and on student achievement. It uses moderator and mediator analysis to assess conditions for impact. Additionally, using established scales, it evaluates impact on teacher social capital, resilience, mindfulness, self-compassion and burnout. Descriptions are provided below.

• **Longitudinal-Descriptive Study of the Impact of CREATE on Experienced Educators/ Goal 2:** Led by Empirical Education, the purpose of this study is to assess whether implementation of CREATE at the school-level is accompanied by changes in experienced educators on outcomes of interest that are supportive of the broader aims of CREATE.

• **Teacher Resident Study / Goal 1:** Focused primarily on Year 1 residents, this study is designed to develop an in-depth understanding of the impact of CREATE on residents’ overall experience as new teachers. Led by the GSU research team, these multiple, embedded case studies add important depth to the impact study mentioned above.

• **Culture of CREATE Study / Goals 1 and 2:** Led by a cross-race GSU research team pair, this ethnographic study is designed to understand the overall culture of CREATE as it examines issues of power, empowerment, equity, race and whiteness across all programing elements.

• **Cross-organizational Study / Goal 3:** A final qualitative study led by the GSU research team, this embedded case study examines the varied cultural and historical activity systems that impact opportunities for boundary-crossing and generative learning across the induction organizations that partner in this grant work. This study also aims to document the overall implementation of this goal and its objectives and outcomes, by tracking numbers of meetings and increases in cross-organizational work.

Details of these studies, including planned and ongoing efforts to study the effectiveness of project activities in Years 4 and 5 are included in Section 2 below.

**SECTION B: Research Study Details**

Below we provide additional details on each of our study designs, in order to address the extent to which

- the studies examine the effectiveness of project strategies
- the design includes the use of objective performance measures clearly related to the intended outcomes of the project
- the design will produce quantitative and qualitative data
We start with the Implementation Study which provides the groundwork for the program evaluation by addressing the key components of CREATE. Then, acknowledging the importance of having a study that meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Evidence Standards with Reservations by the end of our work, we allocate the most space to a description of the design and planned analysis for the Impact Study of confirmatory and exploratory outcomes. Next, understanding the critical role of both quantitative and qualitative work in understanding the impact of CREATE and documenting and disseminating results, we also share current progress and future plans for the additional 5 studies outlined above.

**Implementation Study:**

Though results from the Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) Study are included in Part I, Q2, we briefly outline the FOI study design here. For each key component of CREATE’s logic model (seen here in Figure 2.1c) we have identified indicators of fidelity of implementation and measurable thresholds for achieving fidelity. Fidelity thresholds were identified by the CREATE team during initial stages of the project and shown in the table below. Data sources include CREATE program rosters, resident surveys, and email communication with CREATE administrators. We measure fidelity of implementation for the following:

1) **Levels of adherence to progressive core classroom roles of teaching**, with cooperating teachers in Year 1 of the residency, team teaching in Year 2, and being sole teacher of record in Year 3.

2) **Levels of attendance at professional development (PD)** including of residents in the summer resident academy (SRA), of mentors and cooperating teachers in trainings, and of CREATE program participants (both residents and experienced educators) in Presence, Power, Impact training and Equity-Centered Critical Friendship work.

To present a full picture of implementation, we also survey comparison group teacher-candidates and interview GSU administrators and teaching personnel to assess the extent of common components of CREATE and non-CREATE programs to establish the planned and realized Treatment Control (service) contrast (Cordray & Pion, 1993; Cordray & Hulleman, 2009) and Achieved Relative Strength of the intervention (Hulleman & Cordray, 2009).

As highlighted in Table 2.1d below, CREATE has successfully implemented every component of its program in the first three years of the grant. With such high fidelity of implementation in the first three years of the grant, CREATE is well-positioned to manage the additional program activities required for scaling. The evaluation team will continue to collect data related to FOI in GY4 and GY5 and report back to the CREATE team in order to inform ongoing program adaptations and improvements. These data will also be used to inform interpretation of impact findings.
### Table 2.1d: Fidelity of Implementation Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicators of Fidelity</th>
<th>Measurable Threshold for Achieving Fidelity</th>
<th>Fidelity Met?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progressive Core Classroom Roles</strong></td>
<td>1. Resident is paired with another Y1 resident for fall semester in the same school building</td>
<td>Y1: 95% or more of residents meet fidelity on 2+ indicators</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Resident is placed in classroom of veteran educator trained in mentoring</td>
<td>Y2: 75% or more of residents meet fidelity on 2+ indicators</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Resident is placed in a CREATE school</td>
<td>85% or more of residents meet fidelity on 2+ indicators</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Friendship</strong></td>
<td>1. CREATE administrators host 2 or more options for veteran teachers to attend 4-day CF Institute each year</td>
<td>Y1: Fidelity was met for Indicator 1 and at least one other indicator</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Veteran teachers attend 4-day CF Institute</td>
<td>Y2 and Y3: Fidelity was met for Indicator 1, Indicator 3 and at least one other indicator</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Residents attend 4-day CF Institute by the end of Year 3 of their program. Residents may attend the CF Institute in Year 2 or Year 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. CREATE residents attend monthly CF meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT®)</strong></td>
<td>1. Program admin. offer at least one Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT®) per year for general population of teachers at CREATE schools</td>
<td>Y1: Fidelity was met for two indicators</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Residents attend CBCT® classes</td>
<td>Y2 and Y3: Fidelity was met for Indicator 1</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple Forms of Mentoring</strong></td>
<td>1. Residents have mentors who attend training prior to mentoring</td>
<td>Y2 and Y3: All indicators meet fidelity</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Residents mentors who attends training during their mentoring year (at least 1 session)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Residents attend semi-monthly meetings with their mentor (SBM and IM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Resident participates in mentor-resident observation cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Resident Academy</strong></td>
<td>1. Residents attend Summer Resident Academy</td>
<td>Y1: All indicators meet fidelity</td>
<td>Fidelity met for all cohorts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y2 and Y3: Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Y1 Year 1 of residency (student teaching year); Y2 Year 2 of residency (first year as teacher of record); Y3 Year 3 of residency (second year as teacher of record)
Impact Study of Confirmatory and Exploratory Outcomes

We are in the process of implementing a Comparison Group Study (Quasi-Experiment) that is designed to evaluate the impact of CREATE on primary outcomes and key mediators, and to assess conditions for positive impact of the program. A strength of our current process is that the ongoing study is consistent with the plan for the design and analysis of the impact evaluation submitted in 2017. That is, the current design and analysis will allow us to successfully address the confirmatory and exploratory research questions as stated in the original plan (with some minor adjustments to the timing of collection of certain data due to COVID-19, as described below) and assess the objective performance measures of the goals and outcomes of the project.

In this section, we (a) review the timeline for the study design with planned data collection, (b) state the confirmatory and exploratory research questions, with the objective performance measures that will be used to assess impacts, (c) provide additional details supporting study design including the power analysis for detecting impacts on confirmatory outcomes as well as matching strategies, (d) describe the analysis we will use to evaluate impacts on the primary outcomes of teacher retention, teacher effectiveness and on student achievement, and (e) describe the exploratory analysis we will use to assess differential and mediated impacts of the program. We will indicate places where the current plan departs from the original one. We also have made explicit how specific exploratory research questions in the plan will contribute evidence that can support scale-up efforts.

Timeline for data collection

The timeline for the impact study follows the original design (with two exceptions). The design involves phased entry of three cohorts of residents, with confirmatory impacts assessed using outcomes obtained within the first three years of implementation for each cohort: Cohort 1 (2017/18-2019/20), Cohort 2 (2018/19-2020/21), Cohort 3 (2019/20-2021/22). Confirmatory impact on retention outcomes will be assessed in the third year of each of these periods. Confirmatory impacts on teacher effectiveness and student achievement will be assessed in 2020/21 for all three cohorts (moved up from 2019/20 for Cohort 1 due to COVID-19, and moved back from 2021/22 for cohort 3 to allow sufficient time for analysis, which are the two exceptions to the original plan). Outcomes measured in years prior to the confirmatory allow exploration of preliminary impact (e.g., we show preliminary trends in retention outcomes, Section 2, Q2 below). Outcomes measured in years following confirmatory allow further analysis for a limited sample (e.g., whether impact on retention is sustained beyond three years - an important exploratory question). In addition to collecting outcomes data supporting primary/confirmatory analysis, we are surveying teachers annually using established scales to evaluate exploratory impacts on potential mediators of impact, including teacher social capital, resilience, burnout, mindfulness and self-compassion.

We show the schedule for outcomes data collection to support analysis of confirmatory outcomes (student achievement, resident retention and teacher effectiveness) in Table 2.1e below. This schedule is consistent with the proposed in the original study plan, with any updates stated explicitly.
In addition to collecting outcomes data supporting primary/confirmatory analysis, we survey teachers annually using established scales to evaluate exploratory impacts on potential mediators of impact, including teacher social capital, resilience, burnout, mindfulness and self-compassion.

Table 2.1c: Projected Implementation and Outcomes Data Collection Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Year</th>
<th>GY1</th>
<th>GY2</th>
<th>GY3</th>
<th>GY 4 (Proposed)</th>
<th>GY 5 (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1 Timeline</td>
<td>Y1 resident</td>
<td>Y2 resident</td>
<td>Y3 resident</td>
<td>Y4: graduate</td>
<td>Y5: graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Graduation *</td>
<td>Teacher Retention *</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Instruction by resident teachers</td>
<td>Student Achievement // Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>Student Achievement // Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2 Timeline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y1 resident</td>
<td>Y2: resident</td>
<td>Y3: resident</td>
<td>Y4: graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Instruction by resident teachers</td>
<td>Student Achievement // Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>Student Achievement // Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3 Timeline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y1 resident</td>
<td>Y2: resident</td>
<td>Y3: resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td>Teacher Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Instruction by resident teachers</td>
<td>Student Achievement // Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>Student Achievement // Teacher Effectiveness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend

Y1 = first year of residency (student teaching); Y2 = second year of residency (most residents in co-teaching pairs); Y3 = third year of residency (solo teaching); Y4 = graduate of residency (third year as certified teacher); Y5 = graduate of residency (fourth year as certified teacher)

Outcomes for preliminary exploration

Outcomes for preliminary exploration, but not available because of COVID-19

* Data generating promising preliminary findings re. graduation rates and retention of Black teachers 1 and 2 years in the field

Outcomes for confirmatory analysis of impacts

Outcomes not available due to COVID-19, confirmatory analysis to be replaced with outcomes to be obtained the following school year (2020-2021)

Outcomes for follow-up exploration
Research Questions
Table 2.1f below contains a list of confirmatory research questions, with their objective performance measures and measurement schedule. This design is consistent with the primary research questions specified in the original Study Plan (2017). We indicate any changes to timing of data collection.

Table 2.1f. Confirmatory Research Questions for Evaluating Impact of CREATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Expected impacts and MDES* under current design</th>
<th>Objective Performance Measures</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Measuremen t Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory Research Question 1: Is there a positive impact of CREATE, on achievement in mathematics and language arts in elementary and middle grades, among students of CREATE residents compared to students of novice teachers who completed the Business as Usual (BAU) GSU teacher preparation program, on average three years after start of residency?</td>
<td>.14 standardized effect size units</td>
<td>Milestones State Assessment in grades 4 – 8.(alpha=ranges from 0.89 to 0.94 across all subjects)</td>
<td>GADOE (Data Sharing Agreement secured through 2022)</td>
<td>Spring 2021 for Cohorts 1, 2, and 3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory Research Question 2: Is there a positive impact of CREATE on teacher instructional outcomes, compared to non-CREATE GSU teacher graduates as assessed through the Teacher Assessment of Performance Standards (TAPS), on average three years after start of residency? (dimensions: quality of instructional strategies, quality of learning environment).</td>
<td>.29 standardized effect size units</td>
<td>.29 standardized effect size units Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS) (alpha=0.95)</td>
<td>GADOE (Data Sharing Agreement secured through 2022)</td>
<td>Spring 2021 for Cohorts 1, 2, and 3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmatory Research Question 3: Is there a positive impact of CREATE, compared to the GSU BAU program, on teacher retention three years after start of residency?</td>
<td>19% difference in retention favoring CREATE</td>
<td>Survey response, and record of teaching based on GADOE data</td>
<td>GADOE (Data Sharing Agreement secured through 2022), Teacher Surveys</td>
<td>Spring 2020 for Cohort 1, Spring 2021 for Cohort 2, Spring 2022 for Cohort 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
*MDES = Minimum Detectable Effects Size from the the statistical power calculation

**Due to COVID-19, impacts on Cohort 1 will be assessed 4 years after the start of residency. Impacts on Cohort 2 will be assessed 3 years after start of residency, as planned. Impacts on Cohort 3 will also be assessed in 2021, two years after the start of residency because the expected date for data collection for this cohort (Spring 2022) is too close to the end of the grant to allow analysis. On average across the three cohorts, impacts on these outcomes will be assessed three years after the start of residency.
The exploratory research questions focus on additional tests of average impacts (e.g., on survey outcomes), as well as on moderated and mediated impacts on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. This list includes questions from the 2017 proposal with several additions, designed to generate feedback for the CREATE team so they can make informed decisions about the best strategies for scaling the program.

The following is a list of the exploratory research questions. For additional detail, see Table 2.1 which includes the full list of objective performance measures and measurement schedule of the exploratory questions.

The exploratory research questions are:

1) Is there a positive impact of CREATE on levels of social capital, teachers’ perceived levels of quality of school climate and community, and levels of collaboration, resiliency, and mindfulness, one, two and three years after entry into the residency program?

2) Is there a differential impact of CREATE on student achievement depending on levels of student socio-economic status, incoming achievement, ethnicity, and in middle school compared to elementary school?

3) Do impacts on residents’ perceived levels of conditions for in-school community, sense of cohesiveness of links among teachers within schools, levels of resilience, and perceived levels of stress, during the second year of residency, mediate positive impacts on student ELA and mathematics achievement, among students of residents, two years after start of residency?

4) Are there impacts on outcomes listed under confirmatory analyses, four and five years after the start of residency?

5) Do impacts on residents’ perceived levels of conditions for in-school community, sense of cohesiveness of links among teachers within schools, levels of resilience, and perceived levels of stress, one and two years after start of residency, mediate positive impacts on teacher retention three years after start of residency?

6) Do teacher characteristics as assessed through a baseline survey, including ethnicity, self-reported high school GPA, and self-reported levels of math anxiety, moderate impacts on CREATE on levels of retention.

7) Are impacts on teacher retention after 1- 2- and 3- years increasing by Cohort (i.e., as CREATE matures as a program).

This exploratory work will complement the GSU research team’s qualitative work described below to allow a mixed methods approach to evaluating conditions for successful scale-up and supporting ongoing scale-up efforts.

Study Design

The Comparison Group Design (CGD) is designed to meet WWC Evidence Standards with Reservations. The design is being successfully implemented through the first three years of the grant. Power Analysis: We powered the study to detect impacts on student achievement assessed in Spring 2021 across the three teacher cohorts (the chief confirmatory outcome). Based on successful recruitment and data collection thus far, we expect to obtain student achievement outcomes for 42 CREATE residents and 84 matched comparison teachers for confirmatory analysis. (Numbers in the original proposal were 48 CREATE and 70 comparison cases, and we
have changed this in the power analysis to reflect results of actual recruitment.) Student achievement, TAPS and retention outcomes are being obtained directly from GA DOE (see letter of support 2.1h). For the statistical power calculation we applied the standard equation for the Minimum Detectable Effect Size (adapted from Bloom, Richburg-Hayes and Black [2007] and Schochet [2008]) (Equation 1 below). We assume $n = 18$ students per teacher (post-matching), 42 CREATE residents and 84 matched comparison teachers, power 80%, Type-1 error 5%, $(42/126) \times 100\% = 33.3\%$ of teachers in the treatment condition (i.e., $P = .333$), ICC ($\rho$) of .17 (based on empirical sources from IPR, n.d.) and $R$-squared values of .80 and .40 for teacher- and student-levels, respectively. The resulting MDES is .14, and is approximately the value of observed impact of residency programs like CREATE with CGSs (e.g., Turner, Goodman, Adachi, Brite & Decker, 2012) and RCTs (Glazerman, Mayer & Decker, 2006; Clark et al., 2013).

$$MDES = M_{j-k}(\alpha, \beta)\sqrt{\frac{\rho(1-R_{\text{teacher}}^2)}{P(1-P)J} + \frac{(1-\rho)(1-R_{\text{student}}^2)}{P(1-P)nJ}}$$

(1)

The MDES for impacts on teacher effectiveness (TAPS) is .29 assuming rates of Type-1 and Type-2 error of .05 and .20, respectively, a reasonable expected value for impact given that the instructional outcomes are more proximal and more strongly aligned to skills targeted by CREATE. We expect to obtain TAPS outcomes for 42 and 84 teachers in CREATE and comparison groups, respectively, at the time of confirmatory outcomes data collection in Spring 2021; and we assume covariates (including school fixed effects) and extensive baseline measures will account for 70% of the variation in TAPS outcomes.

To update our numbers for statistical power to detect confirmatory impacts on retention, which will be assessed across cohorts after three years, we considered observed teacher samples for Cohort 1 one and two years after start of residency, and compared them with the values we assumed in the original proposal. Since confirmatory outcomes are obtained after three years of residency, the Cohort 1 result is premature; however, it gives us a conservative estimate of the retention effect (conservative because we expect the difference in retention to increase over time.) After two years of residence, in Cohort 1, 13/14 (93%) of CREATE teachers, and 37/48 (77%) of comparison group teachers are retained. The achieved difference in retention rates is 16% after two years. In our initial proposal, we projected a 19% difference in retention rates after three years (i.e., 89% of CREATE teachers and 70% of comparison cases to be retained.) We are on track to achieving the numbers we predicted after three years of residency, with power of .86 for detecting a 19% difference in proportion attriting.

In our 2017 proposal we stated that given the relatively small number of schools in the study, we will model school effects as fixed, with random sampling variation modeled at the teacher level (and student level for estimates on achievement.) In all of our power calculations, the effect size multiplier, $M_{j-k}(\alpha, \beta)$ which accounts for degrees of freedom lost from modeling school fixed effects and teacher-level covariates (Bloom, 2005), and is set to 2.85 (Schochet, 2008).

**CGS design and matching:** Samples: The CGS design involves two stages of matching CREATE and comparison cases. The first stage (for analyzing impacts on teachers and students)
matches teachers across conditions using Euclidean or Mahalanobis distances. The second stage (for analyzing impacts on students) applies propensity scores to match students in classes of CREATE residents to similar students in classes of comparison teachers. A full description of both stages of matching is provided here in Table 2.1i.

**Analysis**

**Impacts on achievement (on average after 3 years of residency):** Based on the study design described above, we will apply the sub-classification approach to analyzing impacts using propensity scores. We will create five subclasses based on the quintile distribution of estimated treatment group propensity scores and conduct specification tests to assess balance within subclasses on covariates, until an adequate number of strata is arrived at (following Michalopoulos, Bloom, and Hill, 2004). We will then conduct within-stratum regressions (achievement scores will be z-transformed within grade to be put on a common scale, as recommended by May et al. [2009] and Somers et al. [2011]) and take a weighted sum over the strata to arrive at average impact estimates (weights being set to the proportion of treatment teachers in each stratum). Regressions will be of individual student scores against the indicator of treatment status, student covariates (e.g., pretest), and teacher covariates (e.g., baseline survey responses); also, we will include a teacher random effect to adjust for clustering of students in teachers. (See Hierarchical Impact Models 2.1i that will be used to assess impacts on student achievement and the teacher outcomes described below.)

**Impact on teacher effectiveness:** We will use linear regressions with TAPS scores as the outcome variable and teacher characteristics (baseline survey responses) and class averages of student characteristics as covariates. Impacts on retention: Logistic regression will be used to estimate the log odds of retention in the teaching profession in each condition, as well as a difference between conditions in the probability of retention, three years after entry into the GSU induction program (outcomes: 1 retained, 0 not retained) with the same covariates as above. Given our greater focus on retention outcomes, including through addition of questions about changes in this outcome over time, we will use survival analysis to model retention longitudinally. This will allow us to accommodate censored outcomes and estimate survivorship functions and hazard rates and will yield an alternative test of the impact of CREATE on this outcome. Given the relatively small number of schools, fixed effects will be used in all impact analyses to indicate school membership. All impact analyses will be conducted per resident cohort and averaged across cohorts.

**Other analyses:** Exploratory impacts on teacher intermediate outcomes, including surveys, will use similar HL models to those used to evaluate impacts on teacher effectiveness through TAPS scales. Differential (moderated) impacts will be assessed by adding a term for the interaction between the indicator of treatment status and the hypothesized moderator to the regression models. Questions of impact on key mediators (e.g., levels of teacher resilience) will be extended to formal mediator analyses. These will be conducted within a multilevel framework (Krull & MacKinnon, 2001). In addition to a regression-based approach to mediation (which rests on strong assumptions concerning the causal relationship between mediator and outcome variables), we will use a principal stratification approach (Frangakis & Rubin, 2002; Jo, Stuart, MacKinnon,
& Vinokur, 2011; Page, 2012). The mediation analyses will help to determine the active paths in the logic model (refer back to Figure 2.1c). Power may be limited for these analyses; therefore, we consider them exploratory. Analyses will be conducted using PROC MIXED and GLIMMIX in SAS as well as specialized programs such as Remediation (Tofighi & MacKinnon, 2011) and mediation in R (Imai, Keele, Tingley, & Yamamoto, 2010). Researchers will also conduct a series of sensitivity analyses to test robustness of benchmark impact estimates for the primary research question, including the use of simple alternatives such as hierarchical models to estimate impacts on the treated and matched comparison group. For the confirmatory impact analyses addressing the three primary research questions, we will follow WWC topic area review protocols to report all statistics necessary for WWC review, including sample sizes at each stage in executing the study design and baseline equivalence of teachers and students (in terms of demographics and pretests where available and applicable) for analysis samples, as well as for the sample of teachers that serves as the baseline for tracking retention.

**Longitudinal-Descriptive Study of the Impact of CREATE on Experienced Educators**

A central goal of CREATE as administered through the SEED program is to produce change in educator effectiveness and student achievement among residents by adopting a whole-school program model. Under the SEED grant, the CREATE program continues to merge the 3-year teacher residency model with extensive professional development (PD) opportunities for experienced educators who are already working within CREATE schools.

Through the evaluation we ask experienced educators to complete a pre-survey prior to attending CREATE PD and an annual post-survey at the end of each school year¹. We analyze changes to survey results over time to determine if implementation of CREATE at the school-level is accompanied by changes in experienced educators on outcomes of interest that, in the program logic model, are supportive of the broader aims of CREATE. Each year, we also invite a subset of participants to individual interviews, in order to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the CREATE experience for experienced educators in CREATE schools.

The research questions we ask in the experienced educator study are as follows:

1) Do Experienced Educators undergo an increase in perceived levels of quality of school climate and community, social capital and levels of collaboration, resiliency, and mindfulness?

2) What are the Experienced Educators’ impressions of the CREATE PD(s) they participated in?
   a) To what extent do Experienced Educators believe they have developed the skills targeted by each CREATE PD?
   b) To what extent have those skills impacted Experienced Educators’ relationships with their colleagues and students?
   c) To what extent do Experienced Educators believe these skills have led them to becoming more effective teachers?

¹ We have already secured consent from participants to continue data collection through year 5 of the proposed SEED grant.
We plan to invite five cohorts of experienced educators to join the study and collect data over five school years. See Table 2.1k below for more details. So far, we have three cohorts of participants and would add Cohorts 4 and 5 with renewed funding.

So far, we have deployed surveys to Cohort 1 participants two years after their first exposure to CREATE PD and have deployed surveys to Cohort 2 one year after their first exposure. Renewal funding will allow us to deploy post-surveys for up to 5 years after participants’ first point of exposure to CREATE. These results are a critical component to assessing the sustainability of CREATE’s impact over time.

NOTE: The longitudinal-descriptive study of experienced educators is intended to provide vital context for understanding the condition for the success and scale-up of the program--and therefore includes the use of objective performance measures related to the outcomes of the project--however it is not part of the impact evaluation study intended for WWC review.

### Table 2.1k. Experienced Educators Cohorts Timeline and Survey Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Year</th>
<th>Grant Year 1</th>
<th>Grant Year 2</th>
<th>Grant Year 3</th>
<th>Grant Year 4 (Proposed)</th>
<th>Grant Year 5 (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>Baseline survey</td>
<td>Post-survey 2 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 3 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 4 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 5 Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Baseline survey Post-survey 1 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 2 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 3 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 4 Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Baseline survey Post-survey 1 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 2 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 3 Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Baseline survey Post-survey 1 Interviews</td>
<td>Post-survey 2 Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Baseline survey Post-survey 1 Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

*Grant Year 1 Experienced Educator PD events occurred January – May 2018

---

2 As demonstrated in Table 2.1k, we will deploy post-surveys for 5 years after participants’ first point of exposure to CREATE for Cohort 1, 4 years after first exposure for Cohort 2, 3 years after first exposure for Cohort 3, 2 years after first exposure for Cohort 4, and 1 year after first point of exposure for Cohort 5.
Table 2.11 outlines the research questions and measures used in the experienced educator study.

**Teacher Resident Case Study:**

In an effort to add important detail to the impact study conducted by Empirical Education, the GSU research team designed a longitudinal embedded case study (Yin, 2014) (hereby called the “Teacher Resident Case Study”) exploring the impact of CREATE programming on three cohorts of residents in the first, second and third years of their program. Below is a chart that outlines the data collection timeline for this study.

**Table 2.1m. Current and projected data collection for Teacher Resident Case Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Year</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Grant Year 1</th>
<th>Grant Year 2</th>
<th>Grant Year 3</th>
<th>Grant Year 4 (Proposed)</th>
<th>Grant Year 5 (Proposed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 1</td>
<td>Planning Year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y1 residents: Pilot study using interviews (int.) and surveys*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 2</td>
<td>Planning Year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y1 residents: Full longitudinal study of cohort 2, with updated research design based on pilot study, now using int. and observations (obs.)*</td>
<td>Y2 co-teachers: Continuation of longitudinal study, using newly developed equity-centered int. and obs. tool (based on 2018-2020 preliminary data analysis) for Y2 teaching</td>
<td>Y3 solo teachers: Final year of longitudinal study of cohort 2, using new int. and obs. tool for Y3 teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort 3</td>
<td>Planning Year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y1 student teachers: Beginning of first longitudinal study using newly developed observation tool to evaluate teaching from Y1 and on.</td>
<td>Y2 co-teachers: Continuation of longitudinal study of cohort 3, using new int. and obs. tool for Y2 teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Data to be collected if renewal funds are awarded
- *Completed studies that have manuscripts in review at peer-reviewed research journals

Y1 = first year of residency (student teaching), Y2 = second-year of residency (most residents in co-teaching pairs), Y3 = third year of residency (solo teachers)

For each embedded case study in the Teacher Resident Case Study, we follow different cohorts of residents with the overarching goal of understanding the impact of residents’ experiences across different contexts on their beliefs and practices, from preservice teacher training to co-teaching and into solo teaching, with more nuanced and evolving research questions shifting...
from year to year and cohort to cohort. Because the original SEED grant was awarded after the start of the school year, we worked as a team to design this longitudinal, embedded case study of residents’ experiences during the 2017-18 school year, and then recruited our first (of 3) groups of research participants to start in Fall 2018 for a pilot study. In Fall 2019, we began the first year of the 3-year study. We describe the design of these first two studies below, and then outline our projected/continued data collection associated with renewal funding.

2018-19 Y1 student teachers - pilot study. This research was designed to follow eleven racially-diverse CREATE residents (6 total) and non-CREATE teacher candidates (5 total), all enrolled in GSU university coursework and engaged in student teaching. In terms of inclusion criteria, we strived for similar characteristics across CREATE and non-CREATE participants based on 1) school; 2) district and 3) grade levels (elementary or middle). Next, we considered whether the CREATE resident was in a charter or non-charter school and also considered student demographics, with student achievement as the first considered marker, then race, and finally SES. Our guiding question for this study was: “To what extent does participation in social justice-oriented teacher preparation, both within a university teacher preparation program and in a residency program, support development of critical consciousness?” Data collection included one extended semi-structured interview with each participant, which were coded using a set of a priori codes based on our conceptual framework: critical analysis of self, critical analysis of systems, and critical pedagogy elements of historicity, dialogism, emancipation, problem-posing, and praxis. Findings from this interview study indicated positive results regarding critical consciousness development (shared in Part II, Q2 below).

2019-20 Y1 (and Y2/Y3) - full longitudinal case study. Based on positive results obtained from the 2018-19 Y1 resident pilot study, and our desire to expand focus from critical consciousness to examine the full array of beliefs, practices and contextual factors, we designed a new, 3-year longitudinal case study of Cohort 2 residents to begin in Fall 2019 (at the start of their student teaching) and culminate in Spring 2022 at the conclusion of their “Y3 solo teaching” year. For the first year of the 3-year study, we collected extensive data from five residents. This new study design included interviews, observations, and coursework during grant year 2019-20, with continued observations and interviews planned for the proposed grant years 2020-22. This work is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are residents’ evolving beliefs about teaching and learning?
2. What are residents’ teaching practices during student teaching and to what extent do those practices align with beliefs?
3. What challenges and/or supports to enacting beliefs do residents face while in CREATE?
4. What do these residency experiences tell us about how the university, residency program, and the school placement are aligned (or not)? [NOTE: This research question also helps us examine Goal 3 of the CREATE grant, focused on school-university-district partnerships]  

Although this study is longitudinal in nature, preliminary analyses are promising and worthy of discussion, and so appear in our response to section 2, Q2. Continued data collection across grant years Years 4 and 5 of this program, should we receive renewal funding, will allow us to track trends related to growing critical consciousness development of CREATE residents and the
alignment or misalignment of beliefs, practices, and contexts as they head into the second and third years of the CREATE program. Additionally, the design also allows us to determine how varying human and material capital and supports across years influence new teacher learning.

The preliminary findings from the first year of the 3-year longitudinal Teacher Resident Case Study illuminate some misalignment between emphases of the residency/university and emphases in the student teaching placement. This misalignment suggested the need for a more comprehensive equity-centered evaluation and observation tool that could be used across all three spaces and during all 3 years of the residency program, and is currently being designed by a cross-organizational CREATE team of researchers and instructional mentors. Design of the tool is driven by preliminary results from the Teacher Resident Case Study as well as the other qualitative studies and current research on equity-centered observation protocols. A draft of the tool can be found here in Report 2.1n, and a final version will be submitted for publication this summer to encourage other teacher educators to pilot the tool in their respective teacher education spaces. Adding to this, preliminary results from the first year of this longitudinal case study of resident experiences have implications for the training and support of mentors across the university, district, and residency continuum (see section 2, Q2 for more details).

In the second year of the 3-year study (2020-2021) if funded, we will follow the original five residents into Y2 teaching and recruit an additional five Y1 residents.

**Culture of CREATE / Ethnography Study:**

Adding important detail and context to the studies outlined above, the last research study designed and implemented by the GSU research team is a critical collaborative ethnography that aims to describe and interpret the overall culture of CREATE—the shared and learned patterns, behaviors, beliefs and discourses. This critical co-ethnography was designed to explore the under-researched space of the CREATE residency program providers: school and university teacher educators. Drawing on Critical Race Theory and Critical Whiteness Studies, the purpose of this ethnographic research is to illuminate the ways in which CREATE serves educational equity in all elements of its programming, operating structures, and partnerships. This research is essential to the field of social justice teacher education because it fills the gap in lack of critical studies about equity-oriented teacher development spaces, from a qualitative perspective.

As suggested by Carspecken (1996), we collected information on: social routines; the distribution of routines across related social sites; constraints and resources affecting social routines; cultural forms associated with social routines; subjective experiences, and total or partial life history narratives. These data collection strategies have been consistent across the first two years of the ethnography, but each year has (or will have) a slightly different focus, moving from internal team relations to outward facing residency work. Below we outline data collection to date, and share plans for continued data collection should we be awarded renewal funds.

**Grant year 2018-19 - first year of the study:** CREATE Implementation Team Practices: The primary focus of the first year of the ethnography was on the social routines in residency specific meetings and activities, and includes dense fieldnotes from
team planning meetings, mentor trainings, and observations of resident meetings (where the focus was on the facilitation of these meetings). The data set also includes interviews with residency staff and artifacts such as curricular materials, meeting agendas, and promotional materials.

**Grant year 2 (2019-2020 - second year of the study):** Development and Enactment of Equity-centered Professional Development: The primary focus of year 2 of the ethnography was on equity-centered professional development initiatives for CREATE experienced educators. Similar to year 1, we sat in on all planning meetings and attended the equity-centered trainings and meetings as participant observers. Data set for the second year included dense fieldnotes of all planning meetings and trainings, and informal interviews with CREATE equity staff members throughout the year.

To date, data collection for the ethnographic study includes 82 observations of CREATE meetings or professional development activities, 600+ pages of associated field notes, 6 formal interviews with CREATE leaders, and countless informal conversations that inform our notes.

**(Proposed) Grant Year 3 (2020-2021 - third year of the study).** Work with Residents in Schools. Contingent upon continued funding, Year 3 of the ethnography moves us into schools, alongside CREATE instructional mentors, as they work alongside new teacher residents. We will attend all planning meetings for instructional mentors, and also participate in resident observations and support meetings/calls where instructional mentors and new teachers connect. We anticipate roughly 40 additional meetings/observations, with associated fieldnotes and information conversations.

Completing the final years of the ethnography project will allow us to complete a full three-year longitudinal design required for methodologically sound ethnography research and will deepen the contribution to the field. These years will be spent conducting participant observations, interviews, and experiencing the lives of CREATE residency leaders and the teacher they support. This data will record the most unique and effective retention strategies of the CREATE program, which includes the social and emotional learning residents experience in together time spaces, co-teaching with a fellow resident, and ongoing instructional mentorship. These elements have earned CREATE two federal grants and additional private foundation funding, exposure, and notoriety, yet there remains a limited amount of research data on CREATE and programs like it from an ethnographic perspective using critical theories that illuminate how these supports directly serve educational equity. Furthermore, the focus of ethnographic research on culture surfaces unseen, taken-for-granted-assumptions and actions that may contradict stated equity goals. Therefore, the completion of this research will improve the programming and operating structures by illuminating areas for improvement and creating opportunities for innovations to address inequities within CREATE.

**Cross Organizational (IOC) study**

The third central goal of CREATE, under the original SEED grant, was to create a “third space” of teacher preparation -- the Induction Organizations Collaborative (IOC) -- so that organizations
and institutions along the teacher preparation and induction continuum could come together to learn from one another to support change in how we support the effective development of new and experienced educators. The GSU research team aimed first to document the overall implementation of IOC work by tracking all IOC meetings over time, and also measuring the extent to which the IOC creates new opportunities for collaborative work across institutions. We share a summary of all meetings, presentations, and collaborations to date here in Table 2.1.

However, it was not only important to document the implementation of this work, as this whole-school program model and strong university-district partnership also provides a unique opportunity to research the process of cross-organizational collaboration—an area that is significantly under-theorized and researched—to both enhance the CREATE program, as well as share relevant and generalizable findings with other residencies and university-based teacher preparation programs to strengthen university-district partnerships. To study this cross-organizational collaboration, we leveraged CHAT—Cultural and Historical Activity Theory—to analyze how those activity systems converge and teacher educators’ practice and learn. CHAT elevates how people in the systems mediate their learning through the reification of practices and tools. Contractions become focal points and are “key to understanding the source’s trouble as well as the innovative and developmental potentials of an activity.” (Bal et al., 2018, p.1013). With respect to CREATE specifically, and urban teacher residencies broadly, contractions are the places where converging activity systems can cross traditional boundaries of teacher preparation and induction. As such, our research question for this study was as follows:

How do CREATE residency partners understand the work of collaborative, responsive new teacher induction? Data sources are outlined in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1p: IOC Data Sources and frequency of measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IOC monthly meeting minutes and agendas of collaboratively planned and attended sessions.</td>
<td>n = 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes from researchers of IOC meetings and member exchanges.</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products from meetings as well as articles used for shared learning and protocol instructions for meeting activities</td>
<td>n = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations from member presentations in IOC, events, and at local and national conferences</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum designed to support a summer teaching experience and pedagogy training.</td>
<td>n = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews and Participant Surveys</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcribed interviews and reflections from all partner IOC organization members</td>
<td>n = 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Briefly, findings from this study revealed contradictions in the philosophies of education and tools and language used to prepare and induct residents. The findings call for hybridizing our collective identities, designing a new administrative position spanning the university and school district, as well as creating a physical area where the IOC can use CHAT to mediate learning from one another by crossing historic boundaries.
Many of these changes are underway (further outlined in section 2, Q2 below), and continued renewal funding would allow us to research the impact of these changes on organizational/institutional reform. More specifically, research in Years 4 and 5 will include how and why the IOC collaboratively learns, especially as practitioners and stakeholders from different teacher support organizations collaboratively plan and monitor residents’ trajectory of development, taking joint responsibility for its overall progress. This expands our research moving forward and opens these specific lines of inquiry:

1. How do IOC members perceive their positioning/power/role within the IOC?
2. Why are IOC members motivated to transform teacher preparation & induction, and how do IOC members define that work?
3. What are each IOC member’s desired outcomes and how do these outcomes align or contradict across members?
4. How is the IOC collectively re-imagining teacher preparation and induction?
5. What actions were taken to learn in the IOC to support deepening analyses and sharper, more articulated questioning of teacher preparation, induction, and practice?

Continuing to draw on a CHAT theoretical perspective, we will use multiple methods of data collection. Interviews and survey reflections of IOC members, transcriptions of meetings and analysis of IOC materials will provide a holistic vantage of the work activity of the IOC over time, and will provide rich answers to the above research questions. Rigorous data collection and superior qualitative data analysis standards ensure refined findings for CREATE to employ and also to guide other existing and future urban teacher residencies.

SECTION 3: Conclusion

As summarized in the sections above, we are on track to complete all studies as planned, and in some cases we have added additional studies or study components in the first three years of the SEED grant to answer new, evolving research questions.

- Empirical Education has to this point implemented all studies as planned through the first three years of the grant. This includes recruiting study samples, securing consents and data acquisition agreements, collecting preliminary outcomes data and starting analysis of preliminary impacts (e.g., see preliminary trends in retention outcomes.) The program implementation study demonstrates fidelity being met for all key components of the program thus far. The impact study is on-track with expected sample sizes being achieved and is adhering to the plan for exploratory and confirmatory analysis of impacts in Spring 2021 (student achievement, teacher effectiveness) and and Spring 2020, 2021, and 2022 (teacher retention) including all results to allow WWC review.
- The longitudinal-descriptive study of experienced educators, intended to provide vital context for understanding the condition for the success and scale-up of the program, is also on schedule as planned, with baseline surveys, post surveys, and interviews across 3 cohorts already complete. Empirical has shared preliminary results of these studies with the CREATE programming team through interim research reports, and has shared results and/or research designs in several presentations.
The GSU internal research team has also completed all studies as planned. The case study and ethnography teams, working on documenting resident and IOC member experiences within CREATE have fulfilled all university IRB requirements, recruited study participants each year, secured consent, collected at least two years worth of data, and engaged in preliminary data analysis across all projects. The internal research team has shared preliminary results of these studies with the CREATE programming team through interim research reports and research team meetings, and has already shared preliminary results and/or research designs via several publications and presentations.

For a list of all presentations and publications associated with this preliminary work, please see Table 2.1q.

We end this first question with an important note: Our teams have implemented all study components as planned in the first three years of SEED funding, and we are well positioned to use Years 4 and 5 renewal funding to see all studies through to fruition. This includes evaluating current and new promising project activities that will result in information to guide possible replication of successful components of the CREATE program. We share more of those details in Part II, Q2 below. In many cases, this continued funding is vital to study completion.

First, it is critical to continue the impact study through 2021/22 to achieve the principal goals of the impact evaluation. The timing of data collection to support confirmatory and exploratory analysis was set in the original study plan to accommodate multiple cohorts (to obtain large enough samples) and to allow the program to run its course long enough that large enough impacts may be detected with adequate statistical power. That is, we need large enough samples and big enough accrued effects to observe statistically significant impacts. We are on target for that. Stopping the study after three years will undermine the principle goals of the impact evaluation. It is also critical to continue this study through 2021/22 to achieve NEW goals of the impact evaluation. We have adapted the impact evaluation within the parameters of the original study design to address new questions that reflect current principal interests in conditions for scale up. Earlier we stated how analysis of moderated, mediated and longitudinal effects support evidence of scale up as achieved on several dimensions (namely, spread and depth [Coburn, 2003]). Addressing scalability involves much more than this, and is discussed in other sections of this proposal; however, the impact study provides a rigorous full sample test of conditions for impact: for whom does the program work, under what conditions, and why? Therefore the impact evaluation contributes a key component to the mixed methods approach to investigating the program’s successful scalability.

The experienced educator study is also important to expand. As explained above, each year participants are invited to take a pre-survey before they participate in their first CREATE PD. Then they are invited to take a post-survey every year for the duration of the study. In year 1 of the grant, 33 participants agreed to participate in the study and completed the pre-survey. Thirty-one of those participants completed the Year 1 post-survey. By the end of Year 2, 103 participants had joined the study and completed the post-survey. By the end of Year 3, 160 people had joined the study and were invited...
to take a post-survey. If granted renewed funding, we anticipate having approximately 200 participants in the study by the end of Year 4 and 250 participants by the end of Year 5. This is a significant number of educators served and the sample size allows for robust analysis.

- It is also essential to continue the embedded case studies in the Teacher Resident Case Study project, focused on residents' experiences within CREATE, and to continue the ongoing systems analyses in the IOC research. For the Teacher Resident Case Study, lack of continued funding would leave a gap in our understanding of residents’ experiences across all 3 years of the residency program, and would limit our ability to implement the new equity-centered observation and evaluation tool designed by CREATE and GSU team members. Similarly, lack of funds for the IOC study would leave critical new developments and roles in the induction organizations collaborative work unstudied, leaving continued gaps in our understanding of cross-organizational work. Too often, research of residencies or university-district partnerships has narrowly focused on teacher practices and student achievement. The nuanced analysis afforded by utilizing CHAT to both design residency programming and analyze the learning of that residency’s administrative body will strengthen the claims of our entire research project and can shine light on a vital component of implementation. This analysis also allows future IOC members and members of other urban residencies or dynamic university-district-school partnerships to engage more equitably. As such, it is imperative that the design and research of the IOC continue beyond the current funded period for years 4 and 5.

- Finally, completing the final year of the ethnographic study is vital to localized scaling efforts and wider dissemination and replication efforts. As mentioned earlier, there is a gap in the teacher residency literature on understanding the overall culture of these programs and trainings, especially from a critical perspective. Based on peer-reviewed feedback from conference proposals, manuscripts, and conference presentations so far, this research is both timely and vital in the current time of deepening educational inequities.

In sum, renewal funding will allow us to share final results locally with CREATE implementation team members who are attempting to scale with work, and with the broader education field as others try to replicate this important work.
Part II, Question #2: Quality of the Project Design

What activities will you undertake to continue to build upon the existing body of work related to the focus of the grant’s activities and share its results with the field?

At the foundation of our answer to Part II, Question 2 sits key elements of program success thus far that help us to make decisions about our next phase of activities. Therefore, to answer this question, we first (A) summarize key preliminary, promising results from the research studies detailed above; (B) provide a summary of activities we will undertake to build upon the existing body of work; (C) describe how project activities lead toward capacity building; (D) describe the extent to which the program evaluation design will guide possible replication of project activities; and (E) describe how we share results with the field.

Section A: Promising Results

Although all studies are still in progress, we see preliminary promising findings related to new teacher retention, experienced educator satisfaction, and university-school partnership.

New teacher support and retention - preliminary promising findings:

- A key confirmatory question of the impact evaluation described in Part II, Q1 above asks how CREATE impacts retention of teachers three years after starting their residency program, and is a measure of progress on Goal 1. As described in more detail below in Section D of this question below, the percentage of Cohort 1 CREATE teachers retained in the profession is 13/14 (93%) both after one year of residency (Y1) and after one year of being a full-time teacher of record (Y2). For the comparison group, the retention rates are 44/48 (92%) and 37/48 (77%) at Y1 and Y2, respectively. Even more notable is the impact of CREATE on Black educators with 6/6 (100%) CREATE teachers retained at Y1 and Y2, compared to 8/9 (89%) and 6/9 (67%) retained at Y1 and Y2 in the comparison group. This result shows the preliminary promise of CREATE’s positive impact on teacher retention based on the first of three cohorts of residents.

- Findings from the qualitative teacher resident case study support this preliminary result, as residents indicate that being a Y1 resident of CREATE is widely perceived by teacher candidates as helping them stay in the field, and that most participants also found CREATE supported them in the development of their criticality. Additionally, most participants credited university coursework and professors for helping them develop their criticality, particularly their critical awareness of themselves and social systems and structures. Importantly, the coordinated programming provided by GSU faculty and CREATE staff seems to support both criticality and retention, and the first pilot study yielded evidence this university-school partnership is effective in supporting the development of diverse teachers as critically-conscious educators. Adding to this, results from additional embedded case studies indicate that neither university coursework nor residency activities alone seemed to have a significant impact on pedagogical practices;
instead, major influences for some residents were mentor teachers and mandated curriculum at placement sites.

**Experienced educator satisfaction - preliminary promising findings:**

- CREATE has delivered a range of high-quality professional development offerings to Experienced Educators from across CREATE schools while simultaneously scaling its programming. As evidenced by a post-survey following one or more PDs, Experienced Educators were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their CREATE PD experience, whether it was a multi-day equity intensive, a training with subsequent support toward resident mentoring, or the CBCT® course. The majority of participants were completely satisfied with CREATE (Table 2.2a).

**Table 2.2a. Overall Satisfaction with CREATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD Offering</th>
<th>% Responding in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitively Based Compassion Training (CBCT)</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Friendship (CF) Institute</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Equity Institute</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF) Institute</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Based Mentor (SBM)/Cooperating Teacher (CT) training</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference opportunities</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring residents</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 23-39, depending on the item. *Source: Experienced Educator post survey from second year of the study (2018-19)*

A closer look at one of CREATE’s core PD offerings—Equity-Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF) Training (formerly called Critical Friendship (CF))—reveals another promising finding: that over 90% of participants report that CF/ECCF was already helping or had the potential to help at their schools to increase colleagueship, school collaboration, and student achievement.

Overall, these findings demonstrate that experienced educators believe that various aspects of CREATE PD are contributing to improvements in their experiences and practice as teachers.

**University-school partnership - preliminary promising findings:**

- The case study analysis of the IOC found that teacher educators from different organizations exist within varied cultural and historical activity systems, and that when
those systems interact, teacher preparation in all spaces seems to benefit. The benefit is a result of, and contributes to furthering future boundary-crossing and new, generative learning. As a result of enhanced understanding of each other's work and shared personal experiences, members of the IOC have spent more time in each other's spaces, and are envisioning hybridized roles to continue the cross-organizational learning for future work. (Movement towards these hybridized roles was also in response to preliminary analysis of new resident case study data that pointed to different desired outcomes across university-school-district systems, which oftentimes creates conflict for residents.)

**Section B: Activities that build on existing work and promising results**

Preliminary and promising results shared above have an impact on the activities we undertake to continue to build upon the existing body of work related to CREATE’s main project activities. Given that the **impact study** shows preliminary promise of CREATE’s positive impact on teacher retention, particularly for Black educators, and that this finding has been further examined and supported by components of our mixed methods analysis, we keep the main design of the residency program intact. Table 2.2b below designates continuations of programming in **black text**. We also have made adjustments to programming, structures, and practices based on results from the qualitative studies. Part I, Q4 details the **most significant** of those programming adjustments, while Table 2.2b below lists all adjustments, large and small, in **blue text**. All of our programming decisions about activities for the renewal period are building on existing work from the first three years of the grant.
### Table 2.2b. Intensity and duration of CREATE services for Years 4 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description of intensity and duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Placement in residency/progressive core classroom roles across 3 years** | - In Y1, **residents** teach alongside an experienced CREATE teacher for year-long practice teaching *(20 hrs/wk in fall w/coursework; 40 hrs/wk in spring).*  
- In Y2, **residents** are paired as co-teachers (2 teachers/1 class) for *one year of scaffolded teaching (40 hrs/week).* *NOTE: (A) This work is now supported increasingly by the district, and (B) the longitudinal resident study will focus on Y2 residents’ experiences learning as co-teachers.  
- In Y3, **residents** are *sole instructors of record, taking on full responsibility in their classrooms (40 hrs/week).* |
| **Training in cultural competence, personalized learning equity-centered, effective pedagogical practices** | - In Y1, **residents** are *immersed in readings* on race/class/gender and in activities designed to develop cultural competencies *Note: New university/district hybrid position allows for greater curricular alignment between university-district-residency supports and trainings.*  
- In Y2 and Y3, **residents** work with an instructional mentor (IM) trained to support residents in the development of personalized learning *1.5 hours per week* *Note: (A) Instructional mentoring has an added focus on equity-centered, effective instructional practices; and (B): with continued funding, this role will be hybridized as IMs work with university faculty to develop and implement the new equity-centered observation protocol developed during the 2019-20 school year. Some IMs may also enroll in doctoral coursework, further enhancing the school-university connection; and (C) the Equity Coordinator’s role may be hybridized to include the job responsibilities of a university supervisor for a caseload of 4-5 Y1 residents, bringing together as part of one person’s job the perspectives of university faculty, CREATE equity programming staff, and CREATE Y1 school-based support staff.* |
| **Multi-year instructional mentorship** | - In Y1, **residents** work with university supervisors for *3 hrs/wk* and with their cooperating teachers *daily.* *Note: (A) With continued funding, university supervisors will have an opportunity to work closely with CREATE staff and with district personnel to better support the university to school/district transition; and (B) CREATE’s Equity Coordinator and/or Director are likely to serve as program developer(s) for equity-focused CT training for CREATE (with an APS contract for scaling the work to more schools in the district also a likely scenario).*  
- In Y2 and Y3, **residents** are supported *1.5 hours per week* by IMs, supporting residents toward Project-Based Learning, Personalized Learning and/or International Baccalaureate curriculum, among other skills, and by their *on-call School-Based Mentors.* |
| **SRI Critical Friendship (SRI-CF)** | - For **residents**, SRI-CF is offered during *monthly cohort meetings* in Y1 and Y2 and *three times per year* in Y3 *Note: (A) we have redesigned our use of CF to have a powerful foundation in equity work, and all of this work is now called Equity-Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF), and (B) Y3 now meet as a cohort *seven times per year* -- an increase of more than 100%.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT®)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Induction Organizations Collaborative (IOC) “third space” meetings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • For **residents**, CBCT (offered as part of monthly cohort meetings) as a 10-week course in Y1 and Y2, with follow-up in Y3  **Note**: Residents at all levels are supported toward operationalizing their compassion-based practices and so the IMs, trained in CBCT®, also support residents while in schools, between the cohort meetings.  
  • For **experienced teachers**, CBCT is offered as a 10-week foundations course, a 4-day intensive course, and/or an 8 hour “Finding Center” introduction experience  **Note**: (A) This course has been adapted for the community of APS teachers we serve. The framework now holds space for contextual discussions about racism and oppression in schools and hence has been renamed Power, Presence, Impact; and (B) the Finding Center course has been eliminated from our list of offerings, and replaced by the periodic use of a two-hour “CBCT” introduction experience that will provide possible registrants a sample experience with the curriculum.  
  • For **experienced teachers** interested in becoming CBCT® teacher-leaders, CBCT is offered as a 7-day retreat followed by a teaching apprenticeship  **Whether or not we are able to support APS educators toward becoming CBCT® certified teachers will be dependent upon raising cost-share funds for grant years 4 and 5.** |
| **Members of the IOC meet monthly** to discuss/re-imagine teacher prep and support  
**Members of the IOC** engage in cross-organizational experiences (attending induction meetings, courses led by other organizations, co-planning curriculum, etc.) **3 times per year**  
The IOC works with APS/MJ Cluster to design yearly community-based events to bring CREATE experiences (CBCT/SRI-CF) and other equity-based activities to CREATE communities  **Note**: (A) Members of the IOC representing the GaDOE, APS, GSU and CREATE schools will work collaboratively to design and organize the annual Georgia Induction Summit; and (B) cross-organizational experiences are being engaged 6-10 times per year, a 200% increase over our original plan. |

For **experienced teachers, school leaders, and Y3 residents**, SRI-CF (ECCF) is offered as 4-day institutes, monthly within/cross-school CF groups, single day teacher-leader workshops, national conference attendance, and/or year-long support for CF coaches.  

For **experienced teachers** interested in becoming cross-school CF (ECCF) teacher-leaders, CF facilitator apprenticeships are offered  **Note**: (A) In 2019-20 we developed a formalized program for ECCF facilitator apprentices, called the Equity Facilitation Fellowship (EFF) - this program was highly successful and will be continued; (B) In 2020-21 we will launch the Black Male Educator Collaborative - anchored in ECCF practices, this initiative is designed to support and enhance a sense of community amongst this highly valuable, yet underrepresented (in teaching) group.
**Section C: Capacity Building**

In Section B, we outlined the major project activities that we will undertake to build upon our existing body of work. These activities are both informed by promising preliminary findings from our research studies, and designed to ensure sustainability through capacity building. We explain how we do this, in detail, in Part II, Q3 (scaling) and Q4 (capacity building) below, yet also speak to this briefly here—as a preview of what is to come in these questions—in order to explain how our project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance.

One of our overarching long term objectives is for implementation of effective practices to become institutionalized. As such, we draw on Coburn’s (2003) conceptualization of scale that includes an initial focus on **depth** and **internal spread** of reform ideas in schools and districts as a way to build capacity and sustain the work, and on notions of human and organizational capital. In this way, we think about implementation as going “in-house,” with crucial support remaining in place even after funding for the project ends.

**For example:** Based on promising preliminary results from one of our research studies which indicate that experienced educators who participated in Equity Centered Critical Friendship (ECCF) reported improved capacity to “understand why it’s important (and how) to prioritize issues of social justice and racial equity in my teaching practice,” we designed a next level opportunity for teachers to come back and be trained as facilitators of this work, in a newly designed, year-long Equity Facilitation Fellowship (EFF) experience. The EFF program not only supports depth of learning for individual teachers, but positions them to lead this work with other teachers well after grant funding ends, leading to capacity building within individual schools.

As we make decisions about what activities to undertake to ensure institutionalization, we attend not only to inter-organizational capacity, but also intra-organizational capacity as we seek to bring external partners together to start to own this work.

**For example:** As outlined in our original grant application and shared in the table above, we created opportunities for university faculty, district leaders, school leaders, and CREATE team members to meet monthly to discuss and reimagine teacher preparation and support. Based on members’ experiences, and supported by preliminary research findings from a case study designed to investigate this space, we have shifted this work to include more authentic collaboration centered on designing new tools and opportunities together that might benefit and enhance the work of CREATE. For example, later this year, members of the IOC representing the GaDOE, APS, GSU and CREATE schools will work collaboratively to design and organize the annual Georgia Induction Summit as a form of inter-organizational capacity building, and this collaborative work seeks to enhance our intra-organizational capacity, by fostering significant impacts as a result of these and other similar interactions, communications and authentic relationship building opportunities that seek to move toward co-ownership of this work.

As a reminder, we share similar examples, but with more detail, in Part II, Q3 and Q4 below.
Section D: Program evaluation to guide replication

In the sections above, we shared our preliminary research findings and how they inform adjustments to our programming. As highlighted by our myriad planned program adjustments shown in Table 2.2b above, we are committed to the cyclical nature of this work, and understand that we cannot stop here; continued program evaluation will not only ensure we have complete studies (as described in Part II, Q1 above), but will help us identify which program elements are most effective, which to replicate, and how we might further build capacity. We explore these ideas below.

The program evaluation includes an implementation study, a WWC-level impact study, and in-depth qualitative analyses, all of which provide information about the effectiveness of the strategies employed by the project. When considered together, the studies also provide information to guide decisions about possible replication of project activities and strategies.

First, Table 2.2c outlines how studies can be designed to work together in a way that guides advantageous decisions about replication.

Table 2.2c. Steps to informing and guiding replication decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Determine whether intended levels of program activities can be and are being met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Demonstrate that with this level of implementation, impact is achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Provide the finer-grained information about for whom the impacts are most effectively being realized and through which mechanisms positive impacts occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Support quantitative findings with in-depth qualitative data, or vice versa, to provide a mixed-methods analysis with triangulation for details about mediation and moderator components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Utilize the findings generated in steps 1-4 (with any other relevant information available) to help establish a series of guidelines for yourself and other practitioners to make informed, strategic decisions about replication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of a mixed-methods evaluation and research effort (steps 1-5 above) are essential for guiding and promoting practices that work and for addressing possible deficits that can stand in the way of successful implementation and positive impact in replication efforts. As such, our studies follow this model, and will inform our knowledge about which practices are most likely to be successful in renewal grant years 4 and 5, and result in a series of documented guidelines for ourselves and other practitioners to inform decisions about replication in various contexts and into the future, beyond the period of the grant.
We share an example below of how we see CREATE studies working together to guide implementation and possible replication of effective practices, prompted by preliminary promise of CREATE’s positive impact on teacher retention.

**Figure 2.2d. Example of how a design for evaluating components of CREATE can result in information to guide possible replication of effective program activities.**

The impact evaluation is the barometer for evaluating the effectiveness of the program on critical outcomes. A central question of the research is: Is there an effect of CREATE on teacher retention? The answer can be found through the retention analysis, a component of the impact study. Figure 2.2e below displays early trends in outcomes from the retention analysis.

**Figure 2.2e: Teacher retention for CREATE residents and comparison subjects across two years**

(Note: The impact evaluation for CREATE employs a comparison group study that is designed to meet What Works Clearinghouse standards with reservations. It is in the third of its five year implementation. This result shows the preliminary promise of CREATE’s positive impact on teacher retention for cohort I only after two years. The result is neither full-term (confirmatory impacts are gauged after three years) nor full-sample impact, utilizing only 1/3 of the sample size needed to achieve adequate power based on the statistical power calculations. A larger sample will allow a covariate adjusted analysis to see if the effects are sustained after adjusting for differences between CREATE and comparison groups in their initial composition, so that we can move from initial trends to established effects.)

Figure 2.2e above indicates preliminary promise of CREATE’s positive impact on teacher retention based on a single cohort with outcomes assessed one and two years after start of residency. The percentage of CREATE teachers retained in the profession is 13/14 (93%) both after one year of residency (Y1) and after one year of being a full-time teacher of record (Y2). For the comparison group, the retention rates are 44/48 (92%) and 37/48 (77%) at Y1 and Y2, respectively. Even more notable is the impact of CREATE on Black educators with all six teachers retained at Y1 and Y2, compared to 8/9 (89%) and 6/9 (67%) retained at Y1 and Y2 in the comparison group. In Figure 2.2e, the grey box represents the data that will be collected during Years 4 and 5 of the study. The dashed red
The trend gives initial indication that impacts on retention are happening. This prompts a next level question—what is it about CREATE that is promoting retention? One layer to the answer can be found through moderator analysis. It reveals the conditions (such as ethnicity, race, or gender) under which impacts may vary. In this case, the trends in results show moderated impact depending on race. CREATE retention appears strong, especially among Black educators.

To address the question of why retention appears to be especially strong among Black educators, CREATE’s research examines how impacts on teacher survey-based measures of school-level characteristics (teaching environment, school climate) and individual teacher characteristics (resilience, burnout, mindfulness, social capital) potentially mediate impacts on the distal outcomes of teacher retention. The answer can be found through mediation analyses. This work is underway, but requires larger samples (from resident cohorts 2 and 3) to evaluate effects with adequate statistical power (i.e., to move from initial trends to established effects).

To obtain even more specific understandings, a next-level analysis could yield information about whether intermediate effects are more pronounced for Black educators. This is the kind of information that is needed to inform program improvement in the current implementation and to inform successful replication in a diverse range of other potential settings. That is, the analysis is digging ever deeper into questions about conditions necessary for impact.

Still, formal mediation analysis goes only so far to explain the mechanism. Contextualized qualitative research results can provide a triangulated analysis for the production of a mixed methods account that investigates the impact of a wide range of factors to inform possible replication in other settings. That is, the quantitative results will go hand-in-hand with qualitative analysis conducted by GSU to inform, on a more finely-grained level, the circumstances under which impacts occur and are likely to be sustained and/or be successful in a variety of circumstances or with a variety of populations.

Results from all stages of CREATE’s mixed methods research will be summarized in an easy-to-read executive summary with full details of methods and results appended. This can be utilized by other programs to determine appropriateness for replication.

The ongoing mixed methods evaluation is structured to yield the fullest account possible to aid replication. The steps outlined above in Table 2.2c (and in the Figure 2.2d example) are testing impact and contextualizing results while also adopting a “Learning to Improve” approach from Improvement Science (Bryk, Gomez, Grunow and LeMahieu, 2017). Essentially, the results from the first three years of the SEED grant have supported a Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycle on the scale of a full evaluation. We planned and have conducted an implementation cycle. We are now in the midst of studying its results (i.e., whether fidelity is achievable, whether preliminary trends are being observed [e.g., in positive impacts on retention], and through qualitative analysis, what the conditions are for seeing these gains and improvements). We are capitalizing on initial feedback and results, and gleaning insights to drive further improvement (e.g., do we need to make adjustments to reinforce positive outcomes, given the initial trends CREATE is having on retention favoring Black educators?) Next we will continue to act on this
evidence to drive improvement and achieve impact on a broader scale. The final product of the evaluation will summarize the cumulative evidence to make known what it takes to get positive impacts on main outcomes across various contexts, thus leading to opportunities for us and others to consider replication.

**Section E: Steps for Sharing with the Field**

Below is an outline of how we will share these results widely with the field through presentations and publications aimed at multiple audiences. Please note that we share additional information on dissemination beyond these traditional formats in Part II, Q3 (below), as well.

The external evaluation plan describes several components that will provide guidance for further program development, as well as conditions for replicating successful implementation and impacts across contexts. We intend to disseminate findings from our implementation and impact evaluations through peer-reviewed journals, presentations at regional and national conferences, and sharing of results with stakeholders and prospective partners. Specifically, we will propose presentations at national conferences such as the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness (SREE) conference and American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting. Our dissemination plans also include journal submissions to *Occupational Health Science*, *Education Policy Analysis Archives* (EPAA) and *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (EEPA). We will also produce research briefs to be disseminated more broadly through our website and social media accounts. As stated above, GY4 and GY5 are critical to obtain the sample needed to answer these key questions of the impact of CREATE.

The internal qualitative research plan describes several components that will provide guidance for further program development and inform possible replication efforts. We will continue to present this work at local and regional conferences, including the Georgia Induction Conference, and the Atlanta-based *Sources of Excellence in Urban Education Conference*. We also plan to share more widely, presenting at national education conferences (American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting and the National Association for Multicultural Education), and publishing in national and international peer-reviewed journals such as *Journal of Teacher Education, Teaching and Teacher Education, and Equity and Excellence in Education*. We already have one article accepted for publication--to appear in *The Peabody Journal of Education* later this year--and four more manuscripts in review or in progress. With continued funding, we will be able to publish our newly developed teacher support and evaluation tool and framework for others to pilot/use, and collect and disseminate research results on the use of that tool across multiple residency years. Finally, work from all 3 qualitative studies will culminate in two books--one based on the ethnography that details the history and story of CREATE, a social justice teacher residency that changed Atlanta, and another written for practitioners and teacher educators, focused on best practices and lessons learned for equity-centered teacher development.

In sum, continued renewal funding will go towards expanding equity-centered teacher development at local, national, and international levels, capable of informing teacher education at each level.
**Part II, Question #3: Strategy to Scale**

What activities will you undertake to use renewal funds to build upon and scale successful aspects of the grant project to benefit a larger segment of educators and students at schools not included in the original project?

As described above, we are in a cyclical process of implementing the CREATE program while also considering how we best evaluate and then adapt activities to maximize effectiveness and reach our overall program goals. Part of that process is considering the ways this work can be scaled. Drawing on Coburn’s (2003) conception of scale, we describe how our programming and research activities help us consider when and how to build upon and scale successful aspects of this project. We end with a discussion of dissemination practices that go beyond traditional forms of presentation and publication and that aim to support further development and replication of this work.

**SECTION A: Strategies to Scale**

According to Coburn (2003), traditional definitions of scale focus on how a successful reform effort might increase or “scale up” to include more students, teachers, or schools. While a laudable goal in some cases, Coburn argues that “scaling up not only requires spread to additional sites, but also consequential change in classrooms, endurance over time, and a shift such that knowledge and authority for the reform is transferred from external organization to teachers, schools, and districts” (p. 4). She suggests a more complex and complete conceptualization of scale and argues that reformers and researchers must consider scale in terms of *depth, sustainability, spread,* and *shift in ownership*. We agree with Coburn’s multidimensional conceptualization of scale, and have grounded much of our program and research design to date around her four interrelated dimensions. We explore each dimension in the tables below, distinguishing between current and planned components of scale within our project. We then discuss how carefully planned and researched scale by depth, sustainability, spread and shift in ownership impact our ability to “scale up” in the more traditional sense as expanded CREATE programming and research to other locations.

**Depth as a key element to scale.** According to Coburn (2013), before a reform can be implemented more widely, one must consider the nature and quality of change inherent in the reform. More specifically, she argues that for a reform to be “at scale” it must affect “deep and consequential change in classroom practice” that “impacts teachers’ beliefs, norms of social interaction, and pedagogical principles as enacted in the curriculum” (p. 4). Similarly, Coburn argues that efforts to study conceptions of scale that incorporate depth point to the importance of qualitative research methods such as ethnographic field notes, interviews, and observation protocols. Table 2.3a below highlights our program activities, structures, and research methods that align with scaling by depth.
Table 2.3a. Project Elements associated with scaling by depth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Structure/Design for Depth (impacting beliefs, norms, and classroom practice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently underway:</strong> Interactive and interrelated PD opportunities for new and experienced teachers</td>
<td>Two main PD initiatives offered for new and experienced educators—Equity-Centered Critical Friends (ECCF) and Cognitively-Based Compassion Training (CBCT®)—focus on supporting shifts in teachers’ mindsets and beliefs, instead of focusing on “discrete activities, materials or classroom organization” (p. 4):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• deeply interactive and thought-provoking 4-day institutes for all educators, not 2 hour sit-and-get;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• same teachers invited to return for more/deeper training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• teachers invited to engage training to prepare them to facilitate same institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ongoing/on-site support with the struggle to adopt new ways of thinking and seeing the world/education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• approach is about addressing the deepest identifiable cause (the root cause) and about avoiding being distracted by surface level “symptoms”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Current Research design: | |
| | • **Case studies and ethnography:** As suggested by Coburn, a conception of scale that fully incorporates depth has research designs that include ethnographic field notes, interviews, and observations. As such, we initiated these studies in 2018-19 and they have yielded helpful preliminary findings such that we will continue to offer ECCF and CBCT®. | |
| | • **Surveys of experienced educators:** This method ensures we reach all experienced educators who have participated; it’s less of a deep-dive into any one educator’s reflections and more of a broad sweeping assessment of satisfaction and shifted mindsets and practices that result from the programming | |

| Renewal period adjustments: Addition of concepts into CT training protocol | A third PD initiative that has been underway is Cooperating Teacher (CT) training. Based on preliminary analysis from the resident case study, we will redesign CT training to align with the underlying beliefs, pedagogical practices, and norms of social interactions inherent in the CREATE PD initiatives listed above, that also align with university and district norms and expectations. A hybrid university-school-district position (discussed further below) will be created to ensure depth of practice, and alignment across spaces. |

| Renewal period research design: | |
| | • **Case studies and ethnography:** We will continue to use these methods in grant years 4 and 5 to assess not only impact on residents and experienced educator thinking and activities, but to capture the depth of scale within classrooms and schools. | |
| | • **Surveys of experienced educators:** We will continue and expand the surveying to accommodate the natural growth (due to popular demand) of all of our experienced educator PD. | |

**Sustainability as a key element to scale.** A second element of scale is the ability to sustain the reform/change effort (Coburn, 2013). According to Coburn, scale *depends on sustainability* as many reforms are “adopted without being implemented, and can be implemented superficially only to fall into disuse” (p. 6). She argues that most reform efforts do not consider the ability for additional schools to sustain these efforts, and “most seriously, only a minority of studies of scale have employed designs that allow these studies to investigate sustainability” (p. 6). Because we view capacity-building as an essential component of sustainability (which is
addressed fully in Part II, Q4 below), we offer just two examples here of scaling through sustainability, including our purposeful 5-year research design. Table 2.3b below highlights our program activities, structures, and research methods that align with notions of sustainability.

**Table 2.3b. Project Elements associated with Sustainability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently underway:</strong> Teachers as facilitators</td>
<td>Importantly, we not only offer PD to new and experienced cohorts of teachers at CREATE schools, but we also offer a Fellowship and a certification add-on program which both support teachers in becoming <em>ambassadors</em> of equity and compassion work in their schools. The “Equity Facilitation Fellowship” trains teachers/leaders to facilitate equity conversations/learning and the CBCT® teacher certification program prepares teachers/leaders to instruct this specific course. This is a train-the-trainer model and it proved very successful this year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Current research design:** Longitudinal studies | According to Coburn, of the scale-up studies she reviewed, less than half included designs that tracked impact for four or more years. With renewal funds, our efforts at tracking over time can continue, as we are able to examine:  
- Experienced educator recurring annual surveys that monitor teacher mindsets over time; teacher practices over time;  
- Longitudinal Case Studies including observations across the years of same teacher residents;  
- Impact Study achievement and TKES scores year after year of same teachers  
- Critical Ethnography - shared and learned patterns of values, beliefs, norms, of CREATE programming team over time  
Specific to the impact study, understanding characteristics of students and teachers associated with stronger or weaker impacts informs the modification of the program or its implementation to achieve impacts over time. Given the preliminary finding of the impact of CREATE on retention, especially among Black educators, we are especially interested in evidence of sustainment of this effect over time. |
| **Renewal period adjustments:** Adjusted Equity Fellows programming | Adjustments to programming of Equity Facilitators Fellowship to drive greater impact. Increase opportunities for Fellows to practice facilitation with our supervision as a part of the program  
Black Male Educator Collaborative; we seek and believe we have secured grant funds specifically for the establishment of a working group (that will kick-off their experience with an intensive multi-day training) exclusively for Black Male Educators to: explore identity through narrative & build community; learn racial equity concepts & reflect on equity in education; present dilemmas of practice with peers, and; examine systemic inequalities through the use of protocols. These are all practices that residents and experienced educators to date have described as beneficial to their practice. |
| **Renewal period research design:** | • pre- and post-surveys similar to those used for the broader experienced educator surveys;  
• examine impacts on retention;  
• conduct focus groups with specific questions about equity and identity impacts |
**Spread as a key element to scale.** According to Coburn (2013), in addition to the possibility of spread to other schools, scale up efforts must consider the spread of reform initiatives “within a classroom, school, and district” (p. 7). Similar to depth, this includes consideration of the spread of the underlying beliefs, norms, and principles of the reform movement. Important for our work, this includes not only increasing the number of schools that participate, but also the ways in which reform norms and principles influence district policies, procedures and professional development. Spread at the school level not only involves the reform moving to more and more classrooms, but also reform principles or norms of social interaction becoming embedded in school policy and routines. At the classroom level, a reform can spread within, as the teacher draws on reform norms and principles to inform aspects of their practice beyond previously-identified or specific reform-related activities. (p. 7)

Table 2.3c below highlights our program activities and research methods that align with scaling by spread.

**Table 2.3c. Project Elements associated with Scaling by Spread**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently underway:</strong></td>
<td>Instructional Mentors (IMs) conduct intensive training with Y2 and Y3 residents. While many induction supports in other districts focus support on only the first-year teacher, our IM programming (3-4 hours of one-on-one coaching per month) extends through the teachers second year. When the teacher emerges from the first year (commonly described in the literature as a year of being in “survival mode”), they are positioned to reflect on how they can operationalize more of what they have learned through the study of theory, and layer together theory and practice, moving toward mastery of the skills they have been utilizing, and spread beliefs and principles learned through the trainings to impact more of their practices and/or drive improvements within their grade level or subject area teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM training through Y3 of residency</td>
<td>CT techniques are taught how to “make their practice transparent” for residents - how to move beyond modeling through action only, to a strategy where they narrate what they’re doing and why, such that the resident comes to understand the “thinking” behind the “actions”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Current research:** Impact study | • An indicator of spread – that the program is taking-hold better with time and therefore achieving deeper sustainment – is whether impacts are increasing over time. This is especially important for retention rates and effectiveness/achievement impacts, understanding whether bigger gains happen cumulatively for individuals. This is also relevant on the broader level of the impacts of the entire program over time -- whether impacts accrue as CREATE matures as a program.  
• Teacher retention, student achievement, teacher effectiveness measures across time (3 years and beyond) for individuals and also across the collective of all cohorts, all programming years |
| **Current research:** Ethnography | • Building on Coburn’s notion of scale within schools, districts, and reform organizations, the ethnography is designed, in part, to examine how norms and values inherent in the reform movement impact the overall efforts of the project. The study is underway and will be continued |
Renewal period programming adjustments

The IMs have made adjustments to their techniques for helping residents identify opportunities for spread that naturally exist. In alignment with this approach, our direct work with principals guides them in identifying ways they can showcase best practices (of our residents as well as all teachers trained by CREATE) such that more teachers within their schools are exposed to these mindsets, principles, practices, strategies. [Three residents’ classrooms are slated to be established as model classrooms for specific practices in the 2020-21 school year.]

Instructional Mentoring techniques

Through a collaboration with the Boston Teacher Residency, we have learned about a recently developed strategy for training CTs that appears likely to improve their ability to identify the full range of what a new teacher needs to know in order to teach well. Following mastery, some CTs forget what it felt like to “not know”, and they skip steps during their instruction for new teachers. Our newly adopted method—called the “Excavating Teaching” tool—was developed through the use of Improvement Science and will be used during CT trainings beginning 2020-21 school year to slow the thinking and deepen the “excavation” of techniques such that the CT draws the student teacher’s attention to all aspects of the decision-making and pedagogical approaches being engaged.

Renewal period research design:

- Ethnography - Examining the Culture of CREATE: This study is underway and its relevance is described above. This study is expected to continue.
- Impact study: An indicator of spread – that the program is taking-hold better with time and therefore achieving deeper sustainment – is whether impacts are increasing over time. This is especially important for graduation and retention rates and understanding whether bigger gains happen cumulatively for individuals. To this end, we will continue to measure student achievement, teacher effectiveness and teacher retention with consecutive cohorts of teachers as the CREATE program matures.
- Impact study: An indicator of whether the programming is generating cumulative impacts for individuals, the above indicators will also reveal this measure.
- CT and resident surveys: We intend to continue gathering residents' reports on their sense of self-efficacy which we predict will be increased with improved IM and CT practices. CT surveys indicate changes in their own practice as a result of the PD.

Shift in Reform Ownership as a key element to scale. Finally, to be considered “at scale,” Coburn (2003) suggests that ownership over the reform must shift so that it is no longer an “external” reform, controlled by a reformer, but rather becomes an “internal” reform with authority for the reform held by districts, schools, and teachers who have the capacity to sustain, spread, and deepen reform principles themselves (p. 7).

This includes developing a cadre of knowledgeable teachers, the transfer of strategic decision making from the reform organization to district and school leaders, and shifts in the capacity to generate funding. Because we view shifts in reform ownership as also being closely related to capacity building, we offer a few examples here, and further flesh out these ideas in Part II, Q4 below. Table 2.3d below highlights our program activities, structures, and research methods that align with scaling by shifts in reform ownership.
Table 2.3d. Project Elements associated with Scaling by Shift in Reform Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently Underway:</strong></td>
<td><strong>A process is already underway to develop an equity-centered teacher support tool to guide the observations of IMs when they work with Y2 and Y3 residents and are focused on what culturally-relevant and equitable teaching practices look like.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity-Centered Teacher Support tool</td>
<td><strong>Those who work on the CREATE grant generally define their jobs as being on the programming or the research team. These teams are well-coordinated, focused, efficient, and effective yet the IOC and ethnographic research indicate cross-organizational, collaborative program development will improve the work by informing additional perspectives.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job roles &amp; responsibilities defined by institutional affiliation</td>
<td><strong>Through our affiliation with the National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR), CREATE has engaged use of NCTR’s financial modeling tool specifically designed for teacher residency programs. This tool has informed our decision to shift our financial model in an effort to diversify our income sources and generate more earned income. To that end, we had an early success in January/February of 2020 when we earned $10,000 from payments (by educators beyond the CREATE consortium) who attended our training institutes. Four educators traveled to Atlanta from far away states to engage, and a number of metro Atlanta schools not otherwise affiliated with CREATE also sent paying educators. There is great potential for building out this component of our work.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of financial modeling tool and efforts to increase earned income</td>
<td><strong>To encourage co-ownership of reform efforts, we will pilot our newly designed equity-centered teacher support and evaluation tool with all residents--a tool established based on preliminary research results and our collective learning in the field--that will span university and district spaces. The use of this tool highlights a shift in ownership through the co-design by CREATE/university and district partners. Note: with continued funding, this tool may lead to additional scale-up efforts as this equity-centered, reflective observation and evaluation tool is used more widely across the university and district.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal period adjustments</strong></td>
<td><strong>With continued grant funding, we will design several university-school-district hybrid roles that would position current CREATE team members as participants and decision-makers within multiple teacher induction organizations (GSU, APS, schools), allowing for shifts in reform ownership, as well as spread of reform ideas across traditionally close boundaries of school-district-university. Hybrid roles allow for certain individuals to be on CREATE staff and also representing and impacting another partner institution.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-development of new tools to support reform efforts</td>
<td><strong>We have also secured matched funds from the district to buy out at least one university faculty member’s time to engage in district-level training and support of cooperating teachers (one of the several hybrid roles mentioned above designed to build human and structural capacity)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **New hybrid roles**                                   | **Shift from external to internal ownership of the reform effort:**  
  - GSU’s newly funded Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education (CEJTE) will begin to support the work of CREATE, helping to build deep**
Although COVID-19 has impacted our ability to provide in-person training sessions during summer 2020, it is clear that the training experiences we offer are appealing to educators beyond CREATE schools and can serve as a mechanism for generating funds. It is our intention to scale this effort, moving away from grant dependency toward our own ownership of the income-earning processes.

Renewal period research design:

- Case Study - to encourage co-ownership of reform efforts, we will pilot our newly designed equity-centered teacher evaluation tool which will enhance our ability to measure the degree to which our residents’ teaching is culturally-responsive.
- IOC case study - the research design allows us to examine shifts in ownership as institutions with differing activity systems come together to support, enhance, and ultimately co-own CREATE reform efforts. This research will be continued without adjustments.
- Although it is not “research”, our financial reports will indicate our success with generating earned income (and therefore ownership).

The programming and research decisions built into the model of CREATE programming means that we are well on our way to understanding how notions of depth, internal spread, sustainability, and ownership impact our ability to spread this reform to more schools. Drawing on Coburn’s (2003) elaborated conceptualization of scale throughout our project period has meant that we have been forced to think about ways for our work to reach more deeply into schools, districts, and university spaces, focusing on the spread of norms, beliefs and pedagogical practices within and between those institutions. Our work has also included a major focus on shift in ownership, that according to Coburn “may prove key to the ability to sustain and spread the reform over time” (p. 8). At the same time, we took up Coburn’s call to research these multidimensional conceptions of scale that are oftentimes more difficult to measure.

We do all of this work as we continually navigate the tension between depth and breadth and consider more traditional notions of “scale-up” to new school sites. We acknowledge that while Coburn argues that expanding a reform to multiple settings is an insufficient condition for scale, she and others do point out that expansion is oftentimes warranted and necessary. As such, based on preliminary findings from our research studies, and considering the multidimensional components of spread already built into our program, we will be “scaling up” in the following ways:

- **Scale-up of cooperating teacher training**: Preliminary research findings have pointed to the need for (and our capacity to) train and support cooperating teachers across all Atlanta Public Schools. With renewed funding and financial support from the district, in addition to continuing with cooperating teachers in CREATE schools, we will be expanding this important component of CREATE programming toward being district-wide. We feel like we are well positioned to scale-up this work, while also attending to important dimensions of depth and sustainability as we work with a cohort of new experienced educators.
○ Renewal period research on this scale-up: Measures of yield (number of GSU student teachers who convert to being employees of APS, student teacher effectiveness and satisfaction, and CT effectiveness and satisfaction are all measures with baseline values in place that will be monitored closely over time once the intervention is put into place. This data collection will be funded/executed by APS.

**Scale-up residency work to new schools:** We are also cautiously optimistic that with renewal funding, we can expand full residency programming to 1 or 2 new schools in the cluster who have already expressed an interest in joining the CREATE consortium of schools. The primary constraint here is available funds. In addition to scaling-up, working with these schools will include the necessary focus on depth, sustainability, spread and co-ownership of this work. Adding new schools will also allow us to investigate scale within a school using our current and proposed research methods outlined in the charts above.

○ Renewal period research on this scale-up would follow the research model already in place for the CREATE program.

As we take up this new work that aligns with more traditional forms of scale, we remain committed to all forms of scaling that allow for deep and sustained work with new cooperating teachers and partner schools. We do all of this scaling work--with current and new schools--in ways that continue to have a positive impact on teachers and ultimately the students they serve.

**SECTION B: Feasibility of Replication and Mechanisms for Dissemination**

Due to our commitment to high quality, longitudinal, diversified research studies with the ability to triangulate results, we are well positioned to learn from and then replicate this work in other settings. As described in Part II, Q1 above, our research designs include extensive documentation of programming that would allow others to replicate this work when ready. We are also well positioned to understand which research methods most fully allow us to investigate multiple dimensions of scale, positioning this team to fill a gap in the literature. As Coburn suggests, the research agenda on scale is still in the process of formation... [and] **conditions are ripe** for studies that grapple with the challenges of creating research designed to further explore the multidimensionality of scale. With attention to this multidimensionality, research can begin to speak more clearly and persuasively about the tensions and tradeoffs involved in different strategies to take reform to scale.

Therefore, in addition to more traditional methods of dissemination discussed in Part II, Q3 above (see a full list of current publications and presentations here in Table 1g), that focus on the impact of CREATE programming, we are also well positioned to share with other researchers and practitioners best practices in research designed to identify strategies to scale.

Adding to this, if awarded renewal funding, we also plan to expand the ways we share information internally, and with our local partners. For example, local dissemination of information will occur through an interactive webinar series, where CREATE research and
implementation teams present findings and lessons learned. Like much of our work, this webinar series will be co-owned and co-facilitated, which will enable faculty and staff at CREATE schools, GSU, and other local IHEs, to share important research findings, new ideas, and problems of practice with each other, as well as with participating districts in the Atlanta area. These webinars will include a panel of members of the research team and experts in teacher preparation in dialogue with CREATE participants who can offer their unique experience of professional learning, and will encourage and support program scale through depth, shift in ownership, and sustainability. Adding to this, we will draw on newly designed positions and collaborative opportunities to disseminate results from this project. For example, CREATE’s director now serves as the Director of Collaborative Learning at the subaward charter school and this position has been specifically designed for **assisting other schools and districts with taking up some of the successful practices of CREATE**. CREATE leaders have also been invited to participate in the **design of the state-wide Georgia Induction Summit**, providing a unique opportunity to share our results across the state.

In sum, we are committed to broad dissemination, locally and beyond. We know this is key to further development of our own work here in Atlanta, and also so that others may consider replicating this work with the hope of positively impacting the learning and experiences of teachers and students across the nation.
Part II, Question #4: Adequacy of Resources

How would your project use renewal funding to develop or enhance capacity in the key areas (human, material, structural, and organizational) necessary to transition successful aspects of the project into system-wide improvements?

As CREATE works to realize its vision of a critically-conscious, compassionate and skilled educator for every student, we keep one eye on the day-to-day and week-to-week activities of the program, and one eye on capacity-building for future programming after the grant period ends. As referenced in our introduction to this renewal application, CREATE is designed to meet three overarching goals: (1) to recruit, support, and retain a diverse pool of effective teachers to work in high-needs schools; (2) to support effective teaching practices and the development of social capital among experienced educators working in those same high-needs schools; and (3) to develop a cross-institutional “third space” to promote organizational reform within new teacher induction. All three goals guide our work to address an immediate need, while building capacity for long-term programming. Our use of renewal funds for ensuring long-term and widespread system impacts is categorized below into the four key areas of capacity building: human, material, structural, and organizational.

Human Capacity “The knowledge, skills, will, and view of self of key stakeholders within and outside system” (TQP TA Center, Dec., 2017)

- **CBCT Instructor Training:** Since 2017, two experienced educators each year have been selected to obtain certification from Emory University to teach CBCT®, a series of contemplative practices shown to contribute to improved emotional regulation, sleep, and stress management. Most of these certified teachers are on staff with CREATE and can now teach the course themselves--modifying it as needed for our community of Atlanta educators--without direct university involvement, free of most of the associated costs. Because the skills and certification for CBCT® teachers are now in place, our (human) capacity for teaching this course is greater. Renewal funds will be used to pay the salaries of staff and to generate matching contributions that fund continued CBCT® coursework for new teacher residents and experienced educators, as well as funding for additional local educators to become certified to teach CBCT®. CBCT® practices are intended to be engaged for a lifetime and can be supported by cost-free programs available to the public; therefore, the impacts of this programming can continue on after grant funding ends and grow to impact a larger portion of the district.

- **Equity Institutes:** Since the start of our grant in 2017, CREATE has engaged 55 new teacher residents and over 425 experienced educators from the district in extensive equity-centered professional learning--typically in the form of 4 or 5-day intensive training institutes. These impactful and popular institutes are specifically designed to guide participants to experience what it looks, feels and sounds like to be a part of a community of practitioners fiercely committed to educational equity and excellence. Participants explore individual and collective identity, strategies for community-building and reflection, and perspectives and skills that are equity-centered, collaborative and reflective practices. These institutes build APS’ (human) capacity for reducing oppression in schools through the acquisition of knowledge about our history and each other, the development of skills...
and the will to address inequities, and the ability to see “self” and the collective in new ways. Renewal funds will be used to pay the salary of the facilitators that lead this program, which will continue to serve 100-200 educators per year. We will also leverage these funds to expose new schools and districts to these institutes, increasing our earned income through registration fees.

- **Equity Facilitation Fellowship:** We piloted a program across the 2019-20 school year designed to help ensure there would be leaders available to schools for facilitating equity work in the short and long run (such as after grant funds end). The EF Fellows are school leaders and teacher-leaders who have engaged one of the equity institutes detailed above and who then showed interest and promise in further development of their facilitation skills so as to prepare them to lead work in their schools. Sixteen EF Fellows completed the program this year and already seven of them are scheduled to facilitate professional learning on behalf of CREATE or as an independent leadership initiative in their own school. This was an inspiring program and it is our plan to continue it and build on it in the 2020-21 school year. Renewal funds will be used to pay the salary of the facilitators that lead this program, which is--by its very definition--developing human capacity for sustained equity work after the grant funds end.

**Material Capacity**

“The fiscal and staffing resources and other material supports, including matching funds, in-kind time, meeting space, technological capabilities, tools/documents, and transportation/travel” (TQP TA Center, Dec., 2017)

- **New district-level financial commitment to this work:** Atlanta Public Schools (APS) has also made three significant contributions to the project, increasing its “ownership” of the research and programming. APS has (1) agreed to provide $250,000 to cover the second-year residents’ stipends if needed; (2) agreed to provide $50,000 toward a new part-time position to manage a scaled effort to train more CTs across APS; (3) agreed to provide approximately $25,000 to identify strong candidates for CT roles (capacity building) and to develop principals’ understandings of the value of hosting student teachers in their buildings; and (4) proposed involvement with capturing various impact measures for this expanded work. (They have also made significant in-kind contributions of physical space and personnel time.) We are excited about APS’ understanding about the importance of pursuing deeper partnership and increasing ownership of the project. This enhanced material capacity is a critical element for financial sustainability.

- **Foundation support:** CREATE has leveraged our grant to ignite new relationships with local and national foundations for matching funds, as well as local individuals and the district for in-kind donations of work time, meeting space, conference registrations, and other material supports. We have a long list of cost-share sources, most of which continue to grow as the donors deepen their understanding of the benefits of the work.
  - Prompted by improved understanding of the benefits of the programming within the philanthropic community, new donations (Annie E Casey Foundation $80k, RH Dobbs Foundation $130k, APS funding $150k, to name a few) have recently been secured for the renewal grant period. Furthermore, the data that will be generated by activities during the renewal period will in turn leverage funding beyond the end of
the grant period. Renewal funds will be specifically used to pay the salary of the program Director, who spearheads the work of developing material capacity.

- We also have extensive in-kind donations to the project, including significant use of school facilities at no charge and donations of time by local facilitators and other organizations that cannot donate money, but are eager to support the effort.

**Structural Capacity**  "The elements within and outside the system that exist independently of the individuals involved, such as policies, procedures, and formalized practices of a system"  
(TQP TA Center, Dec., 2017)

- **District strategic planning:** CREATE has been influential during the district’s strategic planning process (executed spring 2020) through several mechanisms:
  - The Program Director, [redacted] served on the district’s “Excellence in Schools Project Advisory Committee” as one member of a 30-person team that came together 8 times across 10 months to knit together into a more cohesive whole the important initiatives and work streams the district already had underway; deepen the district’s implementation of the strategic plan and core tenets of their operating model; and better prepare the district to develop the 2020-25 strategic plan.
  - A member of the CREATE visioning team and GSU research team, [redacted] currently serves on the Local School Governance Team, or “Go Team” for a CREATE-partner school. [redacted] joined the GO Team at the Georgia State and CREATE public partner school, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Middle School, in 2019. The GO Team is a cross representation of local stakeholders including teachers and community members and operates under the control and management of the Atlanta Public Schools Board of Education. They have a multifaceted dynamic roles including: (a) Approving the school strategic plan and update and monitor its implementation; (b) Developing innovative ideas for school-level flexibility through the School-Based Solutions process; (c) Providing input on school-based curriculum selection and accompanying instructional materials (to name a few). By participating in the King Middle School GO Team at the behest of the Principal, [redacted] is serving the local community and transforming trusting partnerships to attain the depth of partnership that Coburn (2003) proposes as a central theme of “scale”.
  - All CREATE staff engaged consistent--even persistent--messaging (such as at Board meetings, community meetings, luncheons, one-on-one meetings with the Board members) to raise awareness of the significant costs to the district of operating without substantive new teacher induction policies and procedures or equity-centered professional learning practices in place, and
  - A carefully crafted and executed communications plan to guide stakeholders of the district toward understanding the root causes and costs of high teacher turnover, and methods for mitigating these insidious problems.

The APS strategic plan serves as evidence of CREATE-influenced enhanced structural capacity (because the executed version is substantially different from earlier drafts which were drawn up prior to our involvement) and a driver of structural capacity (because the plan itself calls for initiatives that will result in the development of new policies and formalized practices that support equity-centered professional learning and new teacher
induction supports). During the renewal grant period, we will continue to work with our communications and marketing contractor to drive policy change in the district.

- Mentors/CTs as teacher-leaders: CREATE’s mentor and CT roles benefit new teachers as well as the experienced educators themselves, and have become an expected part of the teacher-leadership structure in CREATE schools. By developing shared understandings amongst experienced educators, principals and the district of the value of these roles for directly increasing early and mid-career teacher retention and effectiveness and indirectly saving the district money, CREATE has and will continue to increase structural capacity. CREATE is in the process of helping shift the district’s and principals’ investments of time and money from a focus on hiring and training teachers (to fill vacated positions) to the more proactive--and ultimately effective--approach of supporting and retaining talented teachers who are already employees. CREATE will leverage renewal funds to further build structural capacity by reaching more schools and principals within the district through the development of a mentor/CT training program and more widespread understanding of the cost-savings of the mentor/CT structure.

Organizational Capacity  “The interactions, relationships, and communications among internal stakeholders (leadership, departments, key staff) and external stakeholders (partners, vendors, others) which shape culture” (TQP TA Center, Dec., 2017)

- Programming for principals and district personnel: Each year CREATE holds a retreat for school and district leaders that develops shared understandings of the value of new teacher induction and teacher-leadership programs and helps leaders focus their attention on the long-term, money-saving, achievement-driving benefits of this work. During these retreats, leaders also discover ways to work together to address staffing and professional development needs, thereby building organizational capacity. We will use renewal funds to continue this practice and expand the reach to more schools by funding the salaries of staff who facilitate these events.

- Induction Organizations Collaborative (IOC): Regrettably, universities and schools/districts are often framed as oppositional to one another (Flessner, 2014). With this in mind, a final goal of CREATE has been to develop a “third space” aimed at organizational reform—a space designed to engage teacher preparation and induction organizations in collective, sustained reflection in order to re-imagine and reform teacher education. CREATE brings together university faculty, district/school leaders, state leaders, and community members involved in the education of students for sustained and deep (re)consideration of the work each does. As described above, key project partners have been coming together to form our IOC for monthly meetings since the outset of our grant, and our narrative in Section 2, Q2 provides examples of the many benefits of this work. The IOC was, by definition, designed specifically to generate organizational capacity and it has undoubtedly fostered significant impacts as a result of the interactions, communications and relationships that have been established in these meetings. Renewal funds will be used to continue the IOC: we have a line item in our budget for the facilitator of these meetings and a verbal commitment and strong interest from all the 2019-20 members to continue the work. A new project we will engage as part of the renewal grant is the shared planning of the Georgia Induction Summit, a one-day conference that brings together teacher preparation organizations from around the state to share learning. Formerly organized and run by only the GaDOE and
more recently by the GaDOE in collaboration with Atlanta Public Schools, the new vision for the induction summit is a collaborative effort across all of the organizations represented in the IOC.

- **Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education (CEJTE):** As mentioned in Section 1, Q2, the leaders in the GSU College of Education and Human Development in 2019 funded a Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education (CEJTE). Three of the four co-Directors of the CEJTE are funded researchers and course instructors on the CREATE grant and the initiative by the College to fund the Center is a direct result of their work with CREATE.
  - **CEJTE’s Mission:** Grounded in critical, humanizing, and culturally relevant theories, the mission of the Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education is to design, research, and reimagine teacher education, from university teacher preparation to veteran teacher development and support. We are dedicated to working with communities and partnering with districts to support equity and justice in teacher education research, policy, and practice.

The CEJTE is positioned such that over time more GSU students can be served by CREATE and more students can be impacted. Additionally, relationships and communications between internal (GSU) and external stakeholders (others) are shifted and will impact communications and partnerships during the renewal period as this group of CEJTE co-Directors takes on a new collective identity and more clearly distinguishes an aligned and declared focus for their work.

### Conclusion of the renewal grant application

Building capacity in each of the four areas mentioned above is essential to ensure system wide change. Extensive research and financial modeling conducted by [insert name] of the Learning Policy Institute, [insert name] of the University of Pennsylvania, and the National Center for Teacher Residencies, among others, clearly indicates that teacher induction programs ultimately save the district money when instituted in a manner that increases educator effectiveness and retention, resulting in a reduction of human resources expenditures (which can total $1.2M per year for a large district) otherwise used for recruitment and onboarding. The challenge is in breaking the vicious “hire and replace” cycle. A shift as monumental as this requires a coordinated and tremendous degree of “local knowledge, skills, willt” (human), “fiscal and staffing resourcest” (material), “policies, procedures, and formalized practices”(structural) and “interactions, relationships, and communicationst” (organizational) capacity. The data CREATE has generated combined with the capacity CREATE has built in these realms has set these wheels in motion. The transition from where we were in 2017 to where we are now is remarkable, yet we have more work to do. It is work we must do for our youth. It is our request that renewal funding be granted so that we can continue what we have started: the process of collaborating for transformation.

In closing, it is our hope that each of us, in our varied roles, will be essentially changed by our new awarenesses, understandings, perspectives and skills for improving education, and that once transformed, we will be better prepared for—and more committed to—taking up the challenges of achieving social justice and equity in our schools.
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