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CHICAGO EARLY CHILDHOOD PREPARATION AND PATHWAY (CECPP):
INTRODUCTION & SIGNIFICANCE

The CECPP is a robust partnership among policy-makers, teacher education faculty, researchers, local school staff, and community members to establish, implement and evaluate an effective early childhood teacher residency program for the City of Chicago (Absolute Priority) designed to improve student achievement or other educational outcomes in computer science by increasing the number of educators adequately prepared to deliver rigorous instruction in STEM fields (Competitive Preference #1). Members of the CECPP partnership include individuals from the Chicago Mayor’s Office of Early Learning, Chicago Public Schools (CPS), City of Chicago Community Colleges (CCC), Chicago community-based organizations (CBOs), faculty from the College of Education (COE) at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) and faculty-researchers from the Department of Psychology at UIC and George Mason University (GMU). Despite our combined years of both partnership and expertise in effective program development and implementation we are novice applicants (Competitive Preference #2). The Early Childhood Education program at UIC has never been part of a TQP grant and this is a first submission for all of the PIs.

The CECPP is a unique partnership that brings together key stakeholders including government agencies, LEAs, community-based organizations and university teacher educators and researchers to support and enhance the recently launched UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program (Absolute Priority). The UIC residency program is designed to prepare high-quality EC teachers in Chicago’s most underserved communities. Eighty-three percent of children served by our partner LEA (CPS) come from low-income families (Illinois report card, 2018).
The UIC residency program provides a viable pathway for teacher residents to gain state teacher licensure and a graduate level coursework while maintaining employment and strong relationships with young children and their families at their current workplace. It intentionally recruits and selects traditionally disenfranchised persons, particularly women of color, to advance their education, strengthen their teaching practice and improve outcomes for children. The foundational concepts and structures for the UIC residency program emerge from the former highly successful alternative certification program (ACP) designed and directed by Main (Project PI). The new UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program builds on this prior success as well as the longstanding UIC M.Ed program that blends early childhood and early childhood special education to prepare teachers to support *all* young learners.

With this proposal for the Chicago Early Childhood Preparation and Pathway (CECPP) Partnership, we seek support to further enhance the UIC residency program by offering 1) additional instruction in critical content areas (including competitive preference # 1: STEM), and 2) adding multi-tiered mentoring through UIC coaches that support quality classroom instruction, sustainable data-informed professional learning, and administrators to sustain professional development beyond the grant period. Finally, the planned, robust and embedded research design will ensure that the CECPP Partnership is rigorously evaluated and continuously improved through formative and summative feedback. Program impact findings and lessons learned will be disseminated via multiple ECE stakeholders to inform sustainability and scalability to increase and support a high-quality, diverse EC workforce.

**Project Goals for CECPP**

1. Enhance the UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program and mentoring model to **include intense UIC coaching support and increased content in socio-emotional learning (SEL), STEM, and inclusion of diverse learners.**
2. **Expand a sustainable model** of the UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program to address the substantial early childhood teacher shortage.

3. **Positively impact** the individuals (teacher residents, site-based mentors and administrators, UIC coaches), participating sites (CBOs and CPS ECE classrooms), and systems (CPS, City of Chicago) involved in this residency program.

4. **Create mechanisms to sustain positive program-level impacts** following program completion including structures and routines for data-informed continuous professional development.

5. **Demonstrate CECPP Partnership effects** on the program residents, participating sites and the Chicago area ECE workforce pipeline.

### Need for High Quality Early Childhood Teachers

Early childhood stakeholders have been increasingly recommending the transformation the early childhood workforce by: 1) improving higher education EC preparation pathways and ongoing professional learning programs; 2) promoting evaluation that leads to continuous improvements in professional practices (Institute of Medicine & National Research Council, 2015); 3) providing career and academic advising and coaching; 4) implementing workplace conditions that support professional learning; leveraging partnerships with employers and other stakeholders to help working adults to continue their education and learning; and 5) using workplace settings to create richer and more integrated experiences for the adult learner (Bernoteit and Holt, 2017). CECPP emerges as a direct response to these national, state and local calls to transform the early childhood (EC) workforce.
The needs related to the early childhood workforce and early childhood teacher preparation are vast. The challenges facing the existing workforce include an acute teacher shortage, a lack of teacher diversity in lead teacher and administrative roles, a high degree of teacher turnover. Early childhood workforce preparation programs face challenges related to a lack of viable, educator pathways to support growth and change in the profession and a lack of specialized training especially in critical areas of SEL, STEM, inclusion of diverse learners and the use of data to support student learning.

The specific needs associated with each of these challenges are described in detail in Appendix C: TQP General Application Requirements Needs Assessment. In short, however, the need for just simply more licensed Early Childhood teachers in Chicago is in crisis mode. To meet the city’s goal for universal, full-day preschool for four-year-olds 1500 EC educators will be needed by 2021 (Chicago Office of Early Learning, 2019). We need to not only increase the quantity of EC teachers for Chicago, but also increase the diversity of our workforce, particularly in lead teacher roles (Rhodes & Huston, 2012). Teachers who of and from the same communities of the children possess critical linguistic and cultural competencies and as such are better able to draw on community resources, are more likely to serve as role models for parents, and are better equipped to develop home-school connections - all of which have been shown to have positive impact on academic growth (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2005, Rodriguez-Brown, 2009). These teachers are often better able to recognize and build on the strengths of children, rather than mistaking differences for deficits. This enables them to more accurately assess—rather than pathologize—children’s development (Dee, 2004). Notably, the UIC residency program has 41 teacher licensure candidates in the pipeline to begin residency in Fall 2019. Thirty-nine of the 41 (95%) are women of color.
Beyond just more teachers and more teachers of and from the communities where children are living and attending preschool, we need teachers with specialized skills, particularly in the critical areas of SEL, STEM, and inclusion of diverse learners. The quality of interactions between EC teachers and children along with the instructional focus of classrooms are amongst the most critical features for improving gains in academic and language growth (Burchinal, et.al 2011; 2011; Zinsser, 2017), and a relationship between children’s social-emotional development in preschool relates to subsequent successful school and life outcomes (Committee on Early Childhood Pedagogy of the National Research Council, 2000). Knowledge of SEL and ways to include children with and without disabilities in same settings is especially necessary now.

One indicator of this pressing need is the alarming rates of suspension and expulsion in EC education. Nationally, 17,000 three and four-year olds are suspended or expelled from preschools annually. Nearly **250 children are expelled or suspended from preschool programs every day in the US** and a study conducted by Co-PI Zinsser found that 25% of Chicago preschool teachers in CBOs had requested that at least one child be expelled during the 2015-2016 school year, and 10% has made three or more such requests (Zinsser, et al., 2017). Of additional concern, expelled or suspended students are disproportionately boys and children of color (U.S. Department of Education, 2016) and are more likely to experience multiple disciplinary actions in elementary school, entering the so-called ‘school-to-prison pipeline’ (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005). Expulsion represents the ultimate failure to both create an inclusive and supportive learning environment and to promote children’s emotional and behavioral competencies to ensure their success in the classroom.
A second indicator is that despite laws and mandates for inclusion (e.g. US programs for Head Start and Early Head Start and Illinois Preschool for All require 10% of enrollment opportunities be set aside for children with disabilities) slightly over half of preschoolers with disabilities still receive education in separate settings (US Departments of Health and Human Services and of Education Policy Statement, 2015).

With regard to STEM, a growing body of literature highlights the importance of early mathematics and science skills in young children, yet children in Head Start programs come to kindergarten showing the lowest scores in science readiness than any other content area (Clements & Sarama 2016). Despite the recognition of the need to increase children’s exposure to science and math content and process skills, many preschool teachers avoid teaching science and math. Tu (2006) found only half of preschool classrooms had science areas available and almost 87% of classroom activities were not related to science. Early et al. (2010) found that only a tiny part of a child’s day (8%) was spent engaging in math related activities while 21% of the day was devoted to literacy instruction.

Possible explanations for the lack of science and math in early childhood classrooms include teachers’ pre-existing attitudes about science and math teaching, low confidence levels and teachers’ beliefs about their own science and math knowledge and abilities (Pendergast, Lieberman-Betz & Vail, 2017). Additionally, early childhood teacher preparation programs tend to under-emphasize science and math (Brenneman, 2011), leaving teachers to rely upon their own experiences and limited background knowledge. The result of this has been early childhood teachers who lack content knowledge and confidence in their ability to implement early math in classroom (Brenneman et al. 2009; Greenfield et al. 2009) and who are resistant to providing
children with high quality, math-rich learning experiences and environments (Hachey, 2013a; Ginsberg, Lee, & Boyd 2008).

Finally, systems issues such as lack of viable pathways for increased educational attainment and high turnover rates contribute to a low-quality EC workforce. Gaining a state-level teaching license requires climbing huge hurdles that include finding ways to pay tuition while working for very low wages (Whitebook, Phillips, & Howes, 2014). Often, coursework is offered during the day while the EC workforce is serving children. And, even when offered in the evenings, classes come after a work day that is often 8 - 10 hours long are too often disconnected from actual work experiences. PI Cathy Main’s recent Illinois survey of hiring managers in community- and school-based ECE settings revealed that turnover rates of EC staff averaged 37% annually (Main, Yarbrough & Patton, 2018). Survey respondents also reported that high rates of turnover create conditions that are counter-productive to teacher and student learning. For example, administrators who must spend time in the classroom due to unfilled teacher positions cannot provide the supports and structures needed for teacher learning and effectiveness. In turn, teachers working without leadership and administrative support often suffer from burnout (Whitebrook and Sakai, 2003). That affects both the emotional and academic support they can provide to their students. All of these combine to emphasize the significance and importance of the CECPP Partnership.

CHICAGO EARLY CHILDHOOD PREPARATION AND PATHWAY (CECPP):
DESCRIPTION, DESIGN AND KEY FEATURES

The CECPP represents a unique combination of a high-quality teacher preparation program that includes a pre-residency EC course of study, multi-tiered mentoring support and content-focused professional learning communities (PLCs) throughout the residency, and a
robust formative evaluation for ongoing program revision in situ. Through the CECPP we expect to increase residents’ competence and confidence in the classroom, increase overall instructional quality and content specific practices related to STEM, SEL, and inclusion of diverse learners (DL) in our residency sites; hone, scale and disseminate a sustainable EC teacher residency model; and ultimately increase children’s achievement and learning. The CECPP also incorporates explicit training for residents and their teaching coaches in the collection, interpretation and use of data to enhance student learning. Finally, CECPP will integrate the use of research-based observational evaluation tools (e.g. EMOTERS, CLASS) and teacher performance measures (edTPA, Chicago REACH). In this section, we present the CECPP design and describe key features and implementation processes.

Figure 1. Logic Model for CECPP project
The key feature of the CECPP partnership is the Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) Program offered through the College of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). This approved program through the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) entitles successful program completers to an Illinois Professional Educator License (PEL) with an endorsement in Early Childhood Education and an option to enter a pathway towards a graduate degree and additional endorsements in early childhood special education (ECSE) and/or ESL/bilingual. It utilizes a cohort model and fully integrates pedagogy and classroom practice through a carefully structured course sequence enhanced by intensive and extensive mentoring from experienced teachers and coaches.

**Building on a Strong Foundation**

CECPP builds on pivotal practice and research. We draw on models and lessons learned from the highly successful former alternative certification program designed and directed by the CECPP PI (Main). We incorporate current innovative online STEM professional development designed and directed by one of the PIs (Sheridan) and add a research and evaluation component by including expertise classroom observation tools and measurement (PIs Zinsser and Curby).

**Former UIC Alternative Certification Program (ACP).** Importantly, the newly launched UIC residency program is based upon models of successful teacher residencies designed to prepare teachers for success in underserved, high-need communities. Specifically, the foundational concepts and structures for the UIC residency program emerge from a highly successful seven-year alternative certification partnership (ACP) between UIC and CPS to certify EC teachers working in community-based programs (CBOs). ACP was designed and directed by Main (Project PI). Of the 112 teachers enrolled in that program, 94% successfully completed and earned state certification. 78% of program completers were women of color, and more than half were African-American. Follow-up data show slightly
over 50% earned a master’s degree and additional endorsements in early childhood special education and/or ESL/bilingual education. Many program completers assumed leadership in their community centers or in schools.

The ACP developed from years of working with CBOs through which we gained a keen awareness of a critical strength teachers working community center showed: they were of and from the communities they served, very committed to supporting and serving children and families in their communities, and able to successfully navigate an intensive, rigorous teacher certification program. To support the ACP teachers to thrive in the program while teaching full time, three key structures were in place: 1) a cohort model in which ACP teachers moved together through a sequence of courses and were encouraged to collaborate professionally and on a personal level in order to manage challenges and obstacles; 2) a mentoring program in which each ACP teacher was assigned a coach who visited their classrooms regularly and provided intensive, context-specific guidance promoted in the mentoring research literature (Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Tamir, 2010). Coaching included, but was not limited to, helping with time management, discussing and adapting course assignments, community resources, modeling teaching, child and adult advocacy, identifying and securing community resources, and, in some cases, directly supporting children and families served ACP teachers’ classrooms; 3) establishing the role of a “director liaison” who worked individually with each CBO site-administrator to develop supportive structures in the CBO for continuous professional development. The importance of the administrator in developing school climate for professional development is well-documented (Datnow, 2005; Eilers & Camacho, 2007; Zinsser, Curby, & Ullrich, in press). Administrators learned ways to support ACP teachers’ through basic structural changes ranging from re-organizing schedules so ACP teachers could get to class on time to creating routines that enabled co-planning and collaboration to draw on ACP Teachers’ new practices. A key lesson
learned from the former ACP was how teaching and learning to teach was highly contextual. That is, the culture and norms within CBOs and the communities and neighborhoods of the CBOs provided pivotal unique experiences for each teacher in the program.

**Online STEM Professional Development for Early Childhood teachers.** In addition to innovative Early Childhood teacher preparation programs, UIC faculty (led by co-PI Sheridan) have also developed an effective professional development program and resources through grant funding from CME Group Foundation and Caplan Foundation for Early Childhood teachers. Math at Home: Early Math Matters is one of the nation’s first online professional development models that targets early math teaching and learning. Math at Home: Early Math Matters (MAH), a grant funded project centered around the big ideas of math, began in 2011. MAH provides free, online professional development courses as well as a vast array of instructional and educational resources for early childhood professionals. The online format is designed to address many of the challenges that early childhood educators face in accessing effective professional development, with concepts and activities that can be easily translated to the classroom. The Math at Home: Early Math Matters online curriculum contains a series of eight courses addressing the major conceptual areas of math and computer science learning: math literacy, number sense, patterns, geometry, measurement, data collection and math processes. Each course is designed to be viewed in a single sitting of no more than an hour in length including the interactive activities.

Additionally, the Math at Home: Early Math Matters website includes several free access resources for early childhood educators to use to improve their classroom instruction. Components include short videos related to major math and computer science concepts, over 100 pre-designed, ready to use lesson plans that align to professional standards and are searchable by age, material or standard. There are short videos that offer suggestions for setting up a math-rich
classroom environment and a weekly interactive blog post written by an early math professional. The blog includes a comment section where early childhood professionals can share thoughts, ideas and best practices, and ask and answer pressing questions about how to integrate math in their EC classrooms. The online platform is housed within the state’s professional development system (Illinois Gateways) and provides educators with an easily accessible product to be reinforced through face-to-face meetings.

Data analysis of a research study on the effectiveness of the MAH professional development program shows that the program was successful in significantly increasing positive practice changes in early childhood teachers and significantly increased early childhood teacher’s knowledge, confidence and beliefs about early math and teaching math in the early childhood classroom (Sheridan, et al, 2019; Sheridan & Wen 2019).

Currently, a similar site to the Math at Home site is being developed for science and is funded by the Caplan Foundation for Early Childhood Education. The Early Science Matters website is currently under construction and will be completed in the Spring of 2020. Combined these two platforms will provide a solid tool box of STEM resources, community, and training for teachers engaging in STEM practices in their classrooms. Since the powerful ideas of early computer science share foundational content with early math and science, teachers are exposed to content and practices for both content areas. For example, the powerful ideas in computer science of patterning, problem solving, representation and sequencing are also a part of the big ideas in early math and science practice.

**A Research Team with Classroom Observation & Measurement Expertise.** The CECPP is greatly enhanced by a research component which will contribute to both the rigorous measurement techniques informing the coaching, and evaluating the program. In addition to a
combined 25 years of experience conducting research in early childhood settings, Zinsser and Curby are the developers of the Emotion Teaching Rating Scale (EMOTERS), an observational measure of social-emotional teaching quality and a core component of the CECPP. The EMOTERS was developed and validated with through a $1.4 million Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences (IES) Goal 5 study.

As part of the CECPP, Zinsser and Curby will transition their tool from purely observation and evaluation to a tool for professional development. Therefore, their collaboration brings to CECPP state-of-the art research-based ways to help EC residents, UIC coaches, residents, and eventually additional staff in residents’ CBOs gain knowledge and skills directly related to inclusive social emotional learning. Zinsser and Curby will train all UIC coaches in use of the EMOTERS observational tool that measures four domains of social–emotional teaching core to EC education: modeling, instructing, responding, and relating. Through formative feedback from the EMOTERS trained UIC coaches, this measure will serve as a model of how to engage in data-informed professional learning.

**Recruiting and selecting candidates**

Core to the UIC residency program is targeted recruitment and selection of individuals who are of and from traditionally underserved Chicago communities, reflect the communities in which they will teach, and are experienced working with young children and their families. That is very unique amongst US teacher residency programs that usually draw candidates with little to no prior teaching experiences and are often not from the communities where they will eventually teach (e.g. Teach for America). The recruitment is also directly **aligned with the hiring objectives of the** in both CPS and CBOs.
The City of Chicago launched the Chicago Early Learning workforce scholarship program to address the severe early childhood teacher shortage. They surveyed over 2500 current EC teaching staff in community-based organizations (CBOs) to determine their educational needs. Almost all indicated that they wanted to earn an Illinois teaching license with an endorsement in early childhood education. Of that group, more than 200 indicated that they have already hold both a bachelor’s degree and an Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS) ECE credential (see Appendix J for description). These individuals have been prioritized for the UIC residency program. We are prioritizing these candidates not only because of their strong content knowledge in the field of ECE (as evidenced by the ECE credential representing course work and competencies in ECE), but also their commitment to and experiences in working with children and families in Chicago’s most underserved communities. This commitment and experience represent critical strengths necessary for effective teachers of young children. These strengths are recognized in the conceptual framework defined as Community Cultural Wealth (Yosso, 2005) which highlight forms of cultural capital often overlooked. By viewing experiences of residents as assets rather than how they are often seen - as deficits (attending a particular school or being from a particular neighborhood), the program is able to find, recruit, and support residents who might not otherwise have access and opportunities to advance their education. In recruitment and selection, the UIC residency program privileges those with strengths such as cultural, community, language and familial knowledge of the children and families they teach and serve, but also with additional features of Community Cultural Wealth such as strong aspirations and perseverance despite challenges and a social lens focused on addressing social inequities. To identify potential candidates the UIC residency program committee collaborates with the City of Chicago Office of Early Learning, the City Department
of Family and Support Services (DFSS) and CPS as well as UIC faculty connections to communities from more than 20 years of work supporting EC teachers in CBOs and CPS.

Through letters of recommendation, personal statements and admissions interviews potential candidates will have the opportunity to demonstrate their Community Cultural Wealth. Specifically, program candidates must submit: 1) a commitment letter from their site administrator indicating full support for the candidate in the program and school or center support for the enhanced coaching model; 2) two letters of recommendation documenting the candidate’s experiences, accomplishments and effectiveness (as indicated by recent teacher evaluations) working with young children and families in underserved communities related to socio-cultural competencies and potential for academic success in post-baccalaureate work; 3) a professional goal statement evidencing continued commitment to working with young children and families in underserved communities. Additionally, in accordance with requirements for ISBE Alternative Licensure programs, the UIC residency program will also review transcripts to ensure candidates meet general education requirements and minimum GPA requirements of 3.0. Rubrics adapted from the previous alternative certification program will be used for faculty to rate all documents and the interview. Then all program faculty will meet to determine applicant admission.

Program Sequence

The key experiences for program candidates in the UIC residency program are outlined in Figure 2. In Illinois, all alternative licensure (residency) programs have two components – a course of study and the actual residency. Given our focus on privileging active practitioners, some recruited candidates may have already completed some of the course of study. These candidates will be able to transfer in approved courses. Regardless of prior coursework, all future
residents will enroll in two UIC early childhood graduate-level courses (*EPSY 520 Introduction to Early Childhood Curriculum and Practice & EPSY 523 Advanced Curriculum and Practicum*). Once the course of study is completed and candidates pass required testing, they are entitled to an Illinois provisional license and can begin their residency.

The Pre-Residency part of the program consists of standards-aligned course of study in early childhood education and an Illinois tests of Basic Skills and Early Childhood Education content. This credit-bearing course of study is aligned with Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) for all Illinois Teachers, Illinois Professional Teaching Standards for Early Childhood Teachers, Illinois Early Learning and Development Standards and those standards specific to the state alternative licensure program: 1) *Instructional planning*; 2) *instructional strategies, including those meeting the criteria for instruction relative to special education, reading and English language learning*, 3) *classroom management*; and 4) *assessment of students and use of data to drive instruction*. The course of study is also aligned with the competencies outlined in the Illinois Gateways ECE level 5 credential. The ECE level 5 credential (See appendix J) represent mastery of over 50 competencies mapped onto seven core content areas: (a) human growth and development ; (b) health safety and well-being; (c) observation and assessment of the young child; (d) curriculum and program design; (e) interactions, relationships, and environments; (f) family and community relationships; and (g) professionalism. This alignment is unique to the UIC residency program and this alignment that provides an innovative structure for articulation and transfer of coursework from other institutions. This is particularly important for our incumbent workforce that often possesses some or all of the required courses. It also allows our teacher licensure candidates with options for taking some coursework at the graduate level at UIC but other required coursework at our partner institution,
Chicago City Colleges, where additional course sections are offered and the cost per course is lower. This provides flexibility and cost-efficiencies, critical features to supporting the EC workforce advance their education (Institute of Medicine & National Research Council, 2015).

The Residency part of the UIC program will be substantially enhanced by the CECPP partnership. These enhancements include: intensive mentoring from site-based teachers and UIC coaches (see section below on mentoring for more detail) and content-focused professional learning communities (PLCs).

For the residency, candidates will be placed as the teacher of record in early childhood education classrooms (grades prek-2) or in Preschool for All classrooms in community-based organizations (CBOs) that are funded through the Illinois Early Childhood Block grant. Residents will enroll in a UIC course called EPSY 522 Internship in Early Childhood Education for four consecutive semesters. This unique course is combination of seminar-type instruction through the use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and intensive on-site mentoring by a UIC coach.

PLCs will be the essential spaces for explicit instruction to residents for creating, collecting, engaging with, and reflecting on data from the classroom. Residents will have multiple opportunities to review data from their own classroom while forming questions and multiple interpretations. With guidance from PLC facilitators (UIC faculty and coaches) and their peers, then residents will learn to draw conclusions and take action in terms of planning, instruction and ongoing assessment. Residents will also be taught how to effectively collect and use videos to improve their teaching (see below for information on integration of video technology).
Figure 2. Key activities and requirements for candidates in UIC residency program including additional supports through the CECPP Partnership

**Pre-Residency**
- Complete ECE content course of study (18 ECE content credits)
- Complete EPSY 520 Introduction to Curriculum & Practice
- Complete EPSY 523 Advanced Curriculum & Practice
- Entitlement to Illinois Professional Educator License (PEL) with stipulation

**Residency Semester 1**
- Bi-weekly SEL-focused PLCs (EPSY 522)
- Bi-weekly SEL-Focused classroom mentoring from UIC coach
- Swivl Training to residents
- Collect own classroom video for evaluation and edTPA
- TS Gold Data entry/collection by residents
- Receive feedback based on EMOTERS® & CLASS observations

**Residency Semester 2**
- Bi-weekly inclusion of diverse-learners focused PLCs (EPSY 522)
- Bi-weekly inclusion of diverse-learners focused mentoring by UIC coach
- Collect own classroom video for evaluation & PLC reflection
- Prepare & submit edTPA performance assessment
- TS Gold Data entry/collection
- Receive feedback based on EMOTERS® & CLASS observations
- Receive formative assessment ratings on UIC Teacher Residency

**Residency Semester 3**
- Bi-weekly STEM focused PLC meetings (EPSY 522)
- Bi-weekly STEM focused mentoring by UIC coach
- Collect own classroom video for evaluation & PLC reflection
- Focused feedback on STEM activity
- TS Gold Data entry/collection
- Receive feedback based on EMOTERS® & CLASS observations

**Residency Semester 4**
- Bi-weekly teacher-leadership focused PLCs (EPSY 522)
- Bi-weekly teacher-leadership focused mentoring by UIC coaches
- Collect own classroom video for evaluation and PLC reflection
- TS Gold Data entry/collection

**Post-Residency**
- Annual Alumni Survey
PLCs will focus on four domains: integrating social-emotional learning and teaching, teaching diverse learners (including dual-language learners and children with disabilities) in inclusive settings, and using STEM curriculum and teaching in early childhood classrooms. The fourth PLC domain will focus on teacher leadership and maintaining PLCs and other organizations structures critical to ongoing professional development (described below in the sustainability section). Through PLC foci, we will help residents learn ways to teach all children and to teach their students emotional competence that is positively associated with academic achievement in all areas including STEM (Durlak et al., 2011).

**PLC 1: Social Emotional Learning.** Integration of SEL is critical. At present, although such skills are emphasized in state standards of teaching, they are rarely explicitly taught in teacher preparation program curricula (Schonert-Reichl, Kitil, & Hanson-Peterson, 2017). Residents will gain knowledge to implement instructional practices and activities – some purposeful and planned, some naturally occurring in the learning environment – that promote emotional development in children. In order to facilitate the connections, program faculty and coaches will focus on the four domains captured by the EMOTERS tool and integrate attention to them throughout the program: modeling, instructing, responding, and relating (Zinsser, Denham, & Curby, 2018). *Modeling* includes all observable adult emotional behaviors and expressions that contribute to a child’s emotional knowledge, expression, and regulation. Through modeling, children are able to learn the nature of various emotions, the appropriate time to express them, and how to express them (Denham et al., 2012; Denham, Zoller, & Couchoud, 1994). *Instructing* involves directly/explicitly teaching about emotions. Explicit instructing expands children’s understanding of the antecedents, consequences, and/or the expressions as well as the nonverbal cues of an emotion. *Responding* to children’s expressions is another way
teachers convey their beliefs or values of emotions. Teachers’ responses can validate or invalidate the child’s emotion. *Relating* describes the positive and negative instances that promote a positive teacher–child relationship. Children’s relationships with teachers are the context in which the other interactions that take place throughout the day.

**PLC 2: Inclusion of Diverse Learners.** Explicit teaching to residents about evidence-based practices to support all students’ learning along with clear processes to differentiate instruction based on student strengths and challenges is essential. Residents will learn ways to document and discuss the range of diversity amongst their students that could include language, cultural backgrounds, developmental delays or disabilities. To support all students’ strengths and assets that also take into account their background familial and cultural experiences, we will integrate two highly-regarded foundational frameworks. One is Universal Design for Learning (UDL), which emerges in part from recent brain research about learning. Underlying Universal Design for Learning is neuroscientific findings about three main brain “networks”: recognition, strategic and affective. This maps onto curriculum and teaching through an emphasis on finding multiple ways to represent ideas (recognition), take action and expression to make meaning (strategic) and engage with (the affective network). Pedagogical research findings demonstrate that UDL can be a core system for planning, teaching (including choices of resources and teaching methods) and assessment in which teachers can adapt curriculum and alter obstacles that could impede learning (Gordon, Meyer & Rose, 2016; Rose, 2000; Rose, Gravel & Gordon, 2013; see National Center for Universal Design for Learning).

Dovetailing with UDL are tenets from the framework Understanding by Design (UbD) (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005; 2011) and linked work with best ways to adapt instruction and differentiate it for individual students (Algozzine & Anderson, 2007; Mastropieri & Scruggs,
2010; Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006). Residents will learn three major ways to differentiate instruction to align with students’ assets, challenges and preferences: study the content they are teaching, examine multiple processes of how it can be taught, and decide on the product(s) students produce to show learning (Tomlinson, 2000; 2001). Knowledge and practice with differentiation, UDL and UbD will provide residents with systematic ways to support all students through intentional and careful planning, assessment and teaching.

**PLC3: STEM.** As a result of their recent examination of the early childhood landscape in the STEM content areas, McClure et al (2017) recommended that early childhood teachers need well designed pre-service training and professional development in the STEM areas in order to better serve children. They recommended that teacher preparation and professional development programs include STEM content alongside education in how children develop the cognitive abilities to learn stem and the learning progression in which that occurs. In addition, they recommended that such training and preparation programs be designed in such a manner that teachers experience STEM learning through a program that models the way that children learn. Curiosity, maker spaces, and the ability to play and explore the environment will help teachers better know and understand how children learn STEM content areas and what motivates them. The STEM PLC will build on the success of the Early Math Matters professional development program and be modeled after the recommendations made by McClure et al (2017). Residents will gain the knowledge, confidence and skills necessary to integrate math, science and computer science in their classrooms. UIC faculty and coaches will focus on the big ideas of math to include: number sense, patterns, shapes and spaces, measurement, data collection and analysis, setting up a math rich environment and mathematical processes. In addition, science will be centered around the early science standards to include helping children to develop beginning
skills in science practices, such as observing, asking questions, solving problems, and drawing conclusions. Content will focus on the following areas of study: living things grow and change, living things rely on the environment to live and grow, objects have physical properties, force and motion impacts nature and objects, earth, water and air are an integral part of the world around us and they must be taken care of, changes related to weather and seasons, and basic tools, technology and safety in exploring scientific concepts. Finally, both early math and science skills are powerful precursors to engaging in the computer science “powerful ideas” of social emotional learning, patterns, problem solving, representation and sequencing developed by Papert (1980). Integrating computer science into STEM classroom practices in the early childhood classroom supports what early childhood teachers are already doing in their classrooms. In this way, computer science is integrated in a child’s everyday experiences, preparing children for the larger K–12 framework (K–12 Computer Science Framework, 2016). Computer science is developmentally appropriate for young children as it is best learned in an environment where young children can play and follow their natural motivations to explore, question and solve problems, In order to facilitate resident’s math, and science (including computer science) practice in their classrooms, besides content, residents, coaches and UIC program faculty will explore and model ways to help children develop the dispositions of a scientist and mathematician through active engagement in the practices of computer science, natural science, and mathematics.

**Program Mentoring**

The pivotal value of providing experience and learning opportunities alongside a trained and experienced mentor cannot be understated. It is a cornerstone of the residency program and
feature of the CECPP. We will use a multi-tiered mentoring for the CECPP that includes both site-based mentors for residents and UIC coaches.

The site-based mentor will not only provide residents with a mentor that accessible and can provide immediate support, but also one who is knowledgeable about the school or CBO context. Seeing the mentor role as that of educational companion with another teacher (Feiman-Nemser and Parker, 1993), rather than some conceptions of site-based mentor as expert or mentor as merely a technical guide (Bradbury, 2010; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Stanulis et al., 2018) is crucial for the site-based mentor. In accordance with ISBE requirements for alternative licensure programs, the site-based administrators must identify site-based mentors that have experience and expertise in early childhood education. Specifically, the site-based mentors will meet the following requirements: 1) hold a professional educator license and be employed by the school district where the candidate is serving his or her residency; 2) have three years of full-time teaching experience in the 10 years immediately preceding his or her assignment as a mentor; and 3) have achieved a performance evaluation rating of proficient or higher in his or her two most recent evaluations. (Per 23 Illinois Administrative Code, Part 25, Section 25.60 (a)(2(A-B)).

With support of site-based administrators and UIC program faculty, mentors and residents will meet on site a minimum of once per week for at least one hour. The focus will be assistance with planning, help gathering resources, addressing specific issues related to children in the classroom, creating inclusive learning environment and reviewing children’s work and assessment data to plan and make curricular decisions. Overall, the key is to be responsive to what the resident wants and needs. As residents progress through the program, we expect these meetings will turn to discussions of continuous growth and improvement. The site-based mentors
will also gain CECPP support from the UIC coaches (described below) in order to continually improve their capacity to advance student learning.

**The additional mentoring from UIC coaches is a unique feature of the CECPP.** The UIC coaches will receive training and work collaboratively with the UIC faculty to co-facilitate the PLCs and provide on-site mentoring to residents. At the start of the program, coaches will be trained by UIC faculty to support the development of evidence-based teaching strategies in critical content areas (STEM, SEL and inclusion of diverse learners). Additionally, they will be trained in collecting and using video, self-report and classroom-level data for reflective supervision and data-driven decision-making. Finally, coaches will be trained to reliability on the EMOTERS and the CLASS and their reliability will be tested annually thereafter.

CECPP coaches will be collaborators and co-facilitators with UIC faculty. They will provide ongoing feedback to program faculty about what they observe in classrooms, and the video they make will be integrated into the PLCs. They will be steeped in each PLC content area (STEM, SEL, and inclusion of diverse learners) and thereby become uniquely qualified to provide expert mentoring to residents in each PLC area. The UIC coaches will also be trained to recognize the assets each resident has as a member of the community they serve and be responsive to residents’ questions and challenges generally. Each semester coaches will support residents in goal setting, reflection on and response to feedback gathered via live and video-based observation, self-assessment, and child data (see section below for detail on the video technology and the Evaluation plan for detailed data collection plans). Feedback from each semester will drive goal setting for subsequent semesters. Towards the end of the residency, coaches will transition the leadership of the PLCs to residents. They will guide them in helping others at their site use data to inform their teaching.
Four coaches will work with five residents in each cohort by visiting residents’ classrooms on a bi-weekly basis (each week that a PLC is not held). Coaches will utilize reflective supervision. Reflective supervision refers to coaching and training that emphasizes the importance of social–emotional development in both the child and the childcare provider (Gilkerson, 2004). This style of supervision is associated with improved care quality (Bernstein & Edwards, 2012) and is also applied in other high emotional professional fields such as social work (Ruch, 2005). At the heart of reflective supervision methods is that EC teachers will reflect on their own interactions with children and consider how they and children may have felt during particular moments.

**Data informed coaching.** In the CECPP mentoring model, we conjoin the emotionally validating method of reflective supervision with rigorous metrics for formative evaluation and professional development including self- and coach-assessments and classroom observations. A cornerstone of this proposal is the use of real classroom data to improve their practice. In particular, the EMOTERS will be used to iteratively assess the quality of teachers’ ability to foster SEL in a formative manner. Coaches will be trained to use the tool while conducting classroom observations throughout the residency but feedback from the 40-item measure will be of particular focus in the first semester because of the foundational role that social-emotional skills play in children’s classroom engagement and learning. The structure of the EMOTERS, developed in an item response theory framework, organizes items in a empirically derived continuum from novice or easy practices which contribute relatively little to children’s SEL to more challenging but impactful practices. Use of the EMOTERS enables coaches and residents to focus on specific goals related to SEL, engage in pointed discussions about it, and identify actionable items for residents to practice.
Curby and Zinsser (co-PIs) will also train all UIC coaches in the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS; Pianta, La Paro, & Hamre, 2008). The CLASS is a global rating system that measures the quality of teachers’ interactions with children and has been used to provide coaching in support of teacher’s interactions and instruction. As with the EMOTERS, the UIC Coaches will use the CLASS as an observational tool providing data to inform coaching and PLC reflection.

**Coaching beyond residents only.** UIC coaches will also interact with multiple site stakeholders and that mentoring may include supporting site administrators and other staff at the site, including the site-based mentor. In so doing, the UIC coach becomes part of multiple triads at the site to support a sustainable culture of professional development. UIC coaches will help site administrators establish conditions and routines to support collaborative planning, structured reflection and critique of teaching, meaningful feedback on teacher performance, and teacher input on decision making. For example, coaches will support site administrator’s professional development structures by training site administrators on how to use video equipment and more importantly how to use classroom data (e.g Teaching Strategies Gold Child Assessments) for reflection and professional development.

**Innovations in the use of video technology.** In order to pass the edTPA, teachers must submit video of themselves teaching. However, most residents will have had little opportunity video themselves. Thus, teachers will be explicitly trained to collect video of themselves and to identify strong exemplar video to include in their edTPA portfolios. For example, residents will be directed not only to watch their own teaching behaviors, but will also be prompted to view the video with an eye towards evidence of children’s learning, emotions, perceptions, and overall behaviors. To record the video, a new classroom tool, the Swivl™, will be utilized. The
Swivl™ is a low-profile video and audio data collection tool used in educational settings. Namely, it can use a variety of Apple or Android devices to capture video on top of a small base that turns to follow the microphone the teacher is wearing. This has the advantage of having the teacher in frame with good audio as s/he moves about the room. This also has the advantage of not requiring any additional personnel in the room. It has been successfully used by Zinsser and Curby in early childhood settings. Coaches and the research team will have access to recorded video through a secure cloud platform. Appendix J presents details of the camera equipment, cloud storage, and access.

**Teacher Performance Assessments of Residents**

As required by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the residency portion of the program will include multiple teacher performance assessments to evaluate residents for continuation in residency and entitlement to licensure at the end of the program. These performance assessments include the [Chicago REACH](#), the [edTPA](#), and the UIC standards-based evaluation.

The Chicago REACH (see Appendix J) seeks to provide a measure of individual teacher effectiveness that can simultaneously support instructional improvement. It incorporates teacher performance ratings based on multiple classroom observations together with student growth measured on different types of assessments. Adapted from the Charlotte Danielson framework for teaching it includes four domains for teacher assessment: 1) Planning and Preparation, 2) The Classroom Environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional Responsibilities. Across the four domains 19 different components of teaching are assessed including demonstrated knowledge of early childhood development, content, pedagogy; knowledge of appropriate assessment including the use of formative and diagnostic assessments to support children’s learning;
appropriate instruction that engages diverse learners; and collaboration with colleagues to improve instruction. The Chicago REACH will be administered at the end semester 2 and the end of semester 4 by site administers qualified and authorized to use the measure as indicated by Section 24A-3 of the Illinois School Code [105 ILCS5/24A-3].

The edTPA is a performance-based assessment designed to engage teacher candidates (residents) in demonstrating their understanding of teaching and children’s learning in authentic ways. It is aligned with the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards for beginning teacher licensing and the Common Core Standards. The Early Childhood edTPA is composed of three tasks: Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Instructing and Engaging in Learning, and Assessing Children’s Learning. It requires video submission resident’s teaching as well as artifacts representing children’s work. The edTPA is evaluated externally (Pearson) using 15 rubrics across the three major tasks. At least three of the rubrics focus on analyzing children’s learning and using assessment data to inform instruction. In Illinois, a passing score on the edTPA is required for all teacher licensure candidates in Illinois in both traditional and residency programs. More information about the edTPA is available at https://www.edtpa.com/.

Lastly, residents are assessed by both site-based mentors and UIC coaches using the UIC Evaluation Form. This evaluation is aligned with Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS) for all teachers. Residents are rated across each standard and supporting indicators on a scale from emerging to advanced. This evaluation is conducted at the end of semester 2 for formative purposes. At the end of the residency, the evaluation is conducted a second time. At that time, the data is used in making decisions regarding licensure and then aggregated and shared with Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE).
Commitment and Sustainability

The CECPP project is built upon years of highly successful programming, innovative research and strong partnerships combined to support the development of highly qualified early childhood teachers. We have a record of sustainability, successful completion, responsiveness to workforce needs and adaptation to state and local policies governing teacher preparation programs.

In 2013 when the state made significant changes to the rules governing alternative certification programs, including a new requirement that teacher candidates must complete their teacher residency in school-based programs only, the UIC Alternative Certification Program (ACP) which used community-based organizations (CBOs) for residency placements was forced to close. In response to the closure, Main (Project PI) along with partners from CPS, City of Chicago, GOECD, and advocacy groups worked for two years to change the statute. This included writing legislation to revise the School Code to allow for teacher Residency programs in CBOs again and lobbying for the legislation to get passed. Once passed, Main (PI) collaborated with the City of Chicago to design and develop the UIC Alternative Licensure (residency) programs that serves as the cornerstone of the CECPP partnership. This experience exemplifies the extraordinary support UIC has from our state legislature, local governmental agencies, the Chicago school district (CPS) and key advocacy groups (e.g. Ounce of Prevention).

More recently, the City of Chicago Office of Early Learning has granted the UIC residency program more $600,000 through the Chicago Early Learning Workforce Scholarship Program to support the first 40 residents enrolled in the program. The Scholarship program provides funding for tuition and fees to both the incumbent early childhood workforce and interested Chicago residents to pursue a degree and/or credentials in early childhood education.
Plans are underway to continue to fund the Scholarship program to cover tuition and fee expenses for additional cohorts in the UIC residency program. This Scholarship program provides not only tuition and fee support but also a robust pipeline of potential candidates for the UIC residency program—key ingredients for sustainability.

Program components specific to the CECPP are designed to provide sustainability and maintain positive program impacts in EC classrooms and across systems. First, our specialized training of UIC coaches will create a cadre of expert EC coaches for continuous mentoring of both former and new program residents. These coaches will over the five years have developed relationships and connections with EC programs in both CBOs and CPS. They will be trusted partners for continued collaborations. Additionally, as a key feature of the CECPP, these coaches will also be providing direct support to site administrators at the residency sites. The coach will help site administrators establish conditions and routines to support collaborative planning, structured reflection and data-driven critique of teaching, meaningful feedback on teacher performance, and teacher input on decision making.

Secondly, our fourth and final PLC will focus on resident’s development as teacher leaders who can help create and/or sustain the PLC structure in their center or school. We expect that they will not only have the confidence and competence to serve informal brokers of new knowledge related to children’s development and learning, especially with regard to SEL, STEM and the inclusion of diverse learners, but they will share their expertise in more formal ways. For example, in the fourth PLC, residents will practice their leadership skills and engage in peer teaching and learning by planning and developing professional development activities (PDA) at their site. Included in this PDA will be how use video to show evidence, reflect, and critique one another’s teaching. Both teacher and administrative leadership, along with key attributes of the
organization, have the potential for providing strong support for sustainable changes and improvement to teaching and learning (Bryk, Sebring Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010).

Finally, residents will be expected to continue to work in early childhood classrooms for a minimum of three immediately after completing the program. As part of the Scholarship program all residents sign commitment agreement indicating that they will continue to work in Chicago EC programs in either CPS or CBOs for at least three years. The commitment agreements are collected and monitored by our partners in Mayor’s Office of Early Learning.

**Resident Stipends/Repayment**

The residents will earn a salary from the CBO or CPS school where they are employed, and therefore no salary stipends are budgeted for residents in the CECPP. Their salaries are being used, along with tuition funding from the Chicago Early Learning Workforce Scholarship Program, as cost-match for the CECPP. Residents will receive financial support through the CECPP to cover expenses such as parking, books, state testing, and technology needs.

**CHICAGO EARLY CHILDHOOD PREPARATION AND PATHWAY (CECPP): MANAGEMENT PLAN**

The CECPP management plan is designed with a supportive organizational structure to govern, manage, implement, and achieve stated goals on time and within budget during the five-year grant period. The partnership will achieve project goals on time and within budget through strong leadership, informed decision making, expert management and coordinated partner contributions.

**Implementation Plan**

The CECCP Partnership management plan is organized through a leadership team and project committees. The CECCP leadership team will oversee all aspects of the program objectives and
activities in the table below. The leadership committee will meet each semester to (1) review policies, operations, and qualitative and quantitative data to ensure accountability, (2) refine strategies and practices to address needs of CECCP partners (specifically CPS and CBOs) and ensure continuous improvement, and (3) share findings and implications to build capacities for scalable and sustainable models for supporting and strengthening the EC workforce. Members include PI (Main), co-PI (Zinsser), co-PI City of Chicago Chief of Early Learning (Aigner-Treworgy), and CPS Director of Talent (Lyon).

Three project committees will manage key aspects of the CECPP. The Operations Committee will oversee the implementation the CECPP including program recruitment and selection, program admissions, coordination with CPS and CBOs for residency placements and site-based mentor selection, and coordination with the state board of education to ensure teacher licensure upon program completion. Members will include the PI, the Program Coordinator, CPS Talent office placement coordinators, and City of Chicago EC workforce coordinator and university liaison with the state board of education.

The Content and Coaching Committee will manage responsibilities related to the content development and design and revisions of the PLCs, implementation of them, ongoing training of coaches, and implementation and revision of the CECPP coaching component. Members of the CC committee will include the PI (Main), faculty content experts (co-PIs Parker and Sheridan and additional faculty consultants) and UIC coaches.

The Research Committee will be responsible for the collection and analysis of classroom (resident) level data (e.g. CLASS, EMOTERS), video coding, development of surveys (self-reflection and follow-up) and coordinating with CC Committee to provide continuous feedback and data. The members of the RC committee include the PI (Main), co-PIs (Zinsser and Curby),
the evaluation consultant (Teasdale), a data coordinator and research assistants. The research committee will oversee necessary measurement development, measurement training, and data collection.

Each committee will meet at least monthly to review, plan for, and meet project milestones. Notes will be shared across the committees. Additionally, the PI will serve on each committee to ensure coordination of plans, implementation and any revisions. All committees will meet monthly. Cross-committee meetings will be arranged, as needed. The implementation plans aligned with responsible key personnel and committees is outlined in the table below.

Table 1: Implementation Plan: Goals, Objectives, Key Activities, Timeline and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 1: Enhance the UIC ECE Alternative Licensure (residency) program and coaching model</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility (Key Personnel and Committee/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective 1:** Train coaches in the coaching framework with content area foci. Develop coaching protocol including reflective supervision practices (observation, reflection, planning, action)  
*Activities: Train coaches in collecting and using video for reflective supervision, collecting and using self-report data for reflective supervision, in using TS Gold classroom-level data for reflective supervisions, in evidence-based teaching strategies in (SEL, STEM, Diverse learners) and in the CLASS & EMOTERS tools* | Su ‘19 | Main, Curby, Zinsser, and Research Committee |

| GOAL 2: Establish & maintain supportive PLC w/ residents:  
*Activities: Conduct bi-weekly individualized coaching on site; Focus PLC content around set foci (SEL, STEM, Diverse learners); Support resident’s reflection on and response to observation, self-assessment, and student data* | F ‘19- F ‘20 (cohort 1)  
F ‘20- F ‘21 (cohort 2)  
F ‘21- F ‘22 (cohort 3)  
F ‘22- F ‘23 (cohort 4) | Main, Parker-Katz, Sheridan, Zinsser, Content/Coaching Committee; Curby, Zinsser, & Research Committee |

| GOAL 2: TRAINING. Expand a sustainable model of the UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program to address the substantial early childhood teacher shortage. | Timeline | Responsibility (Key Personnel and Committee/s) |
| Objective 3: Recruit 100 EC educators to address the significant workforce shortages (especially bilingual teachers and teachers of color)  
Activities: Recruit residents from targeted communities & ECE systems partners | F ‘19 (cohort 2)  
F ‘20 (cohort 3)  
F ‘21 (cohort 4) | Main, Aigner & Leadership Committee, Main & Program Committee |
|---|---|---|
| Objective 4: Train residents in high-quality practices skills (especially around SEL, working with Diverse learners, and STEM)  
Activities: Coursework (EPSY 520 & 523); Weekly Classroom Observations by Coach; Weekly PLC Meetings w/ Coach (EPSY 522); Collect pre-post semester content-focused (SEL, Diverse learners, STEM) video for coding & coach review; Collect pre-post semester classroom video for classroom quality measurement | F ‘19- F ‘20 (cohort 1)  
F ‘20- F ‘21 (cohort 2)  
F ‘21- F ‘22 (cohort 3)  
F ‘22- F ‘23 (cohort 4) | Parker-Katz, Sheridan, Zinsser, Content/Coaching Committee; Curby, Zinsser, & Research Committee |
| Objective 5: Train residents to use data about teaching practice to continuously improve instruction  
Activities: Explicit training in EPSY 523 self-assessment and observational assessments; collection of classroom video for reflection and edTPA testing; Four cycles of data driven reflection and improvement in EPSY 522 | F ‘19 (cohort 1)  
F ‘20 (cohort 2)  
F ‘21 (cohort 3)  
F ‘22 (cohort 4) | Curby, Zinsser, & Research Committee |
| GOAL 3: Positively impact the individuals participating sites (CBOs & CPS ECE classrooms), and systems (CPS, City of Chicago) involved in this residency program. | Timeline | Responsibility (Key Personnel and Committee/s) |
| Objective 6: Increase teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, compensation & leadership positions  
Activities: Coursework on effective instructional practices; Coaching feedback and guidance to improve confidence and competence in the classroom; Supportive PLC environment | Sp ‘19- F ‘20 (cohort 1)  
Sp ‘20-F ‘21 (cohort 2)  
Sp ‘21-F ‘22 (cohort 3)  
Sp ‘22-F ‘23 (cohort 4) | Main, Parker, Sheridan, Zinsser, Content/Coaching Committee; Curby, Zinsser & Research Committee |
| Objective 7: Increase residents' quality of instruction  
Activities: Coursework on effective instructional practices; Coaching feedback & guidance to improve practice | Sp ‘19- F ‘20 (cohort 1)  
Sp ‘20-F ‘21 (cohort 2)  
Sp ‘21-F ‘22 (cohort 3)  
Sp ‘22-F ‘23 (cohort 4) | Parker, Sheridan, Zinsser & Content/Coaching Committee |
| Objective 8: Increase children's STEM, SEL, and ELL Learning Activities: Coursework and coaching to improve content knowledge and instructional skill in each outcome area; Data-informed feedback and reflection to guide targeted classroom practices; Guided reflection Classroom-level TS Gold data interpretation and planning | Sp ‘19- F ‘20 (cohort 1)  
Sp ‘20-F ‘21 (cohort 2)  
Sp ‘21-F ‘22 (cohort 3)  
Sp ‘22-F ‘23 (cohort 4) | Parker, Sheridan, Zinsser & Content and Coaching Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 4: Create mechanisms to sustain positive program-level impacts following program completion including structures and routines for data-informed continuous professional development.</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility (Key Personnel and Committee/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective 9:** Train residents in implementation of data informed data informed continuing professional learning
Activities: During 4th semester of PLC, focus will be on establishing all necessary supports and plans to continue PLC after program completion. | F ’20 (Cohort 1) F ’21 (Cohort 2) F ’22 (Cohort 3) F ’23 (Cohort 4) | Parker, Sheridan, Content/Coaching Committee, Curby, Zinsser, Research Committee |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 5: Demonstrate CECPP Partnership effects on the program residents, participating sites and the Chicago area ECE workforce pipeline.</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsibility (Key Personnel and Committee/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective 11:** Increase number of licensed highly rated early childhood educators who can serve high-need Chicago communities
Activities: Administer annual resident & CPS affiliated programs administrator follow-up surveys to collect retention & promotion rates; Collect & analyze data from CPS & CBQs about retention & turnover of non-resident residents; Collect & analyze ExcelRate (QRIS) data; Collect & analyze Chicago REACH teacher evaluations; Collect pass rates on state content knowledge tests & edTPA scores for ECE teachers in Illinois | Every summer (exact data collected will vary based on cohort) | Main, Aigner-Treworgy and Leadership committee; Operations committee; Parker, Sheridan, Zinsser, and Research Committee |

| **Objective 12:** Train teachers who maintain employment in high-need ECE programs
Activities: Administer annual resident and CPS affiliated programs administrator follow-up surveys to collect current work location; Collect and analyze ExcelRate (QRIS) data | Every Fall (exact data collected will vary based on cohort) | Main, Aigner & Leadership comm; Operations comm; Curby, Zinsser, & Research Committee |

| **Objective 13:** Monitor Program Costs
Activities: Collect and compute cost per program completer | End of program | Teasdale & Research committee |
Quality of Key Personnel

**Catherine (Cathy) Main**, M.Ed, Principal Investigator. Catherine Main is a senior lecturer and program coordinator in the College of Education at UIC and a visiting scholar with the Institute of Government and Public Affairs (IGPA) at the University of Illinois. She has more than 25 years of work on behalf of young children and their families. Her work at the UIC College of Education has included innovative and responsive program development and coordination in Early Childhood Education. Main designed and developed a Blended Early Childhood/Early Childhood Special Education program and Early Childhood Alternative (residency) programs. She was the principal investigator (PI) on the McCormick Foundation on an Early Childhood Workforce grant where she co-led the Illinois workforce team on the Innovation to Incubation (i2I) project with the National Academy Medicine (NAM).

**Michelle Parker-Katz**, PhD, (co-Principal Investigator) Dr. Parker-Katz is Clinical Professor in the Department of Special Education at UIC where she also coordinates the master’s programs and clinical fieldwork. Previously for 11 years, she coordinated the elementary education programs. She led UIC faculty team who worked with CPS to develop and implement a CPS new teacher and mentoring program used across the district. She has been co-PI on several grants funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, Office of Special Education Programs, and National Science Foundation. She has published widely in both general and teacher education journal especially about mentoring, new teacher support and literacy teaching as a way to empower K - 12 students. She teaches masters and doctoral level courses, and directly supervises field internships and student teaching in CPS. She provides professional support to several non-profit community groups and is active in state and national organizations.
Kathleen Sheridan, PhD (co-Principal Investigator) Dr. Sheridan is a developmental psychologist and an associate professor in the Educational Psychology Department at UIC. Dr. Sheridan’s work has been funded by the CME Group Foundation and the Caplan Foundation for Early Childhood. She has a dynamic relationship with other members of the management team. She and Co-PI main have been collaborating together for over 15 years and have successfully written grants and presented at national, state and local conferences. Additionally, Dr Sheridan, Dr Zinsser and Main served as visiting scholars together through the Institute for Government and Public Affairs at UIC. Main has also worked closely with Sheridan on numerous grants and projects serving as co-PI on a number of early math grants with Sheridan.

Katherine (Kate) Zinsser, PhD, (co-Principal Investigator) Dr. Zinsser is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at UIC. Dr. Zinsser’s work has been funded by the Institute for Educational Sciences, the Spencer foundation, and the APA among others and she has productive relationships with other members of the management team. She and Co-PI Curby have been collaborating for over a decade, co-authored over 30 papers and presentations and currently co-directs the IES-funded EMOTERS project. Dr. Zinsser and Main served as visiting scholars together on a multi-year classroom observation and quality evaluation project and have since co-authored a paper (Zinsser, Main & Torres, 2018) on alternative training programs to diversify the ECE workforce. Main has also served as a key stakeholder on Zinsser’s investigations of preschool expulsion in Illinois.

Timothy W. Curby, PhD, (co-Principal Investigator). Dr. Curby is an Associate Professor and Director of Applied Developmental Psychology at George Mason University. Curby is an expert in both classroom social processes and quantitative methods. He has published extensively with over 60 research articles and several book chapters and currently co-
directs the IES-funded EMOTERS project. Dr. Curby has a long-standing working relationship with the team at UIC and has demonstrated the capacity to work together.

**Samantha (Sam) Aigner-Treworgy**, M.S.W and M.P.P. (co-Principal Investigator). Samantha Aigner-Treworgy is the Chief of Early Learning in the City of Chicago, and currently acting as Director of Office of Early Childhood in CPS. She is responsible for implementing the Mayor’s priorities to improve early childhood systems and programs (including CPS programs), reduce barriers for families to access high-quality programming and continue to expand access to programs that can transform children’s lives.

**Rebecca M. Teasdale**, PhD. (Evaluation Consultant). Rebecca Teasdale is a senior evaluation and research associate at Garibay Group, and an independent evaluation consultant. She will complete her PhD in educational psychology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in May 2019. Her methodological research focuses on evaluation methodology, particularly the valuing process and selection and integration of evaluative criteria, and her substantive research focuses on learning in adulthood in workplace and everyday contexts. She has evaluated projects funded by the National Science Foundation (including the INCLUDES, AISL, EAGER, and IUSE programs), the National Institutes for Health (T35 program), and Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

**CHICAGO EARLY CHILDHOOD PREPARATION AND PATHWAY (CECPP): EVALUATION PLAN**

The proposed project will include thorough formative and summative evaluations focused on the effectiveness of the residency program in developing and licensing teachers to provide high quality early childhood education in high needs communities. The evaluation will employ a
rigorous approach that will both support the residency program and yield robust quantitative data about program accomplishments and impacts. As described below, the evaluation plan calls for collecting quantitative data for required measures on residents’ demographics, achievement, persistence, licensure, and employment. In addition, observational data collected by coaches will be used to help coaches support residents directly and in professional learning communities. Separate observations will be conducted to evaluate program effectiveness.

We will utilize several sources of data that will allow us to evaluate all of the questions outlined in TABLE 2. Data collected by the evaluation team will include admissions and enrollment records from prospective and active residents, self- and coach- completed assessments and surveys, video-based and live observation of classroom quality, instructional practice, and emotion teaching separately coded by coaches and evaluators, fidelity observations and ratings of PLCs, trainings, and site administrator meetings, course grades and coach evaluations. Nearly all of this data will be collected every semester allowing for a rich understanding of resident growth. We will also take advantage of data already collected by the CPS and CBOs such as the Teaching Strategies Gold assessment (to evaluate children’s learning), the Chicago REACH evaluations (to evaluate resident performance), and the ExceleRate QRIS data (to evaluate center-level effects by having participating residents). As required by ISBE, we will also assess resident teaching performance using a standardized measure scored externally (edTPA). Following the completion of the residency, alumni and site administrators will complete annual follow-up surveys through the end of the grant period (i.e., 1-4 years in total) that will assess persistence, retention, employment, and sustainability.

Formative evaluation findings will be disseminated to the research team over the course of the project to support adaptive learning and program improvement (Arkesteijn, van Mierlo &
Leeuwis, 2015), leveraging the sequential cohort design as an opportunity to strengthen program activities over time. Summative evaluation findings will be disseminated to the broader group of EC stakeholders seeking to identify models for continuous development of the early childhood workforce. As a result, evaluation findings will strengthen the current project as it unfolds and also inform future efforts focused on early childhood teacher preparation and policy.

The evaluation plan—and the following narrative—is structured to align with project goals and address the Performance Measures outlined in the Grants Performance Results Act (GPRA) as well as the evaluation requirements in section 204(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) that are relevant to this project. All of the goals and objectives outlined below are delineated in Table 2 with corresponding GPRA Performance measures and HEA Requirements labeled. For readability, we have not identified each performance measure and requirement in this text.

**Table 2: Goals, Objectives aligned with Evaluation Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL 1: Enhance the UIC ECE Alternative Licensure (residency) program and coaching model</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Train coaches in the coaching framework with content area foci.</strong></td>
<td>Develop coaching protocol for reflective supervision practices (observation, reflection, planning, action); Train coaches in collecting and using video and self-report data for reflective supervision; Train coaches in using TS Gold classroom-level data for reflective supervisions; Train Coaches in evidence-based teaching strategies (SEL, STEM, Diverse learners); Train Coaches in the CLASS &amp; EMOTERS tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>How many and which trainings do coaches attend? (Video collection training, Data informed reflection training, etc.). How many weekly coach supervision meetings do coaches attend? To what extent do coaches adhere to the framework? (assessed through observed/video recorded coaching sessions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: Establish &amp; maintain a supportive</strong></td>
<td>Conduct bi-weekly PLC meetings w/ coaches &amp; facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do PLCs meet weekly w/ high attendance by residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Objective 3: Recruit 100 early childhood educators to address significant workforce shortages (especially bilingual & teachers of color)** | Recruit residents from targeted communities and through ECE systems partners;  
  - Focus on CPS affiliated programs residents serving working families year round;  
  - Focus on programs serving African-American & Latino families | Demographic and language information on residents.  
Are licensure rates different based on teacher characteristics (e.g., language) and program characteristics (e.g., population served)? |
| **Objective 4: Train residents in high-quality practices skills (especially around SEL, working with Diverse learners, and STEM)** | Coursework (EPSY 520 & EPSY 523);  
Residency Activities: weekly classroom observations by coach;  
Weekly PLC meetings with coach (EPSY 522)  
Collect pre-post semester content-focused (SEL, Diverse learners, STEM) classroom video for coding and coach review;  
Collect pre-post semester classroom video collection for classroom quality measurement | Do residents successfully pass courses?  
Do residents meet competency goals as observed weekly by coach?  
Do residents improve pre-post on content-focused instruction?  
Do residents demonstrate high attendance, participation, self-reflection ratings in PLCs? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Objective 5: Train residents to use data about teaching practice to continuously improve instruction** | Explicit training in EPSY 523 self-assessment & observational assessments, collection of classroom video for reflection and edTPA testing.  
Four cycles of data driven reflection and improvement in EPSY 522 | Are residents successful in collecting video from their own classrooms and sharing it with coaches  
Do they complete self-assessments of skills and competencies (minimum of 4)?  
Do residents successfully utilize the Reflection Protocol (TBD) (HEA Requirement 10) |
| **GOAL 3: Positively impact the individuals and systems involved in this residency program** |  |  |
| **Objective 6: Increase teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, compensation & leadership positions** | Coursework on effective instructional practices;  
Coaching feedback and guidance to improve confidence and competence in the classroom;  
Supportive PLC environment | Do residents report gains in confidence, self-efficacy in the classroom & job satisfaction over successive semester self-assessments?  
Do residents report higher salaries & more leadership roles in CBOs following licensure? |
| **Objective 7: Increase residents' quality of instruction** | Coursework on effective instructional practices  
Coaching feedback and guidance to improve instructional practice | Do teachers' instructional quality ratings improve both with observed measures (CLASS & EMOTERS) and coach-completed evaluations? |
| **Objective 8: Increase children's STEM, SEL, and ELL Learning** | Coursework & coaching to improve content knowledge & instructional skill;  
Data-informed feedback and reflection to guide targeted classroom practices;  
Guided reflection Classroom-level TS Gold data interpretation and planning | Do scores on TS Gold increase over 3 time points each school year (GPRA Perf Measure 6) with respect to SEL, STEM, and ELL?  
Are there positive changes in teacher-reported classroom behaviors with respect to SEL & language? |
### GOAL 4: Create mechanisms to sustain positive program-level impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 9: Train residents in implementation of data informed data informed continuing professional learning</td>
<td>During 4th semester of PLC, focus will be on establishing all necessary supports and plans to continue PLC after program completion. (e.g., giving supportive feedback to one-another, identifying new targets for PLC activities (e.g., parent-teacher relationships), selection of a measure by which to judge success of new PLC activities)</td>
<td>To what extent do residents feel confident to sustain the PLC after the program's conclusion? In alumni surveys, to what extent do former residents' report sustained PLC practice &amp; engagement and what barriers/challenges have they faced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 10: Train residents' supervisors/administrators in the structures and routines necessary to sustain data informed continual professional learning</td>
<td>Ensure evidence-based structures and resources are available Through bi-monthly and bi-annual meetings with administrators, provide guidance to supervisors about how to implement and sustain plan that facilitates the PLC meetings</td>
<td>To what extent to administrators implement supports as recommended in trainings (e.g., time/space for PLC meetings)? To what extent do residents (and alumni) report barriers/challenges to successfully sustaining their PLC over subsequent years?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 5: Demonstrate program-level effects on the Chicago area ECE workforce pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 11: Increase number of licensed highly rated early childhood educators who can serve high-need Chicago communities</td>
<td>Administer annual resident and CPS affiliated programs administrator follow-up surveys to collect retention &amp; promotion rates Collect and analyze data from CPS and CBOS about retention &amp; turnover of non-resident residents Collect and analyze ExceleRate (QRIS) data Collect and analyze Chicago REACH teacher evaluations Collect pass rates on state content knowledge tests and edTPA scores for ECE teachers in Illinois</td>
<td>What proportion of admitted residents earn the Professional Educator License with stipulation? What proportion of residents earn final certification &amp; licensure (PEL with ECE endorsement as assessed by the edTPA)? What proportion of residents with proficient and/or distinguished STEM Residency Evaluation following STEM PLC? What proportion of residents persist from the first to second year of the residency?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Objective 11: Increase number of licensed highly rated early childhood educators who can serve high-need Chicago communities (cont.) | What proportion of program participants receive satisfactory annual evaluations by administrators/supervisors?  
What proportion of licensed participants are members of underrepresented groups?  
How do UIC residents compare to newly licensed ECE teachers on content knowledge and edTPA scores statewide? |
| Objective 12: Train teachers who maintain employment in high-need ECE programs | Administer annual resident and CPS affiliated programs administrator follow-up surveys to collect current work location, Collect and analyze ExceleRate (QRS) data | What proportion of participants are hired by & continue with CPS or CPS affiliate programs?  
One year following program completion, what proportion of participants are retained in their current positions and what proportion are hired into more desirable positions/promoted?  
Three years following program completion, what proportion of participants are retained in their current positions & what proportion are hired into more desirable positions/promoted?  
To what extent are program participants hired by high-need local educational agencies to teach high-need subjects, in high-need areas, and in high-need schools and geographies?  
To what extent do participating CBOs show increased quality during & following program participation? |
| Objective 13: Monitor Program Costs | Collect and compute cost per program completer | What is the Federal cost per resident who completes the program? |
GOAL 1: Enhance the UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program and mentoring model.

Objective 1: Train coaches in the coaching framework with content area foci. Coaches will need to be trained in aspects of the coaching model (e.g., specific content areas of SEL, STEM, inclusion of diverse learners and data-informed reflective supervision) being implemented in the residency program. Thus, the extent to which the coaches are trained to implement the coaching is a key, proximal evaluative piece. We will therefore explore the extent to which coaches were trained by the project staff and how well they adhered to the coaching framework in their meetings with residents. This adherence will be coded through observations of coaching session. Residents will also provide feedback to their coaches every semester about their perceptions of the coaching.

Objective 2: Establish & maintain a supportive PLC with program residents. The professional learning community is a critical context in which the residents will get specific content, hear feedback from coaches, group problem-solve, and form community. The extent to which PLCs are established and maintained will be evaluated through the monitoring of PLC attendance by residents, resident-report of PLC climate, and resident-report of high-quality reflective supervision by the coaches. Furthermore, coaches will be rated on the extent to which they engaged PLCs in the specific content areas and the extent to which data coaches incorporated into the PLC discussions.

GOAL 2: Expand a sustainable model of the UIC Alternative Early Childhood Education Licensure (residency) program

Objective 3: Train 100 early childhood educators to address the significant workforce shortages outlined by the community (especially bilingual teachers and teachers of color).
Through a 5-cohort design, we anticipate being able to prepare, license and evaluate nearly 100 lead early childhood educators. Our partner includes the City of Chicago, CPS and Chicago community-based organizations (CBOs) which all face a shortage of people who can fill this role, particularly as the city seeks to expand towards universal pre-k for all four years-olds. The extent to which the project is successful will be evaluated by examining the demographic and language information of the residents. Furthermore, we will explore whether licensure rates differ based on resident characteristics (e.g., language) and program characteristics (e.g., population served, type of setting) to determine whether the program is more or less effective with different residents.

Objective 4: Train teachers in high-quality practices skills (especially around SEL, working with Diverse learners, and STEM). The entire program is meant to prepare teachers so that they can offer high quality teaching. That begins with the preparation they receive. To evaluate the extent to which residents are being prepared to offer high quality instruction, residents will need to demonstration engagement in the PLCs as proximal goals. Furthermore, residents will be expected to meet competency goals as identified and observed (weekly) by the coach.

Objective 5: Train teachers to use data about teaching practice to continuously improve instruction. Residents will be trained in the methods to capture high-quality classroom video suitable for reflection and the edTPA. The system involves using a phone/tablet on a robotic base that pivots to follow the resident in the classroom who is wearing a microphone. The research team has extensive experience using this system. To evaluate whether the residents have been successfully trained, classroom videos can be monitored to see if they are set up appropriately with video that successfully uploads. Furthermore, residents will be asked about their skills and competencies. Finally, resident training includes training in how to create, engage with, and
reflect on data from their classrooms. We will also determine whether residents are successful in their use of the reflection protocol.

**GOAL 3: Positively impact the individuals and systems involved in this residency program**

*Objective 6: Increase teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, compensation & leadership positions.* Given the significant ECE workforce wide issues related to teacher turnover and low pay, it is critical that we assess the extent to which the program promotes resident’s confidence in the classroom, sense of self-efficacy in foci instructional topics, and overall job satisfaction. Further, outcomes pertaining to increases in wages, promotion and prestige, and the engagement in more leadership activities after licensure are also important to assess. We will do so through successive residents self-report surveys as well as longitudinal follow-up data collection from program alumni and site administrators. Additionally, coaches will provide formative and summative feedback regarding resident’s teaching performance.

*Objective 7: Increase residents' quality of instruction.* We expect that residents who successfully engage with program elements (e.g., course of study, intensive mentoring, reflection), will ultimately be able to demonstrate better teaching. This outcome will be evaluated through the increases in observed measures of instructional quality (CLASS and ECERS) as well as through coach-completed evaluations and site-administer teacher performance evaluations (e.g. Chicago REACH).

*Objective 8: Increase children's STEM, SEL, and ELL Learning.* Trained teachers who demonstrate better instructional quality are expected to have students who learn more. We will evaluate student learning by examining reported scores on the Teaching Strategies Gold assessments from three time points over the year, assessing areas in SEL, STEM, and for English Language Learners.
GOAL 4: Create mechanisms to sustain positive program-level impacts following program completion

Objective 9: Train residents in implementation of PLCs. To ensure the sustainability of the skills and reflective capacity of residents, the final semester of the residency will focus on training residents to manage their own PLC going forward. The success of this training will be assessed in the short-term via resident self-report surveys of confidence in their own and their collective PLCs capacity to sustain their group. We will assess longer-term success through annual alumni surveys which will inquire about the frequency and quality of their PLC meetings and what barriers or challenges they faced in maintaining their PLC group.

Objective 10: Train residents' site administrators in the support of PLCs. Given the critical role administrators play in supporting and making space/time for PLC meetings, the success of Goal 4 is highly dependent on the program’s ability to assist administrators anticipate and provide that support. This training will be provided through regular meetings with site administrator and we will assess the effectiveness of this training both by observing these regular administrator meetings and by surveying both administrators and residents. In particular, residents survey items pertaining to PLC engagement and experiences of challenges and barriers be analyzed to determine whether administrators successfully implement the coached supports.

GOAL 5: Demonstrate CECPP partnership effects on the program residents, participating sites and the Chicago area ECE workforce pipeline.

Objective 11: Increase number of licensed highly rated early childhood educators who can serve high-need Chicago communities. The grant program requires a number of performance measures that are focused on structural aspects of the residency program. To evaluate program effects, we will calculate the proportion of admitted participations who are awarded the Professional Educator License (PEL) with stipulations and can therefore enter the residency and of those, what
proportion go on to be awarded the PEL with an ECE endorsement (GPRA Performance Measure 1). Furthermore, we will get information from the edTPA on 15 different dimensions on teacher planning, instructional strategies, and assessment and across the four domain of teaching from the Chicago REACH.

In line with GPRA Performance Measure 2, but at the early childhood level, we will evaluate residents STEM proficiency via the UIC Residency Evaluation score and instructional quality ratings on the CLASS during observed STEM lessons in Semester 3 (in which the PLCs focus on STEM teaching). Retention will be assessed by examining the percentage of residents who remain enrolled for one year.

To address HEA requirement 1, we will evaluate achievement at multiple time points throughout the residency program. Prospective resident achievement will be assessed by grades in the course of study and scores on the ECE content tests and test of Basic skills required prior to beginning the residency. Achievement during the residency will be assessed via a combination of grades (PLC course, EPSY 522), coaching evaluations and satisfactory ratings by site administrators on the Chicago REACH measure of individual teacher effectiveness. Follow-up survey of site administrators will provide additional information about residents continued achievement following program completion. To assess program-level effects of residents training and continued employment, we will assess the extent to which participating CPS classrooms and CBOs show increased quality (as measured by the state’s publicly available Quality Rating Improvement System data, ExceleRate) during or following program participation. Finally, CECPP residents’ successful passing of content knowledge and edTPA tests will be compared to other newly licensed ECE teachers using publicly available data. Admissions and teacher survey data will be used to determine what proportion of licensed participants are members of underrepresented groups (including but not limited to race, ethnicity, and language proficiency).
Objective 12: Train teachers who maintain employment in high-need ECE programs. In light of the substantial needs outlined above, the UIC Early Childhood Alternative Licensure Program is designed to train teachers who can serve the highest need children and families across the city of Chicago. To assess the program’s success in achieving this goal, several required performance measures will be reported on. Priority recruitment and selection into the UIC Early Childhood Alternative Licensure Program are those candidates already employed by CBOs in high-need communities and thus we will evaluate the extent to which they continue in their current positions, leave the field of teaching, or transition to a position at a different school serving a similar or less-needy population. Relatedly, we will also assess the extent to which teachers who change positions move into more desirable positions (e.g., higher pay or promotion). Data to inform each of these investigations will be drawn from resident and CBO surveys during and following program completion.

Objective 13: Monitor Program Costs. The Federal cost per resident who completes the program (GPRA Efficiency Measure) will also be calculated at the end of the grant period.
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## Optional TQP Application and General Program Requirements Checklist

### Appendix B

To be considered for funding, applicants must address the following general program application and program requirements that the HEA requires. Except as specifically noted in this section, the general application requirements are from section 202(b) of the HEA (20 U.S.C. 1022a(b)). To ensure every program requirement is met and an authorized activity listed below, the Department strongly encourages the applicant, to indicate the page number(s) where the specific component is located in the program narrative on the left side of the page.

### Each eligible partnership desiring a grant under this program must submit an application that contains—

| (a) | A needs assessment of the partners in the eligible partnership with respect to the preparation, ongoing training, professional development, and retention of general education and special education teachers, principals, and, as applicable, early childhood educators. (Place the needs assessment in Appendix C) |
| (b) | A description of the extent to which the program to be carried out with grant funds, as described in the Absolute Priority, in this notice, will prepare prospective and new teachers with strong teaching skills |
| (c) | A description of how such program will prepare prospective and new teachers to understand and use research and data to modify and improve classroom instruction |
| (d) | A description of—
| (1) | How the eligible partnership will coordinate strategies and activities assisted under the grant with other teacher preparation or professional development programs, including programs funded under the ESEA and IDEA and through the National Science Foundation; and |
| (2) | How the activities of the partnership will be consistent with State, local, and other education reform activities that promote teacher quality and student academic achievement |
| (e) | An assessment that describes the resources available to the eligible partnership, including—
| (1) | The integration of funds from other related sources; |
| (2) | The intended use of the grant funds; and |
| (3) | The commitment of the resources of the partnership to the activities assisted under this program, including financial support, faculty participation, and time commitments, and to the continuation of the activities when the grant ends. |
| (f) | A description of—
| (1) | How the eligible partnership will meet the purposes of the TQP Grant Program as specified in section 201 of the HEA; |
(2) How the partnership will carry out the activities required under Absolute Priority, as described in this notice, based on the needs identified in paragraph (a), with the goal of improving student academic achievement;

(4) The partnership’s evaluation plan, it’s plan for including the objective and measures identified in under section 204(a) of the HEA;

(5) How the partnership will align the teacher preparation program with the—

(i) State early learning standards for Early Childhood Education (ECE) programs, as appropriate, and with the relevant domains of early childhood development; and

(ii) Student academic achievement standards and academic content standards under section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA, established by the State in which the partnership is located;

(6) How the partnership will prepare general education teachers to teach students with disabilities, including training related to participation as a member of individualized education program teams, as defined in section 614(d)(1)(B) of the IDEA;

(7) How the partnership will prepare general education and special education teachers to teach students who are limited English proficient;

(8) How faculty at the partner institution will work during the term of the grant, with teachers who meet applicable State certification and licensure requirements, including any requirements for certification obtained through alternative routes to certification, or, with regard to special education teachers the qualifications describes in section 612(a)(14)(C) of the IDEA, in the classrooms of high-need schools served by the high-need LEA in the partnership to—

(i) Provide high-quality professional development activities to strengthen the content knowledge and teaching skills of elementary school and secondary school teachers; and

(ii) Train other classroom teachers to implement literacy programs that incorporate the essential components of reading instruction;

(9) How the partnership will design, implement, or enhance a year-long and rigorous teaching preservice clinical program component;

(10) How the partnership will support in-service professional development strategies and activities; and

(11) How the partnership will collect, analyze, and use data on the retention of all teachers and early childhood educators in schools and ECE programs located in the geographic area served by the partnership to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership’s teacher and educator support system.
(g) With respect to the induction program required as part of the activities carried out under the Absolute Priority—

1. A demonstration that the schools and departments within the IHE that are part of the induction program will effectively prepare teachers, including providing content expertise and expertise in teaching, as appropriate;

2. A demonstration of the eligible partnership’s capability and commitment to, and the accessibility to and involvement of faculty in, the use of empirically-based practice and scientifically valid research on teaching and learning;

3. A description of how the teacher preparation program will design and implement an induction program to support, though not less than the first two years of teaching, all new teachers who are prepared by the teacher preparation program in the partnership and who teach in the high-need LEA in the partnership, and, to the extent practicable, all new teachers who teach in such high-need LEA, in the further development of the new teachers’ teaching skills, including the use of mentors who are trained and compensated by such program for the mentors’ work with new teachers; and

4. A description of how faculty involved in the induction program will be able to substantially participate in an ECE program or elementary school or secondary school classroom setting, as applicable, including release time and receiving workload credit for such participation.
Appendix C: REQUIRED TQP General Application Requirements Needs Assessment
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The partner needs related to growing and supporting both the early childhood workforce and early childhood teacher preparation programs are vast. The challenges facing the City of Chicago, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and Governor’s Office of Early Childhood Development (GOECD) include an acute teacher shortage, a lack of teacher diversity in lead teacher and administrative roles, and a high degree of teacher turnover. Early childhood workforce preparation programs face challenges related to a lack of viable, educator pathways to support growth and change in the profession and a lack of specialized training especially in critical areas of SEL, STEM, inclusion of diverse learners and the use of data to support student learning. The CECPP is designed specifically to meet these challenges.

**Teacher Shortage.** The EC teacher shortage is acute at the national, state and local levels. The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) forecasts that between 2012 and 2022, the percentage of estimated job openings resulting from workers leaving the early learning sector are 29 percent for child care workers and 28 percent for preschool teachers. The Occupational Outlook Handbook (US Department of Labor, 2014) projects percentage increases in employment demand during this 10-year period at 14 percent for child care workers (resulting in 184,100 new jobs) and 17 percent for preschool teachers (resulting in 76,400 new jobs). Whitebrook (2014) estimates that proposed expansions of public preschool programs will generate need for approximately 100,000 preschool teachers with BAs within the next decade. In Illinois, the need is in crisis mode. As the state-funded EC preschool program entitled *Preschool for All* expanded in the last five years to offer full day options and additional classrooms in the most under-resourced communities, the number of teachers earning Illinois state teacher licenses
with endorsement in EC Education dramatically decreased. by fifty-six percent, moving from 1365 new licensure entitlements in 2007 to 599 entitlements in 2017 (Illinois State Board of Education, 2017). Fewer teachers are available to fill positions across the state. Moreover, the need could not be any greater than present for the city of Chicago. The workforce pool necessary to serve these children is simply not there.

A Lack of Teacher Diversity. A highly qualified early childhood workforce is critical to the healthy development and education of young children. Such a workforce is defined as not only having knowledge and skills related to child development and early learning, but also linguistic and cultural competencies that meet the needs of an increasingly diverse population (Rhodes & Huston, 2012). Researchers have also identified that highly qualified teachers should have cultural and linguistic competencies that align with increasingly diverse populations in which they teach (Harry and Klinger, 2014; Howe). Teachers of and from the communities they serve bring critical first-hand knowledge and as such are better able to draw on community resources, are more likely to serve as role models for parents, and are better equipped to develop home-school connections - all of which have been shown to have positive impact on academic growth (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2005, Rodriguez-Brown, 2009). Teachers’ similarities in background, language, and other forms of cultural expression not only support children’s social and emotional development but can also have positive effects on children’s experiences in school. These teachers are often better able to recognize and build on the strengths of their young charges, rather than mistaking differences for deficits. This enables them to more accurately assess—rather than pathologize—children’s development (Dee, 2004).

In a state like Illinois, where 34% of young children are dual language learners, recruiting and retaining such a workforce is increasingly necessary and challenging (Park,
O’Toole & Katsiaficas, 2017). Yet almost 90 percent of licensed teachers are white monolinguals (ISBE, 2017). This presents a mismatch with the student population. Responding to this concern, in 2014-15, IL mandated that preschool English Learners (ELs) be served in specifically designed bilingual, English as Second Language (ESL), and dual language EC programs and taught by licensed bilingual teachers. This includes preschool programs that are subcontracted by districts to Community Based Organizations (CBOs). Moreover, the need is amplified in Chicago, that is home to over 200,000 children under the age of five. The majority of children entering CPS kindergarten each year are Hispanic/Latino (45%) and non-Hispanic Black (36%) and many speak languages other than English at home (Lopez, Grindal, Zanoni & George, 2017).

A rich pool of culturally and linguistically diverse teachers is already part of the early childhood workforce. Data from the Illinois Gateways Registry (which includes information on Illinois early childhood workforce in licensed child care settings), showed that in 2018 of the 7,714 early childhood teaching staff in the “City of Chicago” in 2018 was 43% African-American, 30% Latino/Hispanic, 19% White and 9% Asian. Over time, the teaching staff in Chicago licensed child care centers is becoming more diverse and is much more diverse than other parts of the state (Whitehead, 2018). However, that diversity is underrepresented in lead teacher roles and amongst state licensed teachers and overrepresented in support roles (e.g. teacher’s aides and assistants) (Ray, Bowman, & Bobbins, 2006; Whitehead, 2018). Concurrently, as qualifications for preschool teachers have increased, there has been a whitening of the workforce (Bassok, 2013). Notably, however, the UIC residency program has 41 teacher licensure candidates in the pipeline to begin residency in Fall 2019. Thirty-nine of the 41 (95%) are women of color.
**High Teacher Turnover.** Consistency and continuity in the teaching workforce are hallmarks of high-quality education programs (Guarino, Sanitbanex, & Daley, 2006; Institute of Medicine & National Research Council, 2015), and especially vital to reform in urban school contexts (Freedman & Appleman, 2009; Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 2006). Young children cannot benefit from their teachers' strong academic and pedagogical preparation if those teachers do not remain in the classroom. PI Cathy Main’s recent Illinois survey of hiring managers in community- and school-based ECE settings revealed that turnover rates of EC staff averaged 37% annually (Main, Yarbrough & Patton, 2018). Not surprisingly, low compensation and lack of benefits were most frequently cited as barriers to retention. The Illinois survey and other similar state surveys (e.g. Colorado) also revealed information regarding the impact of such high turnover. For example, administrators who must spend time in the classroom due to teacher turnover often neglect other crucial duties. They also cannot provide the supports needed for teacher learning and effectiveness. In turn, teachers working without leadership and administrative support often suffer from burnout (Whitebrook and Sakai, 2003). That affects both the emotional and academic support they can provide to their students. Prior work conducted by Co-PI Timothy Curby has shown that children with lower levels of emotional and educational support are more likely to exhibit challenging behaviors (e.g., Curby, Brock, & Hamre, 2013). These factors also create working conditions that lead to more turnover.

**Lack of Pathways.** Adding to the issues of teacher turnover, diversification and the overall shortages of EC licensed teachers is the fragmented systems of preparation and professional development for the EC workforce (Institute of Medicine & National Research Council, 2015). Gaining a state license requires climbing huge hurdles that include
ways to pay tuition while working for very low wages (Whitebook, Phillips, & Howes, 2014). Often, coursework is offered during the day while the EC workforce is serving children. And, even when offered in the evenings, classes come after a work day that is often 8 - 10 hours long. High levels of stress ensue. These challenges necessitate not only intensive and nuanced guidance, but also clear and coherent pathways for increased educational attainment and to earn necessary credentials, state teacher licensure and endorsements (Bernetoit and Holt, 2017).

In Illinois, the need to find viable alternatives for teachers with ECE credentials to gain state licensure is acute. While over 3500 teachers with credentials work in licensed child care centers, they have limited pathways enabling them to earn full state licensure, thereby restricting their access to increased pay and leading to higher turnover. In response to the critical teacher shortage, Illinois recently passed legislation that took effect at the start of the 2018-2019 school year and lasts until 2023- 2024. The legislation allows an individual to teach preschool children in a “preschool for all” programs if s/he has a BA degree and holds an ECE credential awarded by the Illinois Department and Human Services (IDHS). However, that person must concurrently pursue state licensure and endorsement in EC. The UIC residency program is currently one of very few pathways available for an individual to pursue state teacher licensure while remaining in the EC workforce, serving young children and their families (For a review of other viable programs, including the ACP, and the Illinois context, see Zinsser, Main & Torres, 2018).

_Lack of Specialized Training_. The factors described above – the acute shortage, teacher retention, stratification of diversity, and a lack of viable pathways for growth – give rise to an unstable EC workforce that impacts capacity for personnel development and, therefore, quality
of programs for young children (Institute of Medicine & National Research Council, 2015). Yet research findings strongly indicate that EC teachers with specialized knowledge of EC development can foster children’s cognitive, social, and emotional development, as well as their learning outcomes, more effectively than those without (Copple & Bredekamp, 2009; Whitebrook, 2003). The quality of interactions between EC teachers and children along with the instructional focus of classrooms are amongst the most critical features for improving gains in academic and language growth (Burchinal, et.al 2011; 2011; Zinsser, 2017), and a relationship between children’s social-emotional development in preschool relates to subsequent successful school and life outcomes (Committee on Early Childhood Pedagogy of the National Research Council, 2000).

This research provides the grounds for benchmarks used as guides for quality EC education (e.g., Advanced Specialty Set for ECE/SpEd and Early Intervention, 2017; Division of Early Childhood of the Council for Exceptional Children, National Academy of Medicine report, IDHS IL Gateways credential, IL Early Learning and Development Standards, 2013). Additional documents also reference key legislation and consequential policies for EC (e.g, US Department of Education, 2010; Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004) Part B). Children develop substantially in their emotional competence during early childhood, and emphasis on that through social–emotional curricula has been shown to positively benefit children’s academic achievement (Durlak et al., 2011). However, implementing a curriculum or instruction related to it does not ensure that all teachers can support all children’s social-emotional development adequately. EC is a time to acquire developmental milestones, and teachers are pivotal in supporting that, which might also involve knowing when a pattern of behaviors might indicate the support of special services (Slentz, 2010).
Knowledge of SEL and ways to include children with and without disabilities in same settings is especially necessary now. One indicator is the rates of suspension and expulsion in EC education. Nationally, 17,000 three and four-year olds are suspended or expelled from preschools annually. Nearly **250 children are expelled or suspended from preschool programs every day in the US** and a study conducted by Co-PI Zinsser found that 25% of Chicago preschool teachers in CBOs had requested that at least one child be expelled during the 2015-2016 school year, and 10% has made three or more such requests (Zinsser, et al., 2017). Of additional concern, expelled or suspended students are disproportionately boys and children of color (U.S. Department of Education, 2016) and are more likely to experience multiple disciplinary actions in elementary school, entering the so-called *school-to-prison pipeline* (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2005). Expulsion represents the ultimate failure to both create an inclusive and supportive learning environment and to promote children’s emotional and behavioral competencies to ensure their success in the classroom.

Fortunately, Illinois took recent legislative action (in 2018) to ban expulsion from all licensed EC programs statewide. Co-PI Zinsser’s ongoing evaluation of the implementation of this new law, however, has shown that state-wide, programs struggle to understand and adapt their practices and policies to mitigate the suspension and expulsion rate. In interviews, administrators specifically called out the need for additional training for teachers on how best to proactively support children’s social and emotional development in addition to manage challenging behaviors (Zinsser et al., 2019). Prior additional research by Zinsser and colleagues has shown that to reduce expulsions, teachers will need additional supports and training on understanding their own emotions in the classroom – teacher stress and emotional
burnout being one of the strongest predictors for their requesting a child be removed from care (Zinsser et al., 2017).

Another related indicator of the need for educating teachers related to EC SEL and inclusion is articulated in the 2015 policy statement about inclusion of children with disabilities in EC programs by the US Departments of Health and Human Services and of Education. The statement identifies the scientific evidence for the benefits of inclusion for all children, which also aligns with US law (e.g., IDEA 2004). In accordance with laws and mandates, US programs for Head Start and Early Head Start now require 10% of enrollment opportunities be set aside for children with disabilities. In IL, the Preschool for All program also requires that at least 10% but no more than 30% of enrolled children have a diagnosed disability and those programs are prioritized for funding (ISBE, Early Childhood Block Grant Administrative Rules, n.d.)

While these regulations provide potentially greater access to inclusive education for all children, the teacher quality issue remains. First, the overall lack of specific training to enact effective EC inclusion (e.g., use of evidence-based practices related to inclusion, promoting social-emotional growth, and managing challenging student behaviors) remains an ever-present problem. Broderick, Mehta-Parekh and Reid (2005) argue learning to see disability as a non-stable condition and amenable to change as essential. Therefore, teachers need to see how interactional processes can support responsive teaching for all students, not just those with disabilities. Pre-service and inservice education for teachers is paramount and could support teachers to have experiences with children with disabilities predictive of a positive attitude toward inclusion and to gain confidence to enact inclusive practices that could mediate how they implement inclusion (Park, Dimitrov, & Park, 2018). Secondly, teachers need to be in
environments with support to enact effective inclusion. For example, Leatherrmann and Niemeyer (2005) reported that teachers’ implementation of inclusive practices related to support they received from resource personnel and administrators along with preservice training. With an uneven and uncertain quality of EC inclusion practices, predicting when and where teachers can receive support remains unclear. Given that slightly over half of preschoolers with disabilities still receive education in separate settings lacking peers without disabilities (US Departments of Health and Human Services and of Education Policy Statement, 2015), EC teachers with experience and expertise to work with students with disabilities remain isolated. That structure mitigates sharing teacher expertise and conjointly learning about, implementing and assessing evidence-based practices.

Finally, STEM education must be part of a child’s early education. A growing body of literature highlights the importance of early mathematics and science skills in young children. The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) all emphasize the need to improve the state of early childhood mathematics and science in the United States (NCTM/NAEYC, 2010; NSTA/NAEYC, 2014). Researchers have stressed that this is especially true for children living in poverty as they are performing worse in mathematics than their financially privileged peers (Chatterji, 2006; Chernoff, Flanagan, McPhee, & Park, 2007). Similarly, findings from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study showed that only 40% of children from low-income homes demonstrated mathematics proficiency versus 65% of children from middle-income homes and 87% of children from high-income homes (Chernoff et al., 2007). Moreover, the most recent National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results have indicated, young children in the United States are
still underperforming in science with only 38% of 4th grade students at or above proficient, while 1 in 4 are scoring below a basic level of science achievement (Kena et al., 2015). In fact, Head Start students come to kindergarten showing the lowest scores in science readiness than any other content area (Clements & Sarama 2016). In Illinois, the first statewide results from the Kindergarten Individual Development Survey were released and it was reported that across the state, 3 out of 4 children were not adequately prepared for kindergarten. Clearly, science and math instruction must begin long before students enter the intermediate grades if they are to be prepared with the skills and knowledge required to maintain the level of science and mathematics understanding necessary for the future development of science and math concepts and skills. Early childhood educators bear the responsibility for preparing effective science and math experiences for young children.

The lingering beliefs that young children are too young to understand and engage in science and math remain today in many US early childhood classrooms. Studies have shown that preschool children have a growing ability to think scientifically and apply beginning science process skills (Brenneman, K., Stevenson-Boyd, J., & Frede, E. (2009); Eshach & Fried, 2005). Additionally, exposure to mathematical thinking and activities increases children’s abilities to think conceptually and engage in complex reasoning (Cross, Woods, & Schweingruber, 2009). Despite the recognition of the need to increase children’s exposure to science and math content and process skills, many preschool teachers avoid teaching science and math. Tu (2006) found only half of preschool classrooms had science areas available and almost 87% of classroom activities were not related to science. Early et al. (2010) found that only a tiny part of a child’s day (8%) was spent engaging in math related activities while 21% of the day was devoted to literacy instruction.
Possible explanations for the lack of science and math in early childhood classrooms include teachers’ pre-existing attitudes about science and math teaching, low confidence levels and teachers’ beliefs about their own science and math knowledge and abilities (Pendergast, Lieberman-Betz & Vail, 2017). Additionally, early childhood teacher training programs tend to under-emphasize science and math (Brenneman, 2011), leaving teachers to rely upon their own experiences and limited background knowledge. For example, research indicates that pre-service learning in early math may be lacking (Brenneman et al. 2009; Greenfield, Jirout, Dominguez, Greenberg, Maier, & Fuccillo, (2009) and that sustained, rigorous early math professional development opportunities for early childhood teachers are limited and insufficient. The result of this has been early childhood teachers who lack content knowledge and confidence in their ability to implement early math in classroom (Brenneman et al. 2009; Greenfield et al. 2009) and who are resistant to providing children with high quality, math-rich learning experiences and environments (Hachey, 2013a; Ginsberg, Lee, & Boyd 2008).
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Appendix D: TQP Optional High-Need LEA
**Optional TQP High-Need LEA Eligibility Checklist**

**Appendix D**

Applicants are strongly encouraged to use the checklist below to indicate the option used to support eligibility and the page of where it can be found in the application. Once complete, upload the checklist into Appendix D. Applicants must include information that confirms that each LEA (or consortium of LEAs) to be served under the grant meet the statutory definition of high-need. For high-need LEAs, data must be submitted for three components: poverty/rural area, teacher need, and High-need school within the partner LEA. The high-need schools eligibility within the partner LEA checklist is the subsequent checklist. It is very important that applicants review the definitions of high-need LEA and high-need school included in the NIA.

### Poverty/Rural Area Requirement (Component A)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)___</td>
<td>(pg.)___1</td>
<td>(pg.)___</td>
<td>(pg.)___</td>
<td>(pg.)___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A1:** Provide the percentage that demonstrates that not less than 20% of the children served by the LEA(s) are children from low-income families. **OR**

- **A2:** Provide the number that demonstrates that the LEA(s) is one that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from low-income families. **OR**

- **A3:** Document that the LEA(s) meets the eligibility requirements for funding under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) Program under section 6211(b) of the ESEA. **OR**

- **A4:** Document that the LEA(s) meets the eligibility requirements for funding under the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program under section 6221(b) of the ESEA.

### Teacher Need (Component B)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)__in Appendix C</td>
<td>(pg.)____</td>
<td>(pg.)____</td>
<td>(pg.)____</td>
<td>(pg.)____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **B1:** The Department may accept data that demonstrates that the participating teachers in the participating LEA(s) have a lack of training in the academic subject areas or grade levels in which they were trained to teach. An applicant may demonstrate that they meet the statutory requirement of a “high percentage of teachers” by including appropriate comparison data, which may include State or National-level data to indicate that the participating LEA(s) have a “high percentage of teachers not teaching in the academic subject areas or grade levels in which the teachers were trained to teach” in relation to State or National averages. **OR**

- **B2:** The Department may accept data that demonstrates that the participating LEA(s) has a “high percentage,” of teachers with “emergency, provisional or temporary certification or licensure.” An applicant may demonstrate they meet this statutory requirement by including appropriate comparison data, which may include State or National-level data to indicate that the participating LEA(s) have a “high percentage of teachers with emergency, provisional, or temporary certification or licensure” in relation to State or National averages. **OR**
**B3: The Department may accept data that demonstrates that the participating LEA(s) has a “high annual teacher turnover rate.”** An applicant may demonstrate they meet this statutory requirement by including appropriate comparison data, which may include State or National-level data to indicate that the participating LEA(s) have a “high annual teacher turnover rate” in relation to State or National averages.

---

**OPTIONAL TQP HIGH-NEED SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST**

**APPENDIX D**

Applicants are strongly encouraged to use the checklist below to indicate the option used to support eligibility and the page of where it can be found in the application. Once complete, upload the checklist into Appendix D. Applicant must submit data to confirm the eligibility for at least ONE partner high-need school from each eligible high-need LEA at the time of application. Additional high-need schools may be added later if the applicant is awarded funding under TQP.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For determining the eligibility of a “high-need school,” the Department is only aware of data regarding free and reduced price school lunches (FRPSL) as available to schools and LEAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)</td>
<td>(pg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1: List the schools proposed for the partnership, confirm that they rank in the top quartile and provide the percentage of students eligible for FRPSL;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)</td>
<td>(pg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)</td>
<td>(pg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2: Provide data that the school is an elementary school where not less than 60% of its students are eligible for FRPSL, or that the aggregate level of poverty of the school’s feeder schools based on the aggregate percentage of their students eligible for FRPSL yields 60% with extra documentation provided from section 200(11)(B)(ii) of HEA;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)</td>
<td>(pg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pg.)</td>
<td>(pg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3: Provide data that the school is not an elementary school where not less than 45% of its students are eligible for FRPSL, or that the aggregate level of poverty of the school’s feeder schools based on the aggregate percentage of their students eligible for FRPSL yields 45%, with extra documentation provided from section 200(11)(B)(ii) of HEA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Appendix E: TQP Optional Absolute Priority Checklist
**OPTIONAL TQP ABSOLUTE PRIORITY CHECKLIST**

**APPENDIX E**

### Effective Teaching Residency Programs (Teacher Residency Program)

Applicants are strongly encouraged to use the checklist below to indicate the option used to support eligibility and the page of where it can be found in the application. Applicants must respond to the Absolute Priority. Applicants must address each component of this priority as listed below. To ensure the application meets all priority requirements and that reviewers and Department staff can locate this information in the application, the Department strongly encourages the applicant to use the checklist below and to indicate the page number(s) where each component is located in the program narrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Number</th>
<th>(1) GENERAL. Under this priority, an eligible partnership must carry out an effective teaching residency program that includes all of the following activities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)____</td>
<td>(a) Supporting a teaching residency program described in paragraph II(a) for high-need subjects and areas, as determined by the needs of the high-need LEA in the partnership;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)____</td>
<td>(b) Placing graduates of the teaching residency program in cohorts that facilitate professional collaboration, both among graduates of the teaching residency program and between such graduates and mentor teachers in the receiving school;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)____</td>
<td>(c) Ensuring that teaching residents who participate in the teaching residency program receive—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)____</td>
<td>(1) Effective pre-service preparation as described in paragraph II;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)____</td>
<td>(2) Teacher mentoring;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)____</td>
<td>(3) Support required through the induction program as the teaching residents enter the classroom as new teachers; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)____</td>
<td>(4) The preparation described in paragraphs (c)(i), (ii), and (iii) Clinical Experience and Interaction in the Absolute Priority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(II) REQUIRED COMPONENTS OF TEACHING RESIDENCY PROGRAMS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (b) Selection of individuals as teaching residents.

#### (1) Eligible Individual. In order to be eligible to be a teaching resident in a teaching residency program under this priority, an individual shall—

1. Be a recent graduate of a four-year institution of higher education or a mid-career professional from outside the field of education possessing strong content knowledge or a record of professional accomplishment; and
2. Submit an application to the teaching residency program.

#### (2) Selection Criteria for Participants. An eligible partnership carrying out a teaching residency program under this priority shall establish criteria for the selection of eligible individuals to participate in the teaching residency program based on the following characteristics—

1. Strong content knowledge or record of accomplishment in the field or subject area to be taught;
2. Strong verbal and written communication skills, which may be demonstrated by performance on appropriate tests; and
3. Other attributes linked to effective teaching, which may be determined by interviews or performance assessments, as specified by the eligible partnership.

### (c) Stipends or salaries; applications; agreements; repayments.

#### (1) Stipends or salaries. A teaching residency program under this priority shall provide a one-year living stipend or salary to teaching residents during the teaching residency program;

#### (2) Applications for stipends or salaries. Each teacher residency candidate desiring a stipend or salary during the period of residency shall submit an application to the eligible partnership at such time, and containing such information and assurances, as the eligible partnership may require;

#### (3) Agreements to serve. Each application submitted under paragraph (c)(2) of this priority shall contain or be accompanied by an agreement that the applicant will—

1. Serve as a full-time teacher for a total of not less than three academic years immediately after successfully completing the teaching residency program;
2. Fulfill the requirement under paragraph (c)(3)(i) of this priority by teaching in a high-need school served by the high-need LEA in the eligible partnership and teach a subject or area that is designated as high-need by the partnership;
3. Provide to the eligible partnership a certificate, from the chief administrative officer of the LEA in which the resident is employed, of the employment required under paragraph (c)(3)(i) and (ii) of this priority at the beginning of, and upon completion of, each year or partial year of service;
4. Meet the applicable State certification and licensure requirements, including any requirements for certification obtained through alternative routes to certification, or, with regard to special...
education teachers, the qualifications described in section 612(a)(14)(C) of the IDEA, when the applicant begins to fulfill the service obligation under this provision; and

(v) Comply with the requirements set by the eligible partnership under paragraph II-(d) of this priority if the applicant is unable or unwilling to complete the service obligation required by the paragraph.

(d) Repayments.

(1) In general. A grantee carrying out a teaching residency program under this priority shall require a recipient of a stipend or salary under paragraph (c)(1) of this priority who does not complete, or who notifies the partnership that the recipient intends not to complete, the service obligation required by paragraph (c)(3) of this priority to repay such stipend or salary to the eligible partnership, together with interest, at a rate specified by the partnership in the agreement, and in accordance with such other terms and conditions specified by the eligible partnership, as necessary;

(2) Other terms and conditions. Any other terms and conditions specified by the eligible partnership may include reasonable provisions for pro rata repayment of the stipend or salary described in paragraph (c)(1) of this priority or for deferral of a teaching resident’s service obligation required by paragraph (c)(3) of this priority, on grounds of health, incapacitation, inability to secure employment in a school served by the eligible partnership, being called to active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, or other extraordinary circumstances;

(3) Use of repayments. An eligible partnership shall use any repayment received under paragraph (d) to carry out additional activities that are consistent with the purposes of this priority.
## Chicago ECE Context
- Shortage of EC Teachers
- Lack of diversity in EC teacher roles
- High turnover
- Lack of pathways for educational attainment & teacher licensure
- Lack of EC teacher knowledge about SEL, STEM and inclusion of diverse learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Residency candidates with experience and/or strong commitment to working in traditionally underserved communities&lt;br&gt;- Strong partnerships among UIC, GMU, CPS, CCOs, City of Chicago and GOECD&lt;br&gt;- Faculty with expertise in SEL, STEM and inclusion of diverse learners&lt;br&gt;- EMOTERS observation tool&lt;br&gt;- UIC Coaching protocol &amp; evaluation tools</td>
<td>- UIC ECE residency program: ECE content course of study, 4 semester residency, mentoring, and assessments of teaching performance&lt;br&gt;- 4 semesters of bi-weekly onsite coaching from UIC during residency&lt;br&gt;- 3 semesters of bi-weekly content focused PLCs (SEL, STEM, inclusion of DL)</td>
<td>- Robust data (including video) to improve practice&lt;br&gt;- Licensed ECE educators with experience serving high-need communities&lt;br&gt;- Robust content knowledge in high-need topics (SEL, STEM, inclusion of DLs)</td>
<td>- Residents report greater confidence &amp; competence in classroom&lt;br&gt;- Increases in overall instructional quality and content specific practices (SEL, STEM, inclusion of DLs) as indicated in coach and site administrator teacher performance assessments&lt;br&gt;- Increases in children’s achievement &amp; learning (especially in foci areas)</td>
<td>- Retention or promotion of residence in the ECE field in high-needs areas&lt;br&gt;- Increased job satisfaction &amp; compensation&lt;br&gt;- Sustained high-quality practice by residents&lt;br&gt;- Sustained data-informed PD at sites through PLC model&lt;br&gt;- Increased overall program quality&lt;br&gt;- Increased sustainable, scalable models of EC teacher preparation programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H – Resumes of Key Personnel
EDUCATION

University of Illinois, Chicago, Illinois

Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Bachelor of Science - Business Administration with specializations in Economics and Finance (May 1987)

PROFESSIONAL & TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Current Position: Senior Lecturer & Coordinator of Early Childhood Education Programs, College of Education, and University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) Develop and administer the Early Childhood M.Ed. program and Early Childhood Alternative Licensure program. This involves leading all program development; recruiting, admitting, advising, teaching, and assessing students; building and maintaining partnerships with community agencies, Chicago Public schools and other schools and districts for making and supporting student field placements; and collaborating with other campus units and the Illinois State Board of Education. Also supervise adjunct faculty, graduate students and program coaches in both programs.

Current teaching responsibilities include the following courses and all associated field placement and instruction: Student Teaching in Early Childhood Education; Collaborating with Families, Professionals, and Community; Introduction to Curriculum and Practice in Early Childhood Education; and Special Topics Course: Anti-Bias Curriculum in Early Childhood Education

Current Position: Faculty Affiliate, UIC Center for Urban Leadership, College of Education, UIC (August 2013-present)

Collaborate and consult on a range of projects seeking to build and leverage evidence to advance high quality early childhood experiences in Illinois. (August 2014-present)

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS (Sponsored Projects & Programs)

Main, C (PI) (August 2018 – June 2019) *Professional Development Project: Anti-Bias Curriculum in Early Childhood Education* $64,152. YMCA.

Main, C (PI) (June 2018) *The Chicago Early Childhood Preparation and Pathway (CECPP) Partnership*, NOT FUNDED, Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Program, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.


Main, C. (PI) (October 2016 - April 2017), *Community Collaboration Grant* $5000. UIC College of Education.


Chou, V. & Main, C. (co-PI) (July 2012- July 2014) *Designing and Implementing Comprehensive Early Childhood Programs*, $200,000, Chicago Community Trust.


Schools Office of Early Childhood Community Partnership Program.


**Main, C.** (Fall 2003- Spring 2004) *Chicago Public School Video Project*, $10,000, Chicago Public Schools & UIC Center for Literacy.

**Main, C., Getzendanner-Blake, S, & Odwarka, A.** (Summer 2003), *Read Around Chicago: Literacy Bags*, $32,000, Chicago Reading Initiative.

**Main, C.** (Fall 2002) *UIC/CAPE Arts Integration Project*, $7,500, UIC Center for the Study of Learning, Instruction, and Teacher Development (LITD) grant.

Delaney, E. & **Main, C.** (August 2001- May 2002) *Preparing Teachers to Work with All Children*, $12,000, UIC Council for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) grant.

**Main, C.** (Fall, 2000) *Second Language Learners: What Classroom Teachers Say*, $1500, UIC College of Education Teaching All Teachers (TAT) grant.


**PUBLICATIONS & PEER REVIEWED PRESENTATIONS**


**Main, C.** and Yarbrough, K. (November 2017) *Hiring and Retaining Illinois Early Childhood Educators: Results from a Statewide Survey*, IERC Focus on Illinois Education Research Symposium, Naperville, IL


Main, C. & Asimow, J. (June 2011) *Developing and Supporting Effective Early Childhood Teachers Online and Face-To-Face: What our Research Tells Us*” National Association of the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development, Providence, RI.


Nepstad, C., Asimow, J. & Main, C. (June 2008) *Experience into Theory: Using student’s life experience to support academic success through technology and engaging learning*

Main, C. (January 2004) *UIC/CAPE Arts Integration Project*. Center for the Study of Learning, Instruction, and Teacher Development Poster Fair, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL


Parker, M. & Main, C. (January 2002) *Mentoring UIC Preservice Teachers: What We’ve Learned*. Center for the Study of Learning, Instruction, and Teacher Development (LITD) Poster Fair, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL


Main, C. (January, 1995) *Anti-Bias Project--Reflections on a Journey*. Chicago Metropolitan Association for Education of Young Children (CMAEYC) Annual Conference, Chicago, IL

Berger, J. & Main, C. (January 1992) *An Examination of Language Acquisition in At-Risk Preschoolers*. Chicago Metropolitan Association for Education of Young Children (CMAEYC), Chicago, IL

**INVITED PRESENTATIONS AND PANELS**


Main, C. (June 2018) Invited panelist. *Transforming the Financing of Early Care and Education*. Erikson Institute, Chicago, IL


Main, C. (February 2017) Invited Discussant. *Preparing and supporting the ECE professionals to work with ALL children and families*. Illinois Early Childhood Inclusion Policy Summit, Bloomington, IL

Main, C. (February 2017) Invited Presentation. *Illinois Innovation to Incubation (i2I) team report*. National Academy of Medicine i2I State Teams Meeting, Omaha, NE.


**Main, C.** (August 2015) Invited Presentation. *Developing systems and supportive environments in the preschool classroom.* UIC Children’s Center. Chicago, IL

**Main, C.** (April 2015) Round Table: *CCC-UIC Pathways for Early Childhood Professionals,* Collaborating for Success, Illinois Gateways to Opportunities Higher Education Forum. Bloomington, IL

Sheridan, K. and **Main, C.** (January 2015) Invited Presentation. *Math at Home: Overview of site resources and research opportunities.* Chicago STEM Educational Consortium (C-STEMEC) Chicago, IL


**Main, C.** (February 2015) Guest Lecturer. Early Childhood Education Landscape in Chicago Public Schools. Urban Leadership Program, College of Education, UIC. Chicago, IL


**Main, C.** (September 2014) Invited Presentation. *Early Childhood Educator Preparation Program Innovations.* Governor’s Early Learning Council, Chicago, IL

**Main, C.** (July 2013) Invited Presentation. *Preparing the Pipeline: Developing the Early Childhood Workforce,* Illinois P-20 Council Meeting, Elgin, IL


Farrington, J., **Main, C.** and Nyman, S. (February 2012) Invited Panel Presentation. *Play Symposium Panel.* University of Illinois Institute of Government and Policy Affairs (IGPA), Chicago, IL

**Main, C.** (November 2011) Invited Presentation. *Guidance for Young Children.* National Louis University. Chicago, IL

**Main, C., Nyman, S., Roldan, C. and Weiner, J** (December 2011) Invited Presentation.
**Early Childhood Education Policy in Illinois.** Teach For America (TFA) Chicago, IL


**Main, C.** (June, 2008) Invited Presentation. *Building Partnerships.* Early Childhood Music Teachers Workshop, Chicago Symphony Orchestra. Chicago, IL


**Main, C.** (October 1999) Invited Presentation. *Multiple Intelligences,* Future Teachers Club, University of Illinois at Chicago at Chicago, Chicago, IL

**Main, C.** (March 1997) Invited Presentation. *Federally Funded Preschool Programs.* College of Education, Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago, IL

**Main, C.** (February 1999) Invited Presentation. *Teaching Tolerance: A Teacher’s Journey,* Erikson Institute, Chicago, IL

**KEYNOTES**

**Main, C.** (November 2018) *Transforming the Illinois Early Childhood Workforce: A Call to Action.* McCormick Foundation, Chicago, IL

**Main, C.** (May 2018) *Voices from the Front Lines: Illinois Early Childhood Workforce Survey Results.* Local Educators and Directors (LEAD) Annual Meeting, Chicago, Il

**Main, C.** (April 2017) *Key to Quality: Strengthening and supporting a culturally and linguistically diverse ECE workforce.* Research and Quality Luncheon, National Head Start Association 2017 Annual Meeting, Chicago, Il

**Main, C.** (October 2009) *Bringing the Arts to schools,* Docent Lecture Series, Chicago Symphony Orchestra. Chicago, IL


**TRAININGS**
Main, C and Sheridan, K. (April 2019) Early Math Webinar: *Patterns, Shapes and Spaces*. v. 2
The Center: Resources for Teaching and Learning, Arlington Hts, IL

Main, C and Sheridan, K. (January 2018) Early Math Webinar: *Patterns, Shapes and Spaces*.
The Center: Resources for Teaching and Learning, Arlington Hts, IL

Sheridan, K. and Main, C (November 2017) Early Math Webinar: *Making Sense of Number Sense*.
The Center: Resources for Teaching and Learning, Arlington Hts, IL

Asimow, J. and Main C., (February, 2016) *Tinkering with Toddlers*. Chicago Children’s Museum Tinkering Summit, Chicago, IL

Main, C. (August 2015) *Developing systems in Prek classrooms*. Children’s Center at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

Main, C. (October 2014) *Math at Home: Overview of site resources*. University of Illinois Child Care Resources, Urbana, IL


Main C. (October 2013) *Common Core Mathematics Instruction for P-5 Teachers*. Network 13, Chicago Public Schools. Chicago, IL

Main, C. & Weber, J. (June 2012) T. *Common Core 101 for Chicago area teaching-artists*. Hubbard Street Dance Chicago & Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Chicago, IL


Main, C. & Asimow, J. (July 2009) *Classroom Management in the Prek classroom*. Early Reading First Project, University of Illinois at Chicago. Chicago, IL


Main, C. (February 2005, August 2004) Youth Early Literacy Trainings. *Reading to Young Children*. Project SOAR, Chicago Youth Services (CYS)

Main, C. (April, October, and November 2004) *Artist/Teacher Collaborations: Building a Model*. Chicago Arts Partnership in Education (CAPE)

Main, C. (March 2003) *Cognitive Development in Preschool/Elementary Aged Child*, Benedictine University, Lisle, IL

Main, C & Koritsaris, M. (September 2002) *Building Collaborative Relationships with Parents*, Plato Academy, Glenview, IL

Main, C. (May 2002) *Social Development in the Preschool*, St. Elisabeth Nursery School, Highland Park, IL

Main, C. (June 1999) *Educational Implications of Piaget’s Theory*, Mary Crane Nursery School, Chicago, IL


Main, C. (January 1998) *Science with Young Children*. Children’s Center at the University of Illinois, Chicago IL

Main, C. (January 1997) *Math Activities for Young Children*. Children’s Center at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

Main, C. (January 1996) *Logical-Mathematical Knowledge: Implications of Piaget’s Theory*, Children’s Center at the University at Chicago, Chicago, IL


**AWARDS & RECOGNITIONS**

Nominated by College of Education for the 2018 Award for Excellence in Teaching (AET), University of Illinois at Chicago

Recipient of 2016 Distinguished Alumni Award, Department of Educational Psychology, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago

Recipient of 2014 Chicago Metro Association of the Education of Young Children (CMAEYC) Service Award

Recipient of the 1999 Dean’s Merit Award, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago.


**DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

*Program Coordinator*, M.Ed. program in Early Childhood Education, Appointed. (August 2000-present)

*Committee member*, College Educational Policy and Program Committee (EPPC) Elected. (August 2008- present)

*Committee member*, Department Executive Committee (DEC) Elected. (August 2014- present)

*Committee member*, Human and Development and Learning Program Committee. Appointed. (August 2014- present)

*Faculty Advisor*, Advisory Board for Center of Excellence in Maternal and Child Health. Appointed (January 2016 - Present)

*Committee member*, Search committee for Associate/Full Literacy Professor in Curriculum & Instruction with a possible appointment as director of the Center for Literacy. Appointed (August 2018 – November 2018).


*Committee member* Lecturer Promotion Policy Committee (October 2014 – December 2014)

*Committee member*, College of Education Restructuring Committee (October 2014 – April 2015)

*Committee member* Academic Programs Prioritization Task Force (APPT) (January 2013- May 2013)

*Committee member*, Council on Teacher Education (CTE) Assessment Committee (September 2013-May 2014)

*Committee member* Clinical Faculty Annual Review Committee (August 2009 – March 2010)

*Faculty Liaison*, Future Teachers Club (Fall 1999 – Spring 2008)

**PROFESSIONAL & COMMUNITY SERVICE**

Committee member, Steering committee, Illinois Professional Development Advisory Council (PDAC). Appointed. (August 2017 – present)

Past-President, Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators (ILAECTE) Elected. (August 2017- present)

Advisory board member, Illinois Governor’s Children cabinet on Children and Youth. Appointed. (January 2017 – present)

Advisory board member, Truman College Child Development Advisory Board. Appointed. (June 2016 – present)

Committee Member, ELC Quality Committee/ Professional Development and Standards committee, Illinois Early Learning Council. Invited. (February 2006- present)


State team co-leader, National Academy of Medicine (NAM) Innovation to Incubation (i2I) Project on Early Childhood workforce. Invited. (October 2015- October 2018)

Committee Member, Mayor’s Taskforce on Chicago Early Childhood Workforce (April 2016 - October 2016)

Co-Chair, Chicago Commons Pathways for Parents Program. Invited. (January 2016 – present)

Vice President & President-Elect, Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators (ILAECTE) Elected. (April 2014 – April 2016)


Co-Chair, Higher Education and Professional Development committee, Illinois Early Learning Council (May 2013- June 2018)

Board Member, Chicago Youth Centers, (March 2013- present)

Advisory Group Member, Early Childhood Advisory Group (ECAG), Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) (November 2011- August 2013)

Secretary, Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators (ILAECTE). Elected (October 2010 – October 2012)

Committee Member, Professional Development and Standards committee, Illinois Early
Learning Council (February 2006- present)

**Advisory Board**, Chicago Public School Early Childhood Department (January 2005 – December 2010)

**Committee Member**, Type 04 sub-committee, Chicago Metro Association for the Education of Young Children (CMAEYC) (March 2005- September 2009)

**Advisory Board**, Harold Washington Child Development & Human Services Program/CDA, City Colleges of Chicago (February 2004 -present)

**Advisory Board**, Chicago Center for Early Education (collaboration between Chicago Department of Human Services, the UIC Center for Literacy and City Colleges of Chicago) (October 2001-December 2013)

**Committee Member**, Chicago Archdiocese, Strategic planning for Deanery II schools (January 2004 - May 2004)

**Panel Member** for ISBE review of teacher preparation program (September 2002 – December 2003)

**Advisory Board**, Preparing Early Intervention Professionals (PEIP) grant (August 2002 –May, 2006)

**Co-Chair**, Hawthorne/Agassiz Arts Partnership Steering Committee, Chicago Public Schools (August 2000 -2008)

**Advisory Board**, Resurrection School (September 1998- June 2004)

**Committee Member**, Public Relations Committee, Chicago Metropolitan Association for the Education of Young Children (CMAEYC) (1995-1998)

**Co-chair**, Workshop Monitoring Committee, Chicago Metropolitan Association for the Education of Young Children (CMAEYC) (1994-1995 conferences)

**Co-chair**, Evaluation Committee, Chicago Metropolitan Association for the Education of Young Children (CMAEYC) (1991-1993 conferences)

**MEDIA AND PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Interview. *Illinois Early Childhood Educators Share Election Hopes*. Illinois Newsroom. October 29, 2018

Invited Testimony. Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Board meeting. April 17, 2019

Invited Testimony. Illinois legislative House Committee- Elementary & Secondary Education:
Administration, Licensing & Charter School committee. March 20, 2019

Interview. 7 Bills to Watch in Illinois. NPR. February 22, 2019


FORMER POSITIONS- TEACHING AND RESEARCH

Adjunct Instructor, College of Education, UIC, Chicago, IL
Taught courses in Early Childhood and Elementary Education programs. Made field placements and provided field instruction and supervision for all early childhood education students.
Courses taught included: *Curriculum and Practice in Early Childhood Education*; *Student Teaching in Early Childhood Education*; *Fieldwork in Elementary Education*; *Student Teaching in the Elementary Grades*; Collaborating with Families, Professionals, and Community; and *Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment in the Primary Grades*. (August 1994- August 2000)

Preschool Teacher, State Prekindergarten Demonstration Center, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL
The Demonstration Center is a model preschool program that serves at-risk three- and four-year olds. While at the Demonstration Center, I designed, planned, and implemented developmentally appropriate activities, curricula, and assessments. I also led professional development and mentored student teachers. (August 1993- June 1995)

Preschool Teacher, McKay Elementary School, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL
Located in a diverse neighborhood on the southwest side of Chicago, McKay school serves children in grades prek- 8th. While at McKay, I designed, planned, and implemented developmentally appropriate activities, curricula, and assessment for preschoolers. (August 1992- June 1993)

Writer (PT), Book Summaries for Educators, Inc., Chicago, IL
For more than five years, on a monthly basis, I read prominent books related to education and school reform and wrote summaries containing main ideas, key points, and recommendations. Summaries were sold to educators worldwide. (June 1992- August 1997)

Intern (PT), North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), Oakbrook, IL
Gathered and synthesized literature on school leadership for Urban Schools Project on Leading and Managing Change. Also assisted with the planning and implementation of a Leadership Conference for Milwaukee Public School principals. (July 1992 - July 1994)

Program Evaluator (PT), Department of Research, Evaluation, and Planning, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL
Observed, evaluated and documented implementation of early childhood programs (State Prekindergarten, Head Start, and Child Parent Centers) in the Chicago Public Schools. Co-principal investigator on a longitudinal study of the effects of preschool on at-risk children in
Chicago Public Schools.  

**Research Consultant (PT), Community Training & Assistance Center (CTAC), Boston, MA.** Researched various topics related to school reform and school improvement. Summarized books, articles, and other relevant materials for use in training sessions. (April 1991- August 1992)

**Director/Teacher, Little Fox Day School, Chicago, IL**  
Responsible for overall operations of the school. Designed and planned curricula and activities for school. Taught a kindergarten class and supervised two preschool teachers. Assisted in the promotion and accounting functions of the school. Ensured compliance with all governmental regulations. (August 1990- June 1991)
EDUCATION

University of Virginia, Charlottesville
PhD in Educational Psychology, May 2008
Emphases: Educational Research, Quantitative Methodology, Child Development

University of Michigan, Dearborn
Master of Arts in Teaching, Biology, December 2003

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Bachelor of Science, General Biology, December 1997

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

Director, Applied Developmental Psychology Graduate Program, 2015-present
Associate Professor, Applied Developmental Psychology, George Mason University, 2014-present
Assistant Director, Applied Developmental Psychology Graduate Program, 2011-2014
Assistant Professor, Applied Developmental Psychology, George Mason University 2008-2014

AWARDS

2013 Travel award from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) for training on Child Care & Early Education Research Connections
2011, 2012 Nominee for the Excellence in Teaching Award, George Mason University
2007 Outstanding Doctoral Student, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia
2006-2008 University of Virginia Fellow, Interdisciplinary Doctoral Training Program in Education Sciences, Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

PUBLICATIONS

* denotes student researcher


Teachers' perceptions of emotional competence and emotionally supportive classroom practices. *Early Education & Development.*


REVISE-RESUBMIT MANUSCRIPTS

BOOK CHAPTERS


MANUSCRIPTS UNDER INITIAL REVIEW


MANUSCRIPTS IN PREPARATION

**NON-PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS**


**GRANT FUNDING**

*In Progress*


*Under Review*


*Not Funded 2018-2019*


*Completed:*


American Psychological Association, Division 15 Early Career Educational Psychology Research Award, "Teachers' global quality and children's development of emotional competence in preschool." 2011-2014. Role: Principal Investigator, $6,614

DuBarry Foundation (subcontract through the University of Virginia). "*Quantitative Support for the Student Engagement Study.*" 2013-2014. Role: Principal Investigator for Subcontract, $32,750

National Science Foundation (subcontract through the University of Virginia). "*Quantitative methods support for the Classroom Processes, Students' Engagement in Mathematics Instruction, and Mathematics Achievement Study.*" 2011-2012. Role: Principal Investigator for Subcontract, $37,232

George Mason University, Office of Research and Economic Development. "*Continuous Measurement of Classroom Social Processes.*" 2010 - 2011. Role: Principal Investigator, $3,000

Institute of Education Sciences, Department of Education. "*Early Childhood Hands-On Science (ECHOS)*" PR/Award # U3365190035
Efficacy Study." 2010 -2014. Role: Consultant, $18,000
George Mason University, Technology Across the Curriculum. "Improving PSYC 313 Child Psychology through the use of improved Scantron equipment." 2009 - 2010. Role: Principal Investigator, $5,460

PAPER PRESENTATIONS AND SYMPOSIA


emotional competence to their support of children's emotional development. In D. A. Osher (chair), A
Is for Adult Social and emotional learning: Supporting educator practices. Paper presented at the

Curby, T. W. (2013, September). [Discussant]. In W. Murrah (chair), The evolution and evaluation of a play-
based, after-school curriculum that improves executive function, visuo-spatial and math skills for
disadvantaged children. Paper symposium at the Fall Meeting of the Society for Research on
Educational Effectiveness.

function predict growth in academic achievement. In Hulleman, C. S. (chair), Conceptualizing and
measuring capacities beyond achievement: Research across the school years. Paper symposium at the
Fall Meeting of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

classroom practices to their beliefs about emotions. National Head Start Research Symposium,
Washington, DC.

quality and child development: Profiles of care and domain-specific aspects of quality. Paper
symposium presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Biennial Meeting, Seattle,
WA. #1520206

Curby, T. W., Downer, J. T., & Booren, L. (2013, April). Behavioral exchanges between teachers' supports
and children's engagement over the course of a typical preschool day. In A. Williford (chair), The
Interplay Between Young Children and Teachers: Teacher-Child Relationships, Teacher Practice, and
Children's Engagement. Paper symposium presented at the Society for Research in Child
Development Biennial Meeting, Seattle, WA. #1528840

grade student-teacher relationship quality within the context of a Responsive Classroom intervention.
In J. Swanson (chair), closeness and conflict in the student-teacher relationship across primary grades:
Complex processes and outcomes. Paper symposium presented at the Society for Research in Child
Development Biennial Meeting, Seattle, WA. #1533206

contribution of classroom social interactions and child attributes to fifth graders' experience of
engagement in mathematics classrooms. In A. E. Baroody (chair), What do children say about
school? Using child-report data to understand students' experience of their classrooms. Paper
symposium presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Biennial Meeting, Seattle,
WA. #1528194.

Curby, T. W. (2013, March). [Discussant]. In R. Jacob (chair), Targeting executive function and self-
regulation: New findings from pre-k and elementary school interventions. Society for Research in
Educational Effectiveness, Washington, DC.

Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Curby, T. W., Baroody, A., Merritt, E., Abry, T. Ko, M, & Thomas, J. (2012,
September). Efficacy of the Responsive Classroom Approach: Results from a Three Year,
Longitudinal Randomized Control Trial. In Jones, N. (Chair), Data driven policy: The importance of
social and emotional learning on student outcomes across levels. Fall meeting of the Society for
Research on Educational Effectiveness, Washington, DC.

Classroom approach predict quality of teacher-student interactions? Paper presented at a roundtable of
the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

the role of English language proficiency for children in low-income immigrant families. In,
Promoting language and literacy development among young children. Society for Research in Child
Development Themed Meeting: Positive Development of Minority Children, Tampa, FL.


WORKSHOPS


PR/Award # U336S190035
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POSTER PRESENTATIONS


student engagement measures on fifth grade students' social competence and achievement in math class. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Child Development Biennial Meeting, Philadelphia, PA, #948929.


knowledge on predicting reactions to frustration in preschool classrooms. Poster presented at the Society for Research in Human Development Biennial Conference, Austin.


Expert Advising

RESEARCH TRAINING
Coordinated Data Analysis: Maximizing Early Care and Education Data, July 2013. University of Michigan Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research

Classroom Assessment Scoring System - Secondary, May 2008. University of Virginia


Analysis of Data Using the NICHD Database, October 2006. University of Virginia

Longitudinal Data Analysis Using Structural Equation Modeling, August 2006. University of Virginia

Hierarchical Linear Models for Studying the Effects of Schools, May 2005. University of Virginia

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY - Fairfax, VA

Instructor: PSYC 211 Developmental Psychology
Instructor: PSYC 313 Child Development
Instructor: PSYC 461/566 Cognitive and Perceptual Development
Instructor: PSYC 646 Longitudinal Data Analysis
Instructor: PSYC 704 Lifespan Development
Instructor: PSYC 756 Multivariate Statistics

UNIVERSITY LIGGETT SCHOOL - Grosse Pointe, MI
Teacher: Biology; Anatomy & Physiology
GEORGE MASON COMMITTEE WORK

Applied Developmental Psychology Program Faculty Search Committee, 2018
Chaired the search for a new Applied Developmental faculty member.

Fact-Finding Committee Member for Eva Wiese's Promotion, 2018.

Psychology Department Long-Range Planning Committee, 2011 - present
Provides a forum for the department to consider the alignment of our teaching, research, and practice to our mission.

Psychology Department Graduate Statistics Task Force, 2017

Applied Developmental Psychology Program Faculty Search Committee, 2016
Chaired the search for a new Applied Developmental faculty member.

Psychology Clinic Steering Committee, 2014 - 2016
Serves as a sounding board for the clinic director and a clearinghouse of information and ideas for sustaining and improving clinic functioning.

University Effective Teaching Committee, 2012- 2014
Helps to implement procedures that encourage and reward effective teaching, and to enable faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness.

Psychology Department Quantitative Committee, 2008 - 2014
Ensures that graduate quantitative curriculum is meeting the needs of the students and department.

Applied Developmental Psychology Program Faculty Search Committee, 2012
Assisted in the search for a new Applied Developmental faculty member.

Psychology Department Mentoring Committee, 2008 -2012
Develops and maintains structures to support graduate student teaching. Provides advice and forums for junior faculty to discuss concerns.

Psychology Department Life Committee, 2010-2012
Arranges for department social activities as well as several department-wide lectures by prominent speakers.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
* denotes Curby was chair of the committee

DOCTORAL

Completed
Xiaozhu An*, 2019
Alexa Roth*, 2019
Ho Kwan Cheung, 2018
Andrea Mascitelli, 2018
Ally Patterson, 2018
Max Shear, 2018
Ally Patterson, 2018
Lucia Stillerova*, 2018
Tanya Tavassolie, 2018
Sarah Carter, 2017
Ivonne Figueroa, 2017
Elizabeth Berke*, 2016
Jameela Conway-Turner, 2016
David Ferrier, 2016
Kristi Herndon, 2016
Samantha Karalus, 2016
Jordan Thibodeaux, 2016
Sarah Campbell, 2015
Nicole Fettig, 2015
Sarah Klein, 2015
Alexandra Perloe, 2015
Diane Wagner, 2015
Naomi Watanabe, 2015
Craig Bailey, 2014
Grace Howarth, 2014
Nicole Jones, 2014
Julius Najab, 2014
Abby Carlson*, 2013
Katherine Zinsser, 2013
Kristen Medeiros, 2013
Deepti Gupta, 2012
Sara Kalb, 2012
Claire Cole, 2011
Caroline Boyer Ferhat, 2011
Chavaughn Brown, 2010
Jessica De Feyter, 2011
Yoon Kim, 2011
Daniel Zapp, 2011
Carol Morris, 2010

Proposals Defended
Jordan Daylor
Alex Moffett
Lauren Paige
J. Reba Troxler*

MASTERS

Completed
Jerry Mize, 2018
Laura Stokes, 2017
Mayra Parada, 2017
Kaity Mumma, 2016
Alex Moffett, 2016
Caitlin Hines, 2015
Tanya Tavassolie, 2015
Max Shear, MA 2014
Xiaozhu An, MA, 2014
Sammi Plourde, MA 2013
Noora Hamdan*, MA, 2013
Kristina Herndon, MA, 2013
Michael Widerman*, MA, 2013
Matthew Willis*, MA, 2013
Nicole Fettig MA, 2012
Helyn Kim*, MA, 2012
Rebekah LaRocque, MA, 2012
Alexandra Perloe, MA, 2012
Ashley Simpkins, MA, 2010
Erin Tarpey, MA, 2010
Katherine Zinsser, MA, 2010

PSYCHOLOGY HONORS PROGRAM

Completed
Margaret Morison, 2018
Ihsan Shaikhly, 2018
Revital Bregman*, 2016
Natalie Williams*, 2015
Wisaam Nubani, 2014
Melanie Bozzay, 2011
Kristina Herndon, 2011
Megan Gammelmo, 2010

PRESENTATIONS


March 20, 2019. SRCD Emotions Pre-Conference. Developing a measure of the teaching of emotions skills in preschool classrooms.


June 15, 2010 American Psychological Association Summer Fellows training. Introduction to SPSS.

SERVICE TO PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

American Psychological Association (APA)
  Division 7 - Developmental Psychology
  -Chair, Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education (2019-2020)
  -Representative, Coalition for Psychology in Schools and Education (2012-present)
  -Representative, Education Leadership Conference (2011)
Division 15 - Educational Psychology
  -Co-Chair for the Ad-hoc Committee for Strategic APA Efforts
  -Council Representative of the Division of Educational Psychology (2013 - 2016)
    -Recording Secretary for the Child, Adolescent, & Family Caucus
  -Nominations Committee member (2012)
  -Social Media Committee chair (2011)

GRANT REVIEW

Ad-Hoc Reviewer, Institute of Education Sciences, Early Intervention and Early Childhood Education Research, February 2015
Ad-Hoc Reviewer, National Science Foundation, April 2009; October 2009

EDITORIAL REVIEW

Associate Editor, School Psychology Review 2015-present
Consulting Editor, Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 2009-present
Editorial Board, Early Education and Development, 2009-present
Reviewer, The Elementary School Journal, 2010-present
Reviewer, Journal of Educational Psychology, 2009-present
Reviewer, Child Development, 2010-present
Reviewer, Social Development, 2015
Reviewer, Emotion, 2011-present
Reviewer, Parenting: Science and Practice, 2011
Reviewer, Science, 2010
Reviewer, British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 2008
Reviewer, NHSA Dialog, 2007
Reviewer, Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness Spring 2014 Meeting, Early Learning and Education Division, 2013.
Reviewer, American Psychological Association Meeting, Division 15 - Educational Psychology, 2010,
2011

**MEDIA**

5/24/2017 Interviewed in "Picking a quality preschool" by Cynthia Long, *Northern Virginia.*
http://www.northernvirginiamag.com/family/education/2017/05/24/picking-a-quality-preschool/


3/6/2014 Work that I was involved with appeared in the Washington Post, "Socialization technique helps in academic achievement, trial study finds" by Lyndsey Layton.
http://t.co/6Xlmnc0DnP

10/27/2012 Work that I was involved with appeared in The New York Times Opinionator Blog by Sara Mosle

4/4/2012 Psychology Today Curious Blog
What Will Make Your Kid Succeed in Kindergarten? The secret to amazing teachers and successful 6-year-olds. By Todd Kashdan
http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/curious/201204/what-will-make-your-kid-succeed-in-kindergarten
or 4/4/2012 HuffingtonPost.com
What Qualities Make a Successful Teacher? By Todd Kashdan
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/todd-kashdan/what-will-make-your-kid-s_b_1401595.html

Fairfax Parents Group Pushes For Full Day Kindergarten
1/19/2010, Channel 9, Washington, DC, by Peggy Fox

Parents Group Urges FCPS To Make All Kindergartens All Day
1/19/2010, Reston Patch, Reston, VA, by Liz Miller
VITA

MICHELLE PARKER-KATZ, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago  Department of Special Education
1040 W. Harrison m/c 147, Chicago, IL 60607
O: (312) 996-2539  F: (312) 996-5651  E: mparker@uic.edu

Current Rank and Appointment: Department of Special Education, College of Education
Clinical Professor of Special Education
Coordinator, Special Education Master’s Programs and Clinical Experiences

Research Specialties:
In urban settings, how to build and sustain respectful authentic communities of educators, families and community stakeholders; how teachers develop and sustain collaborative work and inquiry with K-12 personnel, families, communities and higher education to help students in and out of school; how attention to literacy teaching and learning can support that; best ways to help teachers lead educational reform for the sake of students’ learning

EDUCATION

1992 Michigan State University, Department of Teacher Education
Ph.D. in Curriculum, Teaching, and Social Policy
Dissertation: The Enactment of Thoughtfulness on Collaboration: A Case of Social Studies Teaching and Learning in a Professional Development School

1985 University of Chicago, Department of Education
M.A. in Education
Thesis: Teacher Influences on Implementation of Elementary Reading Programs in Urban Schools

1980 Pennsylvania State University, College of Education
B.S. Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education

Faculty Positions Held

5/11-present Clinical Professor
5/03 - present Clinical Associate Professor
5/11 5/08 Coordinator of Special Education Masters Degree Programs

Coordinate program of approximately 180 students, with most seeking a master’s degree and licensure(s). Students pursue studies as current general educators, special educators or new to teaching. I provide leadership in curricular development and program revision (including program redesign and new program development through approval in advanced knowledge and certification). I facilitate personnel development for teacher education. Student recruitment, retention, progress monitoring and support through first job are also part of my role. I work closely with the Council on Teacher Education (teacher licensure at the university) and the College of Education Office of Student Services, and I liaise with the Illinois Board of Higher
Education and Illinois State Board of Education. I have developed and do formative assessment to revise website information; recruitment plans and materials; program admissions procedures; assessment systems and criteria; enhance communication through websites, listservs and program newsletters; and design databases and surveys to track student progress for retention into early career support. I plan and organize such data to assist faculty with program revision. I liaise continually with Chicago Public Schools in which I make all program all internship and student teaching placements. I also supervised directly in the over 50 partnerships we have had in special education, and I draw on this from my general education program coordination also in Chicago public schools. I coordinate assessments, and develop and sustain advisory groups to lead to continual revision.

1996 - Clinical Assistant Professor, UIC
2003

1997  Director, UIC Elementary Education Programs (B.A. & M.Ed.)
2002
Directed program of 350 students; oversaw fieldwork and placements; led committees to handle student affairs; established and led revisions to admissions and assessment criteria and processes; established UIC Elementary Education Principles to align fieldwork and on-campus assessment; created materials for mentors and principals in partner schools; established Curriculum Resource Room; established program website; streamlined processes. Directed four-year effort that resulted in new undergraduate and master’s programs that align with exemplary urban university practices and with Illinois teaching standards.

1992 - Assistant Professor, UIC
1996 Coordinator, Elementary Education Undergraduate Program
Coordinated program of 150 – 200 students; developed new admissions and assessment systems; developed new courses; prepared personnel and school-based mentors; oversaw fieldwork and placements; did supervision of interns and student teachers in Chicago Public Schools.

1991 - Lecturer, Michigan State University
1992

1990 – Coordinator of Elliott Elementary (MI) Professional Development School
1992
Collaborated with the principal and teachers; liaison between university and school; chaired the Coordinating Council; organized new collaborative structures for courses taught on site and teachers’ work groups; participated in teacher work groups; assisted with budget.

AWARDS AND APPOINTMENTS

2015 - 2017 Master Teacher Scholar, University of Illinois at Chicago
2014 INSPIRE Award, University of Illinois at Chicago
2006 Teacher Recognition Award, University of Illinois at Chicago
1994 Appointment as External Advisor for Quality Education Fund projects
1991       College of Education Nominee for Michigan State University Excellence-in-Teaching Award
1990 – 1992 Pre-doctoral Intern Fellowship, Michigan Partnership
1990       Nominated (with Sharon Feiman-Nemser) for Distinguished Research in Teacher Education, Association of Teacher Educators
1979       Undergraduate Fellow, National Science Foundation
1976       First Federal Bank Scholarship for Academic Excellence

MEMBERSHIPS AND OFFICES IN PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES
Illinois Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children
   Executive Board: President Elect (2016 - 2017); past President (2011-2012)
Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children
   Research Committee and Publication Committees
American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education
   Applicant to committee membership pending

EDITORIAL BOARD/REVIEW ACTIVITIES

TEACHING
University Courses Taught
University of Illinois at Chicago (doctoral, masters and undergraduate)
GC 594: Practicum; University Certificate course in Foundations of Teaching Higher Education (open to all UIC doctoral students seeking the university certificate)
CIE 594: Doctoral seminar in Redesigning Teacher Education
SpEd 592: Doctoral Seminar on Theory and Research in Special Education: Teacher Education and Special Education
ED 500: Cross-college doctoral required course in Conceptions of Educational Research
SpEd 473: Mathematics and Science with Curricular Adaptation
SpEd 577: Fieldwork Internship in Special Education: Field placements, observations in special education classrooms in Chicago Public Schools and teach weekly seminar)
SpEd 578: Classroom-based Inquiry
SpEd 580: Student Teaching in Special Education: Field placements, observations in special education classrooms in Chicago Public Schools and teach weekly seminar)
EPSY 482: Family and Professional Collaboration
SpEd 448: Special Topics in Special Education
SpEd 415: Characteristics of Students with Disabilities (to general education candidates)
ED 325: Seminar in Teaching III (student teaching field instruction and weekly seminar)
ED 321: Teaching and Learning for Children of Various Abilities and Cultures
ED 315: Seminar in Teaching II (seminar with fieldwork placement and instruction responsibilities
ED 305: Seminar in Teaching I (seminar, with fieldwork placement and instruction responsibilities;)
Independent Studies offered to masters and doctoral students
Research Practica supervision for doctoral students
Honors College student practica
Michigan State University, 1986-1992 (undergraduate)
TE 101: Exploring Teaching; student teaching field instructor and weekly seminar leader
TE 405: Special Topics (professional development school practicum)
Chicago State University, 1985 (undergraduate)
Introductory educational psychology

K-12 School Experience and Licenses
Philadelphia, PA; Houston, TX; Kansas City, KS
Michigan (elementary and high school teaching in my professional development work)

UNDERGRADUATE
UIC Honors College Fellow

GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISING/MENTORING
Doctoral students (current)
   Chair (5)
   Committee membership (21)
Doctoral students (completed)
   Special Education (32)
   Curriculum and Instruction (8)

NATIONAL & STATE POLICY WORK
• Illinois Teacher Education Division (ITED). Current Past-President

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-CHICAGO COMMITTEE WORK
University level:
   UIC Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP)
   UIC Graduate College Awards Committee
   UIC Center for the Advancement of Teaching-Learning Communities
   UIC Library Committee representative from College of Education
   UIC New Professor Orientation
   UIC Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
   UIC Provost Task Force for Mathematics and Science
College of Education
  Scholarship Committee 2015 - Present
  Education Policy and Program Committee 1999 - 2001; 2010 – 2016
  Honors Committee, 2006 - 2008

Department of Special Education
  Coordinator of Special Education Masters Programs (2008 – present)
  Department Executive Committee (2006 – 2008; 2018 - 2020)

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
  Elementary Education Program Faculty, Chair (1997 – 2002)
  Director, Elementary Education Programs (1997 – 2002)

GRANTS

Federal: Current

Federal: Complete

Foundation, State and other Funding
Teachers Making Change Project. Principal Investigator. Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Funds/Illinois Board of Higher Education. $50,000.


ESL, Math and Science for Beginning Teachers. Co-investigator. Teaching All Teachers. $1600.


CONSULTATIONS

After-School Matters
IRIS (online modules)
Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE)
Northcentral University
Design team for proposed Chicago public Alcanzar Charter School for Drop-Out Youth
Columbia College: teacher education portfolios
Board of Jewish Education
Archdiocese of Chicago
National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, Michigan State University
Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast and Islands

PEER ACADEMIC REVIEW ACTIVITIES
Promotion/Tenure External Reviewer
Program Reviews
Refereed journal reviews

PUBLICATION ACTIVITY
Refereed Articles in Professional Journals


**Peer Reviewed Chapters in Books**


**Online Publications**


**Policy Briefs**

Monographs
Schools. Chicago, IL.

Nemser & C. Rosean (Eds.). Guiding teacher learning: Insider studies of classroom-based work
with teachers. Washington, DC: AACTE.

Center for Research in Teacher Learning, Research Report 92-10. East Lansing: Michigan State
University.

Lansing: Michigan State University.

teachers’ conceptions: A description of an introductory teacher education course. National
Center for Research in Teacher Learning, Research Report 88-5. East Lansing: Michigan State
University.

Book review essays
Journal of Education, 102, 244 – 254.

Commissioned Papers
Paper commissioned by the Study of Systemic Reform in the Professionalism of School-based
Educators, supported by the US Department of Education, OERI contract #RR 91172009.

Conference Proceedings
Chapter of PME., Raleigh, NC.

Parker, M.B. & Smith, E. (1997). Latino urban students and the meaning of reform in
mathematics education. In J. Dossey, J. Swafford, M. Parmantie and A. Dossey, (Ed.)
Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of North American Chapter of PME, Bloomington, IL,
Eric Clearinghouse.


**PRESENTATIONS**

**National**


Hughes, M. T., Parker-Katz, M., & Braun, G. (2017, November). *A journey to higher education: Preparing faculty to address the needs of urban schools*. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Division of Teacher Education, Council of Exceptional Children. Savannah, GE.


Parker, M.B. (2001, April). *Curricular resources as a vehicle for facilitating reform during induction into teaching.* Presented at the annual meetings of the National Science Foundation. Washington, DC.


**Selected State**


**Invited keynotes addresses/presentations (regional/state)**


Parker, M.B. (2001). *Landscapes of Teacher Education*. Keynote address presented to the Center for Jewish Teacher Education. Chicago, IL.

FACULTY VITA

Name:  Kathleen M. Sheridan
Title:  Associate Professor
Address:  1020 West Harrison Chicago, Illinois 60607
Phone:  312-413-3883
Email:  ksherid9@uic.edu

Areas of Professional Expertise

Higher Education Leadership; Program and Curriculum Design and Development; Online Learning in Higher Education, Evaluation and Improvement of Online Learning; Child Development; Family Systems; Child, Family and Community Relationships; Kindergarten Readiness, Assessment in Teacher Education Programs, Accreditation in Higher Education and Teacher Education Programs; Early Math and Science Literacy and Professional Development for Early Childhood Teachers.

Academic Degrees and Professional Preparation:

Ph.D.  Child and Family Studies – December 1994
       The University of Wisconsin-Madison

       Traveling Scholar Program- 1989
       Awarded by Northwestern University and UW-Madison
       Department of Human Development and Social Policy
       Northwestern University- Evanston, Illinois

M. A.  Elementary Education and Early Childhood Education
        with certification Pk-6 - May 1989
        Washington University – St Louis, Mo

B. A.  Music Education (voice) with K-12 certification- May 1978
        Drake University- Des Moines, Iowa

Selected Professional Experience

University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
9/2014-Present:  Associate Professor and Program Coordinator.

University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
9/2012-9/2014:  Associate Dean for Licensure Programs and Technology.

National-Louis University
Chicago, Illinois
1/2012-9/2012: **Vice-Provost for Academic Programs and Faculty Development.**

*National-Louis University*
*Chicago, Illinois*
2004–2011: **Chairperson, Early Childhood Education.**

*Argosy University*
*Chicago, Illinois*
1/04-7/04: **Interim Campus Manager/President**

*Argosy University*
*Chicago and Chicago Northwest Campuses*
12/01-7/04: **Vice President of Academic Affairs**

*Kendall College*
*Evanston, Illinois*
09/1998-07/2000: **Vice President of Academic Affairs** (Title Change from Dean for Academic Affairs in 1999)

*Kendall College*
*Evanston, Illinois*

*Kendall College*
*Evanston, Illinois*
1995-1998: **Coordinator of Education Programs**

*National-Louis University*
*Evanston, Illinois*
1993-1996: **Research Instructor and Consultant:** The Graduate School Early Childhood Leadership and Advocacy Program

*National-Louis University*
*Evanston, Illinois*
1991-1995: **Instructor**

*University of Wisconsin-Madison*
*Madison, Wisconsin*
1986-1988: **Teaching Assistant**

*Washington University*
*St. Louis, Missouri*
1985-1986: **Teaching Assistant Fellow**

**Recent Courses Taught or Developed at UIC**

- EPSY 255: Child Development
- EPSY 405: Classroom Assessment
- EPSY 429: Constructivist Approaches to Development: Piaget and Vygotsky
Courses Taught or Developed at Other Institutions

- Adult Development and Learning for the Community College
- Early Childhood Instructional Methods/Primary/Language Arts and Social Studies
- Cognition and Learning
- Student Teaching Seminar
- Child Development
- Child Family and Community
- Early Childhood Curriculum
- Grant Writing
- Ethics
- Child Family Community
- Infant Toddler Growth and Development
- Infant Toddler Curriculum and Teaching
- Early Childhood Intervention Screening and Assessment
- Developing Language and Cognition in Early Childhood Programs
- Best Practices in Early Childhood for Children and Families
- Home-School Relations for Early Childhood
- Ethics and Professionalism in Early Childhood
- Life Span Development
- Theories of Personality
- Abnormal Psychology
- Research Methods
- Statistics
- Family and Community Relationships

Dissertation Committees at UIC

- Flori Manning: Defended January 2014
- Melissa Kelly: Defended February 2014
- Stacy Gherardi: Defending proposal 2015
- Cindy Collado: Defended October 2015
- Larry DeHaan: Defended Proposal March 2016
- Tanginia May: Formed Committee: 2017
- Bill Trapp: Defended Proposal: May 2017
- Sierra Ryan: Defended Proposal: May 2019

Selected Service to the Profession and Community

- President: Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher educators (IAECTE) 2010-2013
- Past President: Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher educators (IAECTE) 2013-present
• Secretary: Illinois Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators (ILAECTE) 2015-present
• Member: Advisory Board: Erikson Early Care Portal project 2015-present
• Member of the working group: KIDS Criterion Zone Boundary Work. Run by: Illinois State Board of Education, WestED and the University of California-Berkeley April 2016
• Illinois Professional Development Advisory Council (PDAC) 2010-present
• Member: American Psychological Association Accreditation Review Team: 2002-present.
• Illinois Gateways to Opportunity Higher Education Forum Planning Committee: Member 2019-present
• Illinois Gateways to Opportunity Faculty Fellow: 2019-present
• IAI Early Childhood Education Panel: 2018-Present

Selected Recent Invited Speaking Engagements

• Chicago Mercantile Exchange Foundation: Invited presentation: October 2018
• Chicago Mayors Office Early Learning Research Symposium: Invited presentation: June 2017
• Erikson Institute Panel Moderator: Invited Presentation: June, 2016
• Migrant Education Workshop; Early Math Matters: East Peoria Illinois, June, 2016: Invited Presentation
• Early Math Literacy: Cherry Preschool teachers and staff: Evanston, Illinois 2016
• Best Practices in Engaging Students in Online Environments: University of Wisconsin Madison, Guest Lecture: Feb: 2004

Selected Scholarship

Selected Grants

• Funded: CME Group Foundation: MATH: Math Access for Teacher and Home Care providers: Project Director and Principal Investigator 2011-2014: 456,00
• Funded: Group Foundation: MATH: Math Access for Teacher and Home Care Providers Principal Investigator 2014-2016: 200,000
• Funded: Group Foundation: Early Math Matters Principal Investigator 2016-2019: 300,00
• Funded: McCormick Foundation Grant: UIC Learning Design PK-5 Mathematics Instructional Improvement “Common Core for All Learners” Position: Co-Investigator: 400,000
• Funded: Caplan Foundation for Early Childhood: “Early Science Matters” 2019-2020: 50,00

Selected Scholarly Reviews

• Early Childhood Research Quarterly 2004- present
• the Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education 2011-present
• SAGE publishing 2004-present
• Serve as proposal reviewer for American Education Research Association 2006-present
• Serve as proposal reviewer for Society for Research in Child Development 2017-present
• Serve as proposal reviewer for Zero to Three 2017-present
• Serve as proposal reviewer for American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education
• Serve as proposal reviewer for The Chicago Metro Association for the Education of Young Children 2010- present
• Journal of Online Teaching 2011-present.

Selected Books and Articles:


Sheridan K., & Kelly M. (2010) The Indicators of Instructor Presence that are Important to Students in Online Courses. Journal of Online Learning and Teaching 6(4), 767-779.

Universities.

Selected Grants

- Funded: MATH: Math Access for Teacher and Home Care providers: Project Director and Principal Investigator 2011-2014: 456,00
- Funded: MATH: Math Access for Teacher and Home Care Providers Principal Investigator 2014-2016: 200,000
- Funded: Early Math Matters Principal Investigator 2016-2019: 300,00
- Funded: Early Math Matter: Principal Investigator 2019: 100,000
- Funded: Early Science Matters: Principal Investigator 2019: 50,000
- Funded: McCormick Foundation Grant: UIC Learning Design PK-5 Mathematics Instructional Improvement “Common Core for All Learners” Position: Co-Investigator: 400,000

Awards

- Faculty Bonus Award 2007-2008
- NAECTE and ResearchNet: Technology Leadership Award 2009-2010
- Faculty Excellence in Teaching Award 2017-18
Katherine M. Zinsser
Assistant Professor
Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago

EDUCATION

2010 – 2013
PhD in Applied Developmental Psychology
George Mason University | Fairfax, VA
Dissertation Title: Early Childhood education directors’ impact on social emotional teaching and learning

2008 – 2010
MA in Applied Developmental Psychology
George Mason University | Fairfax, VA
Thesis Title: Expression as prevention: Linking family emotional expressiveness, temperament, and adolescent substance use.

2001 – 2005
BA in Psychology
Smith College | Northampton, MA

HONORS & AWARDS

2017
Rising Star, Association for Psychological Science
2017
Teaching Recognition Program Award, University of Illinois at Chicago
2017
Honoring Our Professors’ Excellence (HOPE) Mentoring Award, University of Illinois at Chicago
2015
Silver Circle Award for Excellence in Teaching, University of Illinois at Chicago
2015
Post-Doctoral Fellowship, National Academy of Education
2013
ADP Dissertation of the Year, George Mason University
2013
Graduate Student Fellowship Award, George Mason University
2012
Graduate Student Fellowship Award, George Mason University
2012
Outstanding Doctoral Student Award, George Mason University
2010
Outstanding Masters Student Award, George Mason University

1007 West Harrison Street M/C 285
Chicago, IL 60607

[O] (312) 996-5494  [F] (312) 413-4122
[C] (413) 695-2046

kzinsser@uic.edu  @SETLlab
www.setllab.com
PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS


**MANUSCRIPTS IN REVISION, UNDER REVIEW, or IN PREPARATION**


OTHER PUBLICATIONS [Op Eds, Book Chapters, Reviews, Policy Briefs, etc.]


INSTRUMENTS


POPULAR MEDIA PUBLICATIONS


PRESENTATIONS OF RESEARCH
[ † Graduate student research assistant or advisee / * Undergraduate student research assistant or advisee. ]


**CONFERENCE POSTERS**


INVITED TALKS

2019 Loyola University Chicago, Department of Psychology, Evaluating legislative attempts to disrupt the preschool-to-prison pipeline
2018 National Association of Young Children, Illinois Chapter The Role of Early Childhood Educators in Disrupting the Preschool-to-Prison Pipeline
2018 The Illinois Governor's Office of Early Childhood, Process Evaluation of Expulsion Legislation
2018 University of Missouri, Kansas City, School of Education, Research as the Catalyst for Urban Education
2018 University of Illinois at Chicago, Clinical Psychology Colloquium Series
2018 University of Illinois at Chicago, Collaborative for Young Children and Families
2017 University of Illinois at Chicago, New Faculty Orientation: Intentionally Supporting Student's Social & Emotional Success
2016 The Society for the Study of Human Development Webinar on Psychological Safety
2016 The Ounce of Prevention Excellence in the Early Grades: District Leadership Summit
2016 University of Illinois at Chicago, New Faculty Orientation: Social Emotional Teaching in Higher Education
2015 University of Illinois at Chicago, Community and Prevention Psychology Colloquium Series
2015 University of Illinois at Chicago, New Faculty Orientation: Social Emotional Teaching in Higher Education
2015 Texas Early Childhood Summer Institute, University of Texas Health Science Center
2015 Warren Township Youth and Family Services Workshop Series
2015 University of Illinois at Chicago, Cognitive Psychology Colloquium Series
2014 University of Illinois at Chicago, Early Investments Collaborative
2014 University of Illinois at Chicago, Clinical Psychology Colloquium Series
2014   University of Illinois at Chicago, Emerging Research Topics in Psychology Colloquium Series
2014   University of Illinois at Chicago, *New Faculty Orientation: Social Emotional Teaching in Higher Education*
2014   University of Illinois at Chicago, Emerging Research Topics in Psychology Colloquium Series
2014   Milwaukee SCORES Social Emotional Learning in afterschool programming
2013   University of Illinois at Chicago, Educational Psychology Seminar Guest Lecturer
2013   University of Illinois at Chicago, Emerging Research Topics in Psychology Colloquium Series
2013   University of Illinois at Chicago, Community and Prevention Psychology Colloquium Series
2013   University of Illinois at Chicago, Clinical Psychology Colloquium Series
2013   HATCH expert webinar series “Plays Nice with Others”: How Educators Can Best Support Social Emotional Learning in Young Children.
2013   George Mason University Applied Developmental Psychology Program Colloquium Series

EXPERIENCE

PROFESSIONAL ROLES/POSITIONS

2014 – Present   Visiting Scholar, *Institute for Government & Public Affairs, University of Illinois*
2014 – Present   Faculty Fellow, *Honors College, University of Illinois at Chicago*
2013 – Present   Graduate Faculty, *University of Illinois at Chicago*
2013 – Present   Assistant Professor of Psychology, *University of Illinois at Chicago*
2010 – 2013   Graduate Research Assistant, Child Development Lab, *George Mason University*
2007 – 2010   Research Associate, Administration of Justice Department, *George Mason University*
2007 – 2008   Project Coordinator, Administration of Justice Department, *George Mason University*

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

2019   Jamie Carter Award Decision Committee
2018-Present   Co-Chair Search Committee, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Community & Prevention Research
2018 – Present   Search Committee, Assistant Director of UIC Children’s Center
2017 – Present   Steering Committee, UIC Collaborative for Young Children and Families
2015 – Present   Associate Head of the Community and Prevention Research Program, *University of Illinois at Chicago*
2016 – Present   Chair, Curriculum Planning Committee – Community & Prevention Research Ph.D. program – Department of Psychology, UIC.
2015 – Present   Member of Committee on Graduate Studies – Department of Psychology, UIC
2017   Jamie Carter Award Decision Committee
2017   Clinical Faculty Teaching Evaluations Contributor
2015   Search Committee – Psychology Dept. Visiting Professor in Quantitative Methods
2015   UIC Child Clinical Training Committee
2015   Honor’s College Admissions Interviews
2014   Organizing Committee “Plants the Seeds of School Readiness” engagement event.
2013 – 2017   UIC LAS Faculty Quorum
2014   Chancellor’s Graduate Research Fellowship Program Reviewer
2014   Nancy Hirschberg Memorial Grant Decision Committee
2014   Christopher B. Keys award for early outstanding research achievement Committee Member

PROFESSIONAL & COMMUNITY SERVICE

2018-2021   Elected Board Member *Illinois Association of Infant Mental Health*
2016 – 2018   Secretary/Treasurer Social Emotional Learning Special Interest Group; *American Education Research Association*
2015 – 2018   Associate Editor *Early Education & Development*
2014  Reviewer  Head Start Standards: Social Emotional Development Domain;  
Office of Head Start
2013 – 2015  Committee Member  APA Division 15 Psych Today Committee
2010 – 2011  Vice President  Applied Developmental Psychology Student Group;  
George Mason University
2009 – 2010  Treasurer  Applied Developmental Psychology Student Group;  
George Mason University
2009  Conference Submission  American Psychological Association;  
George Mason University
2008  Colloquium Series  George Mason University

Ad Hoc Reviewer for: Early Childhood Research Quarterly, Merrill Palmer Quarterly, American Education Research Journal,  
Applied Developmental Psychology, Developmental Psychology Journal, Infant Mental Health, Early Childhood Research & Practice

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

University of Illinois at Chicago

PSCH 537  Community Psychology Practicum Experience
PSCH 533  Advanced Topics in Community Psychology (Theories of Change)
PSCH 320  Developmental Psychology
PSCH 526  Lifespan Development
PSCH 539  Current Topics in Community Psychology

George Mason University

PSYCH 231  Social Psychology [2012]
PSYCH 211  Developmental Psychology [2011]
PSYCH 100  Introduction to Psychology [2010]

ADVANCED RESEARCH TRAINING

2013  Coordinated Secondary Data Analysis – ICPSR, University of Michigan
2012  Methods for Social Research* – Dr. Patrick McKnight
2011  Mixed Research Methods – Dr. Joseph Maxwell
2011  Naturalistic Methods* – Dr. Susanne Denham
2010  Issues & Methods in Longitudinal Research* – Dr. Timothy Curby
2009  Quantitative Methods III – Advanced Regression* – Dr. Jose Cortina

*Meets the requirements for quantitative methods emphasis doctoral track at George Mason University.

MEASURES & ASSESSMENT CERTIFICATIONS

The Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS-PreK, observer & trainer)
The Denham Affect Knowledge Test (AKT)
The Challenging Situation Task (CST)
The FOCAL-T
The Minnesota Preschool Affect Checklist (MPAC)
The Emotion Elicitation and Regulation Assessment (EERA)
The Bracken School Readiness Assessment
Motivational Interviewing

PAST and PRESENT PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

American Psychological Association (APA)
Division 7 – Developmental Psychology
Division 15 – Educational Psychology
Association for Psychological Science
American Educational Research Association (SEL SIG)
Society for Research on Child Development (SRCD)
Midwestern Psychological Association
Eastern Psychological Association
Society for Prevention Research

CONSULTING

2018 – Present  PBS Kids - Family Media Engagement Program
2016  Erikson Institute – Calm Classrooms Project
2014  Curriculum Consultant, *America SCORES Milwaukee*, funded by The Greater Milwaukee Foundation

MEDIA


FUNDING

PENDING / IN PREPERATION


ONGOING GRANT FUNDING


COMPLETED PROJECTS

2015  Honors College Faculty Fellow Small Grant. *Developing a Measure of Social-Emotional Teaching in Preschool Classrooms*. Role: PI, $5,000.
2015 – 2017  Chancellor’s Discovery Fund for Multidisciplinary Research University of Illinois at Chicago. *Instrumental Variable Analysis of Head Start Center’s Compliance with Teacher Education Requirements*. Role: Co-PI: $30,000

2015 Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois. *Early Investments Initiative*. **Role: Co-I/Visiting Scholar, Y1 $69,125 Y2 $74,134 Y3 $84,825**

2014 University of Illinois at Chicago Office of Social Science Research Seed Grant. *Computerized Assessment Program for Social-Emotional Learning (CAPSEL)*. **Role: PI, $2,500**

2012 *The Role of Leadership in Creating Positive Climates in Early Childhood and Care Programs* ($400). **Role: PI**

2011 – 2013 *Teachers as Socializers of Social Emotional Learning* (TASSEL) (Funded by the Institute for Educational Sciences, Goal 1 Exploration Project, - $1,567,533. **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Susanne A. Denham, George Mason University**

2012 – 2013 *Computerized Assessment Program for Social-Emotional Learning (CAPSEL)*. (Funded by National Institutes of Health Exploratory Research Grant (R21) – $365,449 direct + indirect). **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Susanne A. Denham, George Mason University**

2010 – 2011 *Social-Emotional Assessment for School Readiness (ASSESR)* (Funded by National Institutes of Child Health & Human Development/ACF — $2,200,000 direct + indirect). **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Susanne A. Denham, George Mason University**

2007 – 2010 *Using Rewards in the Criminal Justice System: Technology & Contingency Management*. (Funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse and with Cooperation from the U.S. Administrative Office of the Courts) **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Faye Taxman, George Mason University**

2009 – 2010 *Juvenile Assessment, Referral, Placement, and Treatment Planning (JARPP)* (Funded by the National Institute of Drug Abuse) **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Faye Taxman, George Mason University**

2007 – 2010 *eCourt: Technology Transfer in Drug Courts* (Funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance) **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Faye Taxman, George Mason University**

2009 *Producing Behavior Change through Motivational Interviewing in the Fairfax County Jail*. **Role: Key Personnel, PI: June Tangney, George Mason University**


2006 - 2007 *Building Community Trust and Confidence in Prince George's County, Maryland* (Funded by the National Institute of Justice) **Role: Key Personnel, PI: Karen Amendola, The Police Foundation, Washington D.C.**

**MENTORSHIP**

[Listed by date student defended]

**THESES, PRELIMINARY EXAMS, and, DISSERTATIONS CHAIRED**

2015 Christensen, C. Dissertation Title “Training Teachers to Observe Preschoolers’ Social-Emotional Behavior”

2016 Solomon, B. Dissertation Title “Traversing the Evidence-Based Terrain: A Phenomenological Study of Teachers’ Experiences with Intervention Programming”

2016 Zulauf, C. Master’s Thesis Title “Stability and Change in Profiles of Bullying: A Person-Centered Approach”

2016 Hernandez, S. Preliminary Examination Title “Dissemination in community based participatory research with Mexican immigrants: A community engaged review of the literature”

2017 Zulauf, C. Preliminary Examination Title “Teacher-Parent Relationships as Protection against Preschool Expulsion”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Silver, H.C.</td>
<td>Thesis Title: “Ecological Predictors of Expulsion in Center-Based Preschools.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Zulauf, C.</td>
<td>Dissertation Title “Parent-Teacher Relationships: Preventing Preschool Expulsion”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Hernandez, S.</td>
<td>Dissertation Title “Process Evaluation of Dissemination in Community-Based Participatory Research”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Torres, L.</td>
<td>Maser's Thesis working title &quot;Parent comfort with and perceptions of teachers' engagement actions in Head Start classrooms&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Park, C.</td>
<td>Thesis Title &quot;Profiles of Family Child Care Provider Job Motivation and Stress&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Silver, C.</td>
<td>Preliminary Exam &quot; Looking to Community Psychology to Increase the Rigor and Relevance of Infant/Early Childhood Mental Health Consultation Studies&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADUATE COMMITTEE SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Peters, A.</td>
<td>Preliminary Examination Title: &quot;Developmental Pathways to Mania: Toward an Integrated Model of the Bipolar Prodrome and Implications for Early Intervention”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Myers, B.</td>
<td>Preliminary Examination Title: “A Multi-Level Longitudinal Investigation of the Effect of School Climate on Juvenile Delinquency”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Katz, A.</td>
<td>Preliminary Examination Title: “Effect of Comorbid Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Panic Disorder on Defensive Responding”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Jaeger, A.J.</td>
<td>Dissertation Title: “What does the Paper Folding Test measure?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Wellman, M.</td>
<td>Dissertation Title: “Examination of the Mediating Effects of Academic Mindset on the association between College-going Culture and College Success”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>Lakin, D.</td>
<td>Dissertation Title &quot; Patterns and Outcomes of Parent Participation in Flexible Paraprofessional-led Services&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>Row, H.</td>
<td>Dissertation Title: “First Time Mothers’ Beliefs, Expectations, and Experiences as They Adapt to Motherhood”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>Kraft, A.</td>
<td>Preliminary Examination Title: &quot;A systematic review of acculturation gap research.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>DaViera, A.</td>
<td>Masters' Thesis &quot; Chicago youths’ exposure to community violence: Contextualizing spatial dynamics of violence and psychological functioning&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Miller, A.</td>
<td>Master's Thesis &quot;Using Ecological Momentary Assessments (EMA) to Evaluate Companionship, Mood, and Behavior in a Sample of Racial/Ethnic Minority Youth&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Borowski, T.</td>
<td>Preliminary Exam &quot; Dancing to Social-Emotional Competence: How and Why Dance Promotes the Development of Social and Emotional Competence&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH PROJECT DIRECTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Carmona, R.</td>
<td>Honors Capstone Project &quot;Inside or Out: Comparing emotional teaching practices in the classroom and during outdoor free play&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Ejupovic, J.</td>
<td>Honors Capstone Project Title: “Belongingness in Freshman STEM classrooms”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Hussaini, Q.</td>
<td>Honors Capstone Project Title: “Teachers’ conceptualization of gender in preschool classrooms, connections to disciplinary decision making”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2017  Ponce, E.D.  Honors Capstone Project Title: “Development & validation of children’s perceptions of teachers’ contingent reactions to emotional displays”


2016  George, P.  Honors Capstone Project Title: “Perspectives of social-emotional teaching: research and practice expert agreement”

2015  Kingra, R.  Honors Capstone Project Title: “Agreement between Parent and Teacher Reports of Preschoolers’ Social Emotional Competence.”

2015  Kumar, S.  Honors Capstone Project Title: “Maternal mental health and child physical and emotional well-being.”

2014  Torres, L.  Independent Senior Research Project Title: “Teacher well-being and child social and emotional success”

STUDENT AWARDS / GRANTS

2019-2020  Silver H.C.  SRCD Pre-Doctoral Fellowship
2019  Zulauf C.  Eron Award for Outstanding Impact, UIC Dept. of Psychology ($500)
2018  Zulauf C.  Nortan Dissertation Award, Illinois Association of Infant Mental Health ($5000)
2017  Silver, H.C.  Chancellor’s Research Award ($5000)
2017  Harris, D.  Outstanding Oral Presentation at Illinois Summer Research Symposium
2017  Trujillo, M.  Outstanding Round Table Presentation at Illinois Summer Research Symposium
2017  Ponce, E.D.  LASRUI Award ($6000)
2018  Hussaini, Q.  LASRUI Award ($6000)
2018  Hussaini, Q.  First Place Social Sciences Poster, UIC Student Research Forum
2018  Carmona, R.  Honor’s College Small Research Grant ($500)
2019  Silver, C.  Society for Research on Child Development Pre-Doctoral Training Fellowship
Rebecca M. Teasdale
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Illinois at Chicago
1040 Harrison St. | Chicago, Illinois 60607
reteasd2@uic.edu | 773.318.5435

Education
Ph.D. candidate University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), Educational Psychology
Anticipated completion: May 2019
M.A. University of Iowa, Library Science, 1997
B.A. University of Northern Iowa, Biology (Chemistry minor), 1991

Position
2013-present Principal, Rebecca Teasdale Consulting, Chicago, Illinois
2015-present Adjunct Instructor, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago
2016-present Senior Evaluation and Research Associate, Garibay Group, Chicago, Illinois

Research Interests
Methodological: Valuing process in evaluation, particularly selection and integration of evaluative criteria; evaluation of initiatives to broaden participation in informal STEM education
Substantive: Learning in adulthood in the context of everyday and workplace activity; making and makerspaces; pathways in life-long, life-wide, and life-deep learning

Awards and Honors
Hardie Dissertation Award, College of Education, UIUC, 2018
Hardie Conference Travel Award, College of Education, UIUC, 2018
Russell and Janet Zwoyer Scholarship, College of Education, UIUC, 2017
Graduate College Travel Grant, UIUC, 2017
Leticia Walsh Fellowship, College of Education, UIUC, 2014-2016
Department of Educational Psychology Travel Grants (four awards), UIUC, 2015-2018

Publications
Publications (cont’d.)


Evaluation Experience

Project SYSTEMIC, National Science Foundation (INCLUDES/EAGER), 2017-present
Children Investigating Science with Parents Afterschool, National Science Foundation (AISL), 2016-present
STEM Matters, National Science Foundation (AISL), 2017-present
Strengthening Innovative Library Leaders, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2015-2018
Designing Our World, National Science Foundation (AISL), 2016-2018
Summer Research Training Program, National Institutes of Health (T35), 2016-2017
IOLab, National Science Foundation (IUSE), 2016-2017

Previous Publications (related to prior employment in molecular biology research labs)


PR/Award # U3365190035
Page e198
Previous Publications (con’t’d.)


Select Conference Papers and Posters


Select Conference Papers and Posters (cont’d.)


Previous Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>Research Assistant, Illinois STEM Education Initiative, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2016</td>
<td>Research Assistant, Department of Educational Psychology, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2013</td>
<td>Assistant Director for Public Services, Oak Park Public Library, Oak Park, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>Director of Reference Services, Schaumburg Townships District Library, Schaumburg, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Instructor, Centro Canadiense de Cultura, Santiago, Chile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2003</td>
<td>Central Library Administrator and Rockwood Library Supervisor, Multnomah County Library, Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-2000</td>
<td>Reference and Outreach Librarian, Eugene Public Library, Eugene, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1997</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, Women’s Resource and Action Center, University of Iowa, Iowa City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1995</td>
<td>Research Assistant (Scientific staff position), College of Medicine, University of Iowa and Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Iowa City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1991</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant, Department of Biology, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-preset</td>
<td>Adjunct instructor, EPSY 560: Educational program evaluation Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois at Chicago. Online asynchronous format (four semesters) and on campus (one semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Guest lecturer, INFO 490: Makerspaces Illinois Infomatics Institute, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016, 2017</td>
<td>Guest lecturer, EPSY 490: Learning in everyday contexts Department of Educational Psychology, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Guest lecturer, EOL 598: Thesis proposal seminar Department of Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership, UIUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2018</td>
<td>Instructor, Survey methods, Community needs assessment Research Institute for Public Libraries, Colorado State Library, Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2017</td>
<td>Instructor, Community needs assessment, Public library services for adults Mortenson Center for International Library Programs, UIUC, Continuing education for groups of librarians from Bhutan, China, India, Moldova, Namibia, Nepal, Romania, and Ukraine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching Experience (cont’d.)

2015  Instructor, Outcome measurement for teen programming (delivered via webinar)
Young Adult Library Services Association, Chicago, Illinois

2014-2015 Instructor, Personal finance services in public libraries (delivered via webinar)
American Library Association, Chicago, Illinois and FINRA Investor Education Foundation,
Washington, DC

2014  Instructor, Evaluation of library services, STEM services in public libraries
Summer Library Institute, Arizona State Library, Flagstaff, Arizona

2003-2004 Instructor, English as a foreign language
Instituto Chileno Canadiense de Cultura, Santiago, Chile

1989-1991 Discussion section leader and grader (Teaching Assistant), BIO 3420: Genetics
Department of Biology, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa

Service

2016-present  Ad hoc Reviewer
   Evaluation and Program Planning
   Curator: The Museum Journal
   American Evaluation Association annual meeting
   Visitor Studies Association annual meeting

2017-present  Advisor, National Impact of Library Public Program Assessment

2013-2016  Project Outcome Task Force, Public Library Association

2012-2016  Advisor, Public Library Data Service Statistical Report, Public Library Association

2012-2013  Advisor, Smart investing @ your library grant program, American Library Association

2010-2012  Committee on Research and Statistics, American Library Association

2009-2012  Executive Board, Illinois Library Association

2009  Co-Chair, Structure Task Force, Illinois Library Association

2008  Nominating Committee, Illinois Library Association

2007-2008  Co-Chair, Conference Program Planning Committee, Illinois Library Association


2006-2010  Technology in Public Libraries Committee, Public Library Association

2001-2003  Workload Measures and Staffing Patterns Committee, Public Library Association

2001-2002  Co-Chair, Intellectual Freedom Committee, Oregon Library Association

2000-2001  Intellectual Freedom Committee, Oregon Library Association

Affiliations

American Evaluation Association    Chicagoland Evaluation Association
American Educational Research Association  American Library Association
Visitor Studies Association   Public Library Association
Appendix I: Letters of Support
May 7, 2019

Catherine Main
Senior Lecturer and Coordinator of Early Childhood Programs
Department of Educational Psychology
College of Education
1040 West Harrison
Chicago, IL 60607

RE: CHICAGO EARLY CHILDHOOD PREPARATION AND PATHWAY (CECPP) PARTNERSHIP GRANT

Dear Cathy,

The City of Chicago and Chicago Public Schools have a decades long history of partnering with you to support and prepare exemplary early childhood teachers throughout the city. As the Mayor seeks to expand access to high quality preschool programs to all children throughout the City, our partnership will become even more critical to make sure that we have the workforce we need to make this vision a reality.

Therefore, we are happy to partner with you and your team at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) to establish and implement an early childhood teacher residency program that will support sixty teacher residents working in Preschool For All (PFA) programs in Chicago community-based organizations (CBOs) earn an Illinois Professional Education License (PEL) with an endorsement in early childhood education. The proposed teacher residency program and the enhanced mentoring component designed to create professional communities of teacher learning within CBOs has the potential to transform those organizations and increase the instructional effectiveness of the teachers. We value the emphasis on children’s socio-emotional learning as that directly correlates to better academic and well-being outcomes for our children.

To date, the City of Chicago has made a commitment of over $6 million in order to invest in the pipeline of professionals entering the early childhood field. This investment is a critical component of our expansion strategy, recognizing that we’ll need upwards of 1,500 professionals to adequately reach our goal of ensuring all four-year-olds have access to full-day pre-K by 2021. We anticipate growing this scholarship fund over the next two years, as the need in the field and the pipelines of professionals pursuing advanced degrees continues to
grow. As a key partner, we will direct funding from Chicago Early Learning Workforce Scholarship fund to support UIC tuition costs for teacher residents and facilitate data sharing agreements to provide the grant with the data it needs to evaluate the impact of the program.

In addition, either myself or a senior member of staff will co-chair the proposed Collaborative Impact Alliance to identify additional sustainable pathways and programs to grow and strengthen the Chicago early childhood workforce.

We look forward to building on our rich history of collaboration and collectively improving outcomes for young children and their families. Thank you for all you are doing to support Chicago’s youngest learners and the highly qualified teaching workforce needed to ensure that children are getting the education they need to be successful.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Samantha Aigner-Treworgy
Chief of Early Learning
City of Chicago
Office of Mayor Rahm Emanuel
May 11, 2019

Dear Cathy,

On behalf of Chicago Public Schools, we are happy to be a partner with you and your UIC team in the Chicago Early Childhood Preparation and Pathway (CECPP) Partnership. We appreciate the opportunity to continue our collaborative efforts to support and prepare early childhood education teachers.

CPS is the third largest school district in the country serving over 360,000 students. Our vision is that every student in every neighborhood will be engaged in a rigorous, well-rounded instructional program and will graduate prepared for success in college, career and life. In order to achieve that vision, the students of Chicago need an early start to their education, one that is safe, engaging and supportive. To that end, we are expanding our early childhood programs with the goal of ensuring all four-year-olds have access to full day pre-k by 2021. To meet this goal, we estimate that we’ll need upwards of 1,500 early childhood professionals.

Early childhood education — like education at all levels — requires effective instructors who are trained experts. Our goal is to prepare and recruit effective educators who have the skills, mindsets, and behaviors that are critical to delivering an excellent education to our young learners. For this reason, we are fully supportive of the UIC College of Education Early Childhood Teacher Residency program and we are proud to partner with UIC and the City of Chicago to bring it to fruition.

Specifically, CPS is excited to partner UIC program by identifying residency placements and supporting early childhood residents in both CBOs and CPS schools. Our school leaders and CBO administrators will serve as evaluators of teacher candidate’s performance throughout their residency. Consistent with applicable statutes and rules, the evaluators will help ensure that teacher candidates are progressing sufficiently in their residency and that they meet the high standards of both the State and the district for quality instruction prior to program completion.

In addition to building an ever-bigger cadre of talented early childhood educators in Chicago, this partnership benefits CPS in exciting ways. The research component of CECPP will help us identify the most effective and impactful components of residency programs and provide critical guidance for expansion and sustainability. We will support the partnership by facilitating access to data necessary to evaluate the impact of the program.

This partnership with UIC – and this ECE residency program – is the right move for CPS and the City of Chicago as we strive to provide high-quality early childhood education for all students across the city.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Matt Lyons
Chief Talent Officer
Chicago Public Schools
May 11, 2019

Dear Cathy,

The Governor’s Office of Early Childhood Development (GOECD) is proud to partner with the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) on the proposed Chicago Early Childhood Preparation and Pathway (CECPP) Partnership Grant. Over the past five years, our partnership with you on the National Academy of Medicine’s Pathway Implementation Project has been fruitful in inciting progress in early care and education workforce development, and we are eager to further that progress through this opportunity. This work supports our joint efforts to increase the educational attainment and diversity of the Illinois early childhood workforce, two goals of GOECD.

At GOECD, we are committed to a vision in which every young child develops to their maximum potential and thrives with the support of their families and communities. Achieving this vision requires priorities that serve families and communities, educators and the workforce, providers and settings, and service delivery systems. We are particularly dedicated to expanding the pipeline of highly qualified educators and streamlining the pathway to opportunity and advancement for that workforce, as evidenced through investment in educational reimbursements and cohort models during and after the Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge, our leadership of the Early Childhood Workforce Development Children’s Cabinet project, and our support of the Early Learning Council and various other statewide collaborations dedicated to this goal.

Therefore, we pledge our support of your proposal and look forward to continuing our partnership with you and your team at UIC to implement the goals of the CECPP. We are particularly interested in the effect that your proposed program will have on our broader early childhood workforce, and your program’s ability to further streamline and connect a historically fragmented teacher preparation pathway.

As a partner, we will help facilitate necessary data agreements to study program impact and support dissemination of key findings from the program evaluation to ECE stakeholders and policy makers.

We look forward to building on our rich history of collaboration to collectively improve outcomes for young children and their families.

Sincerely,

Cynthia L. Tate, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Governor’s Office of Early Childhood Development
A. FY19 PROVISIONAL FACILITIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE (F&A) RATES

The FY19 – FY21 F&A rates have not been finalized and approved by our cognizant Federal Agency, the Office of Naval Research (ONR). A provisional rate agreement covering the period July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019 has been approved by ONR. These rates, listed on page 2, include separate categories for Instruction, Organized Research, and Other Sponsored Activities for on-campus and off-campus projects.

- F&A Rates for Instruction, Organized Research and Other Sponsored Activities
  - Activity Type Definitions:
    - **Instruction**
      Includes all teaching (direct and indirect), course and curriculum development, and academic advising and development. Instruction also includes departmental research, defined as all research and scholarly development which: (1) is supported by University funds, (2) is not separately budgeted, (3) is not performed for a specific sponsored research agreement, and (4) is undertaken in general support of the instructional function of the institution.

    - **Organized Research**
      Includes all research and development activities that are: (1) separately budgeted and accounted for by the University, and (2) performed for specific research projects. Sponsored research means all research and development activities that are sponsored by federal and non-federal agencies and organizations. This term includes activities involving the training of individuals in research techniques (commonly called research training) where activities use the same facilities as other research and development activities and where such activities are not included in the instruction function.

    - **Other Sponsored Activities**
      Includes sponsored program activities other than instruction or organized research. This definition includes grants and contracts in support of public service, administration, student services, and the library. Not included in the definitions are fellowships, work study and gifts in support of the same.

  - **Base for Rate Assessment**
    Direct costs are those costs that can be identified specifically with a particular sponsored project, relatively easily with a high degree of accuracy. The base on which F&A will be assessed is Modified Total Direct Costs (MTDC) which includes such expenditures as salaries and wages, fringe benefits, materials and supplies, travel, services and the first $25,000 of subcontract expenditures. The MTDC excludes equipment costing $5,000 or more; subcontract expenditures in excess of $25,000; graduate assistant tuition remission; fellowships; scholarships; traineeships; patient care charges; participant support costs; and rental/lease of capital items.

  - **Application of FY19 Rates**
    Awards beginning in FY19 should be at the provisional rates provided below based on the project classification, determined by activity type (e.g. instruction, organized research or other sponsored activities) and location (e.g. on-campus or off-campus). The provisional rates used at the time of award will be adjusted to the final FY19 rates upon receipt of the approved Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA).
Continuing Projects
Under federal guidelines, rates and bases should continue for the life of the project until a competing renewal is submitted. Therefore, the University will honor the FY18 F&A web bulletin rates for continuing projects that began in FY18 or earlier. For example, the F&A rate for an on-campus, organized research project that began in FY18 (i.e. before 7/1/2018) will remain at 59.9% until the next competing continuation. Proposals for non-competing continuations, incremental funding and budget amendments for previously awarded federal projects should use the rates specified in the original award document.

Use of On-/Off-Campus Rate
The on-campus rate should be used for proposals where all work is done using University facilities. The On-Campus rate is to be assessed except when a portion of the sponsored agreement is performed at an off-campus site. The criteria for utilization of the off-campus rate consists of all of the following: (a) performance at the off-campus site must be on a continuous basis; intermittent performance is not sufficient; (b) the University personnel working or engaged on the project must be physically located at an off-campus site; and (c) the off-campus performance must be of sufficient duration; normally a full semester, summer term or period of performance of the sponsored agreement. The space on the South Campus and at 2242 W Harrison that the University leases to UIC departments is considered off-campus. The off-campus rate will be used for the off-campus portion of the work on a sponsored agreement.

Off-campus costs may include costs incurred at the off-campus site for salaries, related benefits, supplies, utility costs, rent, local travel and other similar costs, which are treated as direct. Travel to and from an off-campus site is considered an off-campus cost.

### Chicago Campus Facilities and Administrative (F&A) Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provisional FY19 Rates</th>
<th>FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Research</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsored Activities</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Off-Campus Awards (Instruction, Organized Research, and Other Sponsored)</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **F&A Rates for Clinical Drug Trials**
  - **Definition**
    These include studies performed for private sponsors which involve human subjects in drug protocols.
  - **Base for Rate Assessment**
    The base for rate assessment is total direct costs. Total direct costs include all costs charged to a sponsored program account, excluding indirect costs, costs of education allowance and administrative allowances.
  - **FY19 F&A Rate for Clinical Drug Trials**
    Clinical drug trials are assessed at a rate of 25.0%. This rate was established during FY1994 for non-federally funded clinical drug studies and is applied to Total Direct Costs (TDC)

### B. FY19 GRADUATE ASSISTANT TUITION REMISSION RATE (SPONSORED ACCOUNTS)

The Fiscal Year 2019 graduate assistant tuition remission rate will remain 42%. Salaries of graduate assistants with tuition and fee waivers are the base for the assessment of the tuition remission rate. This rate is applied to all GA/RA/TAs working on sponsored programs. Please note that the campus also assesses a "GA tuition remission benefit cost" charge on non-sponsored accounts. More information on this charge is available here: [Memo on Tuition Remission for Graduate Assistants](#).

### C. FY19 FRINGE BENEFITS RATES (PROVISIONAL AND FINALIZED)

Fringe benefit rates are updated annually and audited and approved by the Federal government near the beginning of each fiscal year. Unlike facilities and administrative cost rates, changes in fringe benefit rates are assessed immediately when they become effective, even if the budgeted rates are different. The UIC FY19 Fringe Benefit rates included in the table on pages 3 and 4 are effective July 1, 2018 with BW 15 and MN 8 pay periods (with the exception of Retirement, which is effective with BW 14 and MN 7). The Retirement (SURS), Medicare, and OASDI rates are finalized; however, the Health, Life & Dental (HLD), Termination Vacation and Sick (TVS), and Workers’ Compensation rates are provisional. Please refer to Nessie for detailed information on State of Illinois Plans, Eligibility for State Benefit Plans, and Part-Time Insurance Eligibility for additional fringe benefit eligibility information. Contact Payroll for assistance with the Substantial Presence test and for additional fringe benefit information related to residents on J-1, J-2, F-1 and F-2 visas.
The following 2 charts detail the fringe benefit costs by appointment type. The first chart below, details fringe benefit charges to sponsored accounts. The second chart on the following page details fringe benefit charges to non-sponsored accounts. The primary differences between the 2 charts are highlighted in yellow on each chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Total Fringe Benefits Rate</th>
<th>Finalized Retirement (SURS)**</th>
<th>Provisional Health, Life &amp; Dental</th>
<th>Provisional Workers’ Comp†</th>
<th>Provisional Term. Vacation/Sick</th>
<th>Finalized Medicare‡</th>
<th>Finalized OASDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Non-Academic Employees Eligible for SURS and Insurance*</td>
<td>35.15%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Non-Academic Employees Eligible for SURS, but Ineligible for Insurance*</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Student Employees Enrolled 6 hours or More (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled 3 hours or More (Summer)</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Student Employees Enrolled Less Than 6 hours (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled Less Than 3 hours (Summer)</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA/RA/TAs Enrolled 6 hours or More (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled 3 hours or More (Summer)</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA/RA/TAs Enrolled Less Than 6 hours (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled Less Than 3 hours (Summer)</td>
<td>11.21%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Residents</td>
<td>34.21%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Non-Academic Employees Ineligible for SURS and Insurance*</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Associates receive fringe benefits that are consistent with their appointment type, detailed above.
Retired employees who are rehired by the University are assessed for Term. Vacation and Sick (0.89%), Medicare (1.45%) and Workers’ Comp (0.05%). Fellowships are not assessed fringe benefits.

*Please refer to the Nessie for detailed information on State of Illinois Plans, Eligibility for State Benefit Plans, and Part-Time Insurance Eligibility.
** For employees who have elected the self-managed plan, the actual rate of 7.6% will be charged.
** The current annual compensation limit for SURS is $275,000 (for participants certified on or after July 1, 1996) and $113,644.91 for new employees hired as of January 1, 2011.
† For Auxiliary Services, the Worker’s Compensation rate is 0.27%.
‡This chart includes a Medicare charge for employees hired after 4/1/86. There are no Medicare charges for employees hired before that date.
## CHICAGO CAMPUS
**FY19 FRINGE BENEFIT RATES**
(ADMINISTRATIVE ALLOWANCES, ICR, PRIVATE UNRESTRICTED GIFTS, ETC)
This Chart Details Fringe Benefit Rates for Appointments Commonly Charged to Other Assessed Accounts; It is for Budgeting Purposes and is Not Intended to be Used as a Basis for Determining Benefits Eligibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Total Fringe Benefits Rate</th>
<th>Finalized Retirement (SURS)**</th>
<th>Provisional Health, Life &amp; Dental</th>
<th>Provisional Workers’ Comp†</th>
<th>Provisional Term. Vacation/Sick</th>
<th>Finalized Medicare‡</th>
<th>Finalized OASDI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Non-Academic Employees Eligible for SURS and Insurance*</td>
<td>34.26%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Non-Academic Employees Eligible for SURS, but Ineligible for Insurance*</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Student Employees Enrolled 6 hours or More (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled 3 hours or More (Summer)</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly Student Employees Enrolled Less Than 6 hours (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled Less Than 3 hours (Summer)</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA/RA/TAs Enrolled 6 hours or More (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled 3 hours or More (Summer)</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA/RA/TAs Enrolled Less Than 6 hours (Fall / Spring) Or Enrolled Less Than 3 hours (Summer)</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Residents</td>
<td>34.21%</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
<td>20.47%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Non-Academic Employees Ineligible for SURS and Insurance*</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Associates receive fringe benefits that are consistent with their appointment type, detailed above. Retired employees who are rehired by the University are assessed for Term. Vacation and Sick (0.89%), Medicare (1.45%) and Workers’ Comp (0.05%). Fellowships are not assessed fringe benefits.

*Please refer to the Nessie for detailed information on State of Illinois Plans, Eligibility for State Benefit Plans, and Part-Time Insurance Eligibility.
** For employees who have elected the self-managed plan, the actual rate of 7.6% will be charged.
** The current annual compensation limit for SURS is $275,000 (for participants certified on or after July 1, 1996) and $113,644.91 for new employees hired as of January 1, 2011.
† For Auxiliary Services, the Worker’s Compensation rate is 0.27%.
‡This chart includes a Medicare charge for employees hired after 4/1/86. There are no Medicare charges for employees hired before that date.
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D. GUIDANCE ON BUDGETING BENEFIT COSTS BEYOND FY19

We are publishing guidance on projected fringe benefit rates for faculty to use in their grant proposals. While estimated rates may not precisely equal the actual rates in a given year, it will certainly result in far less reallocation than if the proposal reflected a constant fringe benefit rate for the entire grant period. Depending upon agency limitations, an appropriate inflation rate (e.g., 3% to 5%) should be used to estimate fringe benefit costs beyond FY19.

This departure from our prior practice of publishing detailed fringe benefit projections is intended to provide departments with additional flexibility to more effectively budget proposals. The chart accessible via the following link has been prepared based on this guidance to help you estimate fringe benefit costs.

Please click on the link below and follow the instructions in order to calculate projected fringe benefit costs beyond FY19: https://www.obfs.uillinois.edu/common/pages/DisplayFile.aspx?itemId=995129

E. CONTACTS

Please direct any questions or concerns to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHICAGO CAMPUS CONTACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions Regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals and Budget Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Tuition Remission Benefit Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General F&amp;A and Fringe Benefit Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Other Documents

Illinois Gateways ECE credential Framework
Chicago REACH teacher performance assessment
Swivel Camera information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECE Levels</th>
<th>Education Requirements</th>
<th>Education and Training in Early Care &amp; Education</th>
<th>Work and Practical Experience in Early Care &amp; Education</th>
<th>Professional Contributions in Early Care &amp; Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>30 points in the ECE Content Areas (of level 5 benchmarks) – of which a maximum of 6 points may be from credential approved training</td>
<td>6,000 hours of documented ECE related experience</td>
<td>Six professional contributions in three different areas within the last five years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>30 points in the ECE Content Areas (of level 5 benchmarks) – of which a maximum of 6 points may be from credential approved training</td>
<td>Minimum of 200 hours of ECE supervised experience or 1200 total hours of documented ECE work experience</td>
<td>Required at Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Associate’s Degree or 60+ semester hours (including the 9 semester hours listed at level 3)</td>
<td>24 points in the ECE Content Areas (of level 2-4 benchmarks) – of which a maximum of 3 points may be from credential approved training (must include 20 clock hours of ECE observation)</td>
<td>100 total hours of ECE supervised experience or 600 total hours of documented ECE work experience</td>
<td>Required at Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Three semester hours: Any Math, English, and General Education electives (Psychology, Sociology, Science, etc.) (These 9 hours must be credit bearing and nondevelopmental 100 level +)</td>
<td>18 points in the ECE Content Areas (of level 2-4 benchmarks) – of which a maximum of 3 points may be from credential approved training (must include 20 clock hours of ECE observation)</td>
<td>10 hours of ECE supervised experience or 400 total hours of documented ECE work experience</td>
<td>Required at Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>High School Diploma or GED</td>
<td>12 points in the ECE Content Areas (of level 2-4 benchmarks) – 3 points in Human Growth and Development, 3 points in Health Safety and Well-Being, and 6 points from ECE electives or 6 points in ECE electives and a CDA, CCP, or Montessori Credential through AMS* or 3 points may be from credential approved training or the ECE Credential Level 1</td>
<td>10 hours of ECE observation or 200 hours of documented ECE work experience</td>
<td>Required at Renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 1 ECE Credential is awarded through completion of a 48 clock hour training available through local Child Care Resource &amp; Referral Agencies statewide or 16 modules online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide: A point is equivalent to one semester hour of college credit.

*A: American Montessori Society (AMS) Early Childhood and Infant Toddler Credentials count for a maximum of 6 points of credential approved training for the ECE, Infant Toddler Credential, or Illinois Director Credential.
The seven content areas below encompass the depth of knowledge and skills of the ECE Credential.

**Human Growth and Development (HGD)**
Early childhood practitioners use current and emerging principles, theories, and knowledge of developmental milestones as a foundation for all aspects of their work with young children, birth through age 8, and their families. Practitioners have a curiosity about how children develop and learn, and understand the mutual influences among different domains of development, and between the child and the contexts within which s/he develops. They view child development knowledge as the core of their professional practice, and engage in ongoing learning and reflection about developmental knowledge and theory. They use their understanding as they plan and implement observations and teaching/learning interactions, and as a context for collaboration with families and other team members on behalf of children.

**Health, Safety, and Well-Being (HSW)**
Early childhood practitioners understand that children’s physical health, mental health, and safety are the foundations for development and learning in children, birth through age 8. They acknowledge the value of creating a healthful environment to foster children’s physical, cognitive, language, and social-emotional development. They collaborate with families and health professionals to provide safe, healthful environments and to adjust health, nutrition, and safety routines to children's individual needs and abilities. They take responsibility for providing multiple opportunities for children to learn habits that will ensure their health and safety.

**Observation and Assessment (OA)**
Knowledge of individual children's development and learning provides the framework for curriculum and teaching/learning interactions. Early childhood practitioners are curious about how children develop and learn, and value the roles of informal and formal observation and assessment. They understand the purposes, benefits, and uses of observation and assessment information in early childhood settings. They view observation and assessment as ways to understand children, not only as means for evaluation and accountability. They take responsibility for using a variety of age, developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate formal and informal assessments to gather and share information on each child's skills, abilities, interests, and needs birth through age 8; to monitor children's progress, and to continually evaluate and reflect on and modify their own roles and practices.

**Curriculum or Program Design (CPD)**
Early childhood practitioners have broad knowledge of appropriate curriculum for young children from birth through age 8. They understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the content disciplines, as well as the interrelationships between and among content disciplines, and developmental domains. They recognize and value the interdependence between children's relationships with others and their construction of knowledge. They view curriculum development as a collaborative, dynamic, and ever-changing professional endeavor. They take responsibility for planning and providing an emerging, anti-bias, integrated curriculum to build on each child's current abilities and interests to expand competence in all content areas and developmental domains.
Interactions, Relationships, and Environments (IRE)

Early childhood practitioners use their understanding of developmentally appropriate interactions and environments to provide integrated learning opportunities to young children from birth through age 8. They use interpersonal interactions that guide each child toward desired developmental and learning outcomes. They recognize the important teaching roles of the physical and social environments, and provide and support environments that are nurturing, pleasing, and intellectually stimulating. Environments and teaching/learning interactions reflect values about young children and families, and are sensitive to bias and to individual differences. Environments and interactions are responsive to each child’s abilities, interests, and needs, and reflect appreciation of family and community contexts and resources.

Family and Community Relationships (FCR)

Early childhood practitioners understand and value the critical role of positive, collaborative partnerships with families, colleagues, and community service agencies. They respect multiple perspectives and demonstrate integrity in conveying their own personal and professional perspectives and values. They use their knowledge of family and social systems to create reciprocal, productive interpersonal relationships that recognize and enhance the contributions of family, program, and community participants to the development, learning, and well-being of young children, birth through age 8, and their families.

Personal and Professional Development (PPD)

Early childhood practitioners identify themselves as professionals and conduct themselves as members of a significant, expanding, and changing profession. Their professional attitudes evolve with experience, professional development, and advances in the profession. They honor diversity in cultures, beliefs, and practices. They know and value the history and contributions of their profession and its related fields. They are committed to ongoing professional development, and continually reflect on and take responsibility for their own values, choices, and actions. They advocate for young children, birth through age 8, and their families, and exemplify the ethical standards of their discipline in their profession in their personal and professional interactions and activities.
### Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of:&lt;br&gt;• Content Standards Within and Across Grade Levels&lt;br&gt;• Disciplinary Literacy&lt;br&gt;• Prerequisite Relationships&lt;br&gt;• Content-Related Pedagogy&lt;br&gt;Teacher demonstrates little to no knowledge of relevant content standards within and/or across grade levels. Teacher demonstrates no knowledge of the disciplinary way of reading, writing and/or thinking within the subject area. Teacher demonstrates little understanding of prerequisite knowledge important to student learning of the content/skills. Teacher’s plans reflect little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content/skills being taught.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates knowledge of the relevant content standards within the grade level but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another and/or build across grade levels. Teacher demonstrates some knowledge of the disciplinary way of reading, writing, and/or thinking within the subject area. The teacher demonstrates some understanding of prerequisite learning, although knowledge of relationships among topics may be inaccurate or incomplete. Teacher's plans reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content/skills being taught.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates knowledge of the relevant content standards, within and across grade levels. Teacher demonstrates knowledge of the disciplinary way of reading, writing, and/or thinking within the subject area. Teacher demonstrates accurate understanding of prerequisite learning and relationships among topics and concepts. Teacher’s plans reflect a range of effective pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content/skills being taught.</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates knowledge of the relevant content standards within the grade level and across grade levels, as well as how these standards relate to other disciplines. Teacher’s plans demonstrate extensive knowledge of the disciplinary way of reading, writing, and/or thinking within the subject area. Teacher demonstrates deep understanding of prerequisite learning and relationships among topics and concepts. Teacher’s plans include a range of effective pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content/skills being taught and anticipate student misconceptions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</strong>&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of:&lt;br&gt;• Child and Adolescent Development&lt;br&gt;• The Learning Process&lt;br&gt;• Students’ Skills, Knowledge, and Language Proficiency&lt;br&gt;• Students’ Interests and Cultural Heritage&lt;br&gt;• Students’ Special Needs and Appropriate Accommodations/Modifications&lt;br&gt;The teacher demonstrates little to no understanding of how students learn and does not attain information about levels of development. Teacher does not gather knowledge about students’ backgrounds, cultures, prior knowledge, skills, language proficiencies, learning styles, interests, and special needs and does not indicate that such knowledge informs teacher’s practice.</td>
<td>The teacher displays generally accurate knowledge of how students learn and attains information about levels of development for the class as a whole. Teacher gathers some knowledge about some students’ backgrounds, cultures, prior knowledge, skills, language proficiencies, learning styles, interests, and special needs.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for groups of students. Teacher purposefully gathers information from several sources about most students’ backgrounds, cultures, prior knowledge, skills, language proficiencies, learning styles, interests, and special needs.</td>
<td>The teacher demonstrates an understanding of the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for individual students. Teacher purposefully and continually gathers information from several sources about all students’ individual backgrounds, cultures, prior knowledge, skills, language proficiencies, learning styles, multiple intelligences, interests, and special needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The CPS Framework for Teaching

Adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c: Selecting Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Learning objectives are not standards-based, are unclear, or are stated as activities rather than as student learning outcomes, prohibiting a feasible method of assessment. Teacher does not sequence and align learning objectives to build toward deep understanding and mastery of the standards. Objectives reflect only one type of learning and/or only one discipline.</td>
<td>Learning objectives are partially standards-based, clear, written in the form of student learning outcomes, aligned to methods of assessment, and/or are only written for the class as a whole. Teacher demonstrates an attempt to sequence and align some standards-based learning objectives, but does not build toward deep understanding or mastery of the standards. Objectives reflect more than one type of learning, but teacher has made no attempt at coordination of the disciplines.</td>
<td>Learning objectives are standards-based, clear, written in the form of student learning outcomes, aligned to methods of assessment, and varied in whatever way is needed to account for individual students' needs. Teacher sequences and aligns standards-based objectives to build toward deep understanding, mastery of the standards, and meaningful authentic application. Objectives reflect several different types of learning and invite opportunities for coordination within and across the disciplines.</td>
<td>Learning objectives are standards-based, clear, written in the form of student learning outcomes, aligned to methods of assessment, and varied in whatever way is needed to account for individual students' needs. Teacher sequences and aligns standards-based objectives to build toward deep understanding, mastery of the standards, and meaningful authentic application. Objectives reflect several different types of learning and provide multiple opportunities for coordination and integration within and across the disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d: Designing Coherent Instruction</td>
<td>Teacher does not coordinate knowledge of content, students, and resources to design units and lessons. Learning tasks are not aligned to objectives. Tasks are not cognitively challenging and do not require students to provide evidence of their reasoning. There is no evidence of scaffolding and differentiation for students to access the content/skills. The progression of tasks is not coherent and has unrealistic time allocations. Units and lessons do not include grade-appropriate levels of texts and/or other materials and do not represent a cognitive challenge. The lesson or unit does not have a recognizable structure and makes no use of instructional groupings to support the learning objectives.</td>
<td>Teacher coordinates some knowledge of content, students, and resources to design units and lessons. Learning tasks are partially aligned to objectives. Tasks are cognitively challenging, designed for the class as a whole, and occasionally require students to provide evidence of their reasoning. There is evidence of scaffolding and differentiation for some students to access the content/skills. The progression of tasks in units and lessons is not always coherent, and some time allocations are unrealistic. Units and lessons include grade-appropriate levels of texts and other materials that represent a moderate cognitive challenge. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure with some evidence of instructional groupings that partially support the learning objectives.</td>
<td>Teacher coordinates knowledge of content, students, and resources to design units and lessons. Learning tasks are aligned to objectives. Tasks are cognitively challenging, designed for groups of students, and require students to provide evidence of their reasoning. There is evidence of scaffolding and differentiation for most students to access the content/skills. The units and lessons are paced appropriately. Units and lessons include grade-appropriate levels of texts and other materials, representing a cognitive challenge. The lesson or unit has a clear structure with intentional and structured use of instructional groupings that support the learning objectives.</td>
<td>Teacher coordinates in-depth knowledge of content, students, and resources (including technology) to design units and lessons. Learning tasks are aligned to objectives. Tasks are cognitively challenging for individual students and require students to provide evidence of their reasoning. There is evidence of scaffolding and differentiation for all students to access the content/skills. The units and lessons are paced appropriately. Units and lessons include grade-appropriate levels of texts and other materials so every student can access the content/skills. The lesson or unit has a clear structure that incorporates student choice, allows for different pathways of instruction aligned with diverse student needs, and uses instructional groupings intentionally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CPS Framework for Teaching

Adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e: Designing Student Assessment</td>
<td>The plan for student assessment is not aligned with the standards-based learning objectives identified for the unit and/or lesson. Assessments contain no criteria or descriptors aligned to student expectations. Teacher does not select or design formative assessments that measure student learning and/or growth. Teacher does not use prior assessment results to design units and lessons.</td>
<td>The plan for student assessment is partially aligned with the standards-based learning objectives identified for the unit and/or lesson. Assessments do not clearly identify and/or describe student expectations. Teacher selects or designs formative assessments that measure only part of student learning or growth. Teacher uses prior assessment results to design units and lessons that target the class as a whole.</td>
<td>The plan for student assessment is aligned with the standards-based learning objectives identified for the unit and/or lesson. Assessment methodologies are designed or adapted for groups of students as needed. Assessments clearly identify and describe student expectations and provide descriptors. Teacher selects and designs formative assessments that accurately measure student learning and/or growth. Teacher uses prior assessment results to design units and lessons that target groups of students.</td>
<td>The plan for student assessment is aligned with the standards-based learning objectives identified for the unit and lesson. Assessment methodologies have been designed or adapted for individual students as needed. Assessment criteria are thorough, describe high expectations for students, and provide clear descriptors. Teacher’s formative assessments are complex, well designed or selected, and tailored for individual students, when necessary, in order to measure varying degrees of each student’s learning and growth effectively. Teacher uses assessment results to design units and lessons that target the diverse needs of every student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CPS Framework for Teaching
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**Domain 2: The Classroom Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Teacher Interactions with Students&lt;br&gt;• Student Interactions with Other Students</td>
<td>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are mostly negative and disrespectful. Interactions are insensitive and/or inappropriate to the ages and development of the students, and the context of the class. The net result of interactions has a negative impact on students emotionally and/or academically.</td>
<td>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are generally respectful but may reflect occasional inconsistencies or incidences of disrespect. Some interactions are sensitive and/or appropriate to the ages and development of the students, and the context of the class. The net result of the interactions has a neutral impact on students emotionally and/or academically.</td>
<td>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are friendly and demonstrate caring and respect. Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful. Interactions are sensitive and appropriate to the ages and development of the students, and to the context of the class. The net result of the interactions has a positive impact on students emotionally and academically.</td>
<td>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring. Students contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. Interactions are sensitive to students as individuals, appropriate to the ages and development of individual students, and to the context of the class. The net result of interactions is that of academic and personal connections among students and adults.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Importance of Learning&lt;br&gt;• Expectations for Learning&lt;br&gt;• Student Persistence&lt;br&gt;• Student Ownership of Learning | The teacher creates a classroom culture that reflects a lack of teacher and/or student commitment to learning. The teacher fosters a culture in which there is little or no investment of student energy into the task at hand. The teacher does not convey that practice or perseverance is expected or that it results in student success. The teacher’s expectations for student learning are medium to low, with high expectations reserved for only a few students. Students do not show interest in task completion or quality. | The teacher creates a classroom culture that reflects some teacher and/or student commitment to learning. The teacher fosters a culture in which there is some investment of student energy into the learning task at hand. The teacher conveys that student success is the result of natural or innate ability rather than practice and perseverance. Teacher conveys high learning expectations for some students. Students indicate that they are interested in completion, rather than quality, of a task. | The teacher creates a classroom culture that reflects teacher and student commitment to learning. The teacher fosters a culture in which classroom interactions indicate learning and hard work. The teacher conveys that with practice and perseverance students can reach desired goals. Teacher conveys high learning expectations for all students. Students take some responsibility for their learning by indicating that they want to understand the content or master the skill rather than simply complete a task. | The teacher creates a classroom culture that reflects a shared belief in the importance of learning and hard work. The teacher conveys high learning expectations for all students and develops structures that enable practice and perseverance for each individual student. Students assume responsibility for high-quality work by persevering, initiating improvements, addressing critiques, making revisions, adding detail and/or helping peers. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c: Managing Classroom Procedures</td>
<td>Ineffective classroom routines and procedures lead to loss of much instructional time. The teacher’s management of instructional groupings, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies are ineffective, leading to disruption of learning. There is little evidence that students know or follow established routines. The teacher does not give volunteers and/or paraprofessionals clearly defined duties.</td>
<td>Partially effective classroom routines and procedures lead to loss of some instructional time. The teacher’s management of instructional groupings, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies are inconsistent, leading to some disruption of learning. With regular guidance and prompting, students follow established routines. The teacher assigns duties to volunteers and/or paraprofessionals during portions of class time.</td>
<td>Effective classroom routines and procedures lead to minimal loss of instructional time. The teacher’s management of instructional groupings, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies are consistent and effective with little disruption of learning. With minimal guidance and prompting, students follow established classroom routines. The teacher engages volunteers and/or paraprofessionals with clearly defined duties that support student learning.</td>
<td>Effective classroom routines and procedures maximize instructional time. The teacher orchestrates the environment so that students contribute to the management of instructional groupings, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies without disruption of learning. Students follow classroom routines without the teacher’s prompting. Teacher productively engages volunteers and/or paraprofessionals in tasks that make a substantive contribution to student learning and are well integrated into the classroom community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d: Managing Student Behavior</td>
<td>Teacher has not established standards of conduct. Teacher engages in little to no monitoring of student behavior. Teacher does not use positive framing to model and reinforce appropriate behavior or redirect inappropriate student behavior. Teacher does not respond to students’ inappropriate behavior, or the response is negative, repressive, and/or disrespectful.</td>
<td>Teacher has established standards of conduct, but there is inconsistent implementation so some student behaviors challenge the standards of conduct. Teacher inconsistently uses positive framing to model and reinforce appropriate behavior and redirect inappropriate student behavior. Teacher tries, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior. Teacher’s response to students’ inappropriate behavior is inconsistent and is sometimes disrespectful.</td>
<td>Teacher has established standards of conduct with consistent implementation so most students follow the standards of conduct most of the time. Teacher monitors student behavior against established standards of conduct. Teacher uses positive framing to model and reinforce appropriate behavior and redirect inappropriate student behavior. Teacher’s response to students’ inappropriate behavior is consistent, proportionate, respectful to students, and effective.</td>
<td>Teacher and students establish and implement standards of conduct. Students follow the standards of conduct and self-monitor their behaviors. Teacher’s monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive. Teacher uses positive framing to model and reinforce positive behavior for individual students. Teacher’s response to students’ inappropriate behavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students’ dignity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Domain 3: Instruction

### 3a: Communicating with Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher neither clearly communicates standards-based learning objective(s) to students nor addresses their relevance to learning. Teacher’s directions and procedures are confusing to students. Teacher’s explanation of content is unclear or inaccurate; explanations do not connect with students’ knowledge and experience. Teacher’s spoken and written language is unclear and incorrect. Vocabulary is vague, incorrect, or inappropriate for the students’ ages and levels of development, leaving students confused.</td>
<td>Teacher does not communicate the standards-based learning objective(s) to students or does not address their relevance to learning. Teacher clarifies directions and procedures after initial student confusion. Teacher’s explanation of content contains minor errors, and/or some portions are difficult to follow; explanations occasionally connect with students’ knowledge and experience. Teacher’s spoken and written language is unclear or incorrect. Vocabulary is limited or inappropriate for the students’ ages or levels of development.</td>
<td>Teacher clearly communicates standards-based learning objective(s). Teacher guides students to articulate the relevance of the objective(s) to learning. Teacher clearly explains directions and procedures, and anticipates possible student misunderstanding. Teacher’s explanation of content is thorough, accurate, and clear, enabling students to develop a conceptual understanding of content while making connections to their interests, knowledge, and experience; students contribute to extending the content by explaining concepts to their classmates. Teacher’s spoken and written language is expressive, and builds on students’ language development and understanding of content. Vocabulary is appropriate for the students’ ages and levels of development.</td>
<td>Teacher clearly communicates standards-based learning objective(s). Teacher guides students to articulate the relevance of the objective(s) to learning. Teacher clearly explains directions and procedures, and anticipates possible student misunderstanding. Teacher’s explanation of content is thorough, accurate, and clear, enabling students to develop a conceptual understanding of content while making connections to their interests, knowledge, and experience; students contribute to extending the content by explaining concepts to their classmates. Teacher’s spoken and written language is expressive, and builds on students’ language development and understanding of content. Vocabulary is appropriate for the students’ ages and levels of development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher does not ask questions, or all questions are of low cognitive challenge, requiring only short, specific, right or wrong answers. Questions are not developmentally appropriate. Teacher does not require students to construct viable arguments. Questions are asked in rapid succession with no “wait time” for student processing and response. The discussion is irrelevant to the content under study or predominantly in the form of recitations, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers. Teacher accepts all contributions without asking students to explain or provide evidence for their thinking. Few students are listening and responding to questions and answers from either the teacher or peers.</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions lead students through a single path of inquiry where answers are seemingly pre-determined, with few high-level or open-ended questions. Questions are not always developmentally appropriate. Questions are asked with limited “wait time.” Teacher attempts to create a discussion among students to engage with the content under study, with uneven results. Teacher sometimes requires students to provide evidence of their thinking or construct viable arguments based on evidence. Some students are listening and responding to questions and comments from their teacher or peers, and/or a few students dominate the discussion.</td>
<td>Teacher’s questions are low- and high-level, open-ended, and developmentally appropriate, requiring student thinking, and promoting understanding. Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate “wait time” for students to engage with the content under study and stepping aside when doing so is appropriate. Teacher requires students to provide evidence of their thinking and construct viable arguments based on evidence. Most students are listening and responding to questions and answers from their teacher and peers. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discourse.</td>
<td>Teacher uses a variety of low- and high-level, open-ended, and developmentally appropriate questions to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition. Teacher’s discussion techniques enable students to engage each other in authentic discussions about the content under study. Students formulate questions and challenge one another using viable arguments based on evidence. All students are listening and responding to questions and answers from their teacher and peers. Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discourse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The CPS Framework for Teaching

## Adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</strong></td>
<td>Tasks do not align with standards-based learning objectives. Tasks and/or text require only rote responses, do not result in active engagement, and do not challenge student thinking. Teacher does not scaffold or differentiate instruction so that all students access complex, grade-level, and/or developmentally appropriate text or tasks. The teacher’s pacing of the lesson is too slow or rushed, and tasks are not sequenced to build students’ depth of understanding. The teacher’s grouping of students is unintentional and inhibits student mastery of the content/skills.</td>
<td>Tasks partially align with standards-based learning objectives. Tasks and/or text minimally challenge student thinking, and result in active engagement of only some students while allowing others to be passive or merely compliant. Teacher occasionally scaffolds and/or differentiates instruction so that only some students access complex, grade-level, and/or developmentally appropriate text and/or tasks. The teacher’s pacing of the lesson is partially appropriate, and/or tasks are partially sequenced to build students’ depth of understanding. The teacher’s grouping of students is intentional but does not lead to student mastery of the content/skills.</td>
<td>Tasks align with standards-based learning objectives. Tasks and text are complex and challenge student thinking, resulting in active engagement of most students. Teacher scaffolds and differentiates instruction so that most students access complex, grade-level and/or developmentally appropriate text and tasks. The teacher’s pacing of the lesson is appropriate, and tasks are sequenced to build students’ depth of understanding. The teacher’s grouping of students is intentional and leads to student mastery of the content/skills.</td>
<td>Tasks align with standards-based learning objectives and are tailored so virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content. Tasks and text are complex and promote student engagement through inquiry and choice. Students contribute to the exploration of content. Teacher scaffolds and differentiates instruction so that all students access complex, grade-level, and/or developmentally appropriate text and/or tasks. The teacher’s pacing of the lesson is appropriate, and tasks are sequenced not only to build students’ depth of understanding, but also to require student reflection and synthesis of the learning. Teacher’s grouping of students is intentional and students serve as resources for each other to achieve mastery of the content/skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

- **Monitoring of Student Learning with Checks for Understanding**
- **Assessment Performance Levels**
- **Student Self-Assessment**
- **Feedback to Students**

Teacher does not use formative assessment, neither to check for completion of work nor to monitor progress and check for student understanding. Students cannot explain the criteria by which their work will be assessed and do not engage in self- or peer-assessment. Teacher’s feedback is absent or of poor quality.

Teacher sometimes uses formative assessment to monitor progress toward student understanding of the learning objectives and/or teacher checks for completion of work rather than student understanding of the learning objectives. Students can explain some of the criteria by which their work will be assessed; few engage in self- or peer-assessment. Teacher’s feedback is general and/or doesn’t advance specific learning.

Teacher uses formative assessment during instruction to monitor progress and to check for student understanding of the learning objectives. Students can explain the criteria by which their work will be assessed; some of them engage in self- or peer-assessment. Teacher provides accurate and specific feedback to individuals and groups of students to advance learning.

Teacher fully integrates formative assessment into instruction, and uses it to monitor progress, and to check for understanding for individual students. Students can explain, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the criteria by which their work will be assessed. Students self- and peer-assess to monitor their progress. Teacher and students provide individualized feedback that is accurate, specific, and advances learning.

### 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

- **Response to Student Needs**
- **Teacher’s Persistence**
- **Lesson Adjustment**

The teacher ignores students’ questions, needs, learning styles and interests; when students have difficulty learning, the teacher blames them or their home or the external environment for their lack of success. The teacher makes no attempt to adjust instruction during the lesson to meet student needs, even when students don’t understand the content or have not mastered the skill.

The teacher attempts to accommodate students’ questions, needs, learning styles and interests during instruction and accepts responsibility for the success of all students. When formative assessments show a need for intervention or enrichment, teacher attempts to adjust instruction during the lesson, but unprompted adjustments are ineffective.

Teacher accommodates students’ questions, needs, learning styles and interests during instruction. The teacher accepts responsibility for student learning and persists in seeking approaches for all students. When formative assessments show a need for intervention or enrichment, teacher makes effective unprompted adjustments to instruction.

Teacher seizes opportunities to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous world or local event and/or student interests. Teacher persists in adjusting instruction so individual student misunderstandings or advanced needs are successfully accommodated. When formative assessments show a need for intervention or enrichment, teacher makes effective unprompted adjustments that individualize instruction for students.
### Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4a: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
<td>Teacher does not describe whether or not a lesson or unit was effective or achieved its objective, or teacher misjudges the success of a lesson or unit and its impact on student learning. Teacher is not able to analyze the aspects of his/her practice that led to the outcome of the lesson and the impact on student learning. Teacher makes no suggestions about how practice could have been altered to improve the lesson or future similar lessons.</td>
<td>Teacher accurately describes whether or not a lesson or unit was effective but does not describe the extent to which it achieved its objective or its impact on student learning. Teacher is able to analyze some aspects of his/her practice that led to the outcome of the lesson and the impact on student learning. Teacher makes general suggestions about how a lesson could have been altered to improve the lesson or future similar lessons.</td>
<td>Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson’s or unit’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its objective and impact on student learning and can provide evidence to support the judgment. Teacher analyzes aspects of his/her practice that led to the outcome of the lesson and the impact on student learning. Teacher makes specific suggestions about how a lesson could have been altered to improve the lesson or future similar lessons.</td>
<td>Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson’s or unit’s effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its objective and its impact on student learning, citing many specific examples and evidence. Teacher is able to analyze many aspects of his/her practice that led to the outcome of the lesson and the impact on student learning. Teacher offers specific alternative practices, complete with the probable success of each aspect of practice could have improved the lesson or future similar lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</strong></td>
<td>Teacher has a disorganized system or no system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, resulting in errors and confusion.</td>
<td>Teacher has a rudimentary system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, requiring frequent monitoring to avoid errors.</td>
<td>Teacher has an organized system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, requiring little monitoring to avoid errors.</td>
<td>Teacher has a detailed system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records, requiring no monitoring for errors. Students contribute information and participate in maintaining the records.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CPS Framework for Teaching

Adapted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4c: Communicating with Families</strong></td>
<td>Teacher does not communicate with families to inform them of class activities, to convey an individual student's progress, nor to solicit the family's support in relationship to grade level expectations. Teacher does not engage families in the instructional program. Teacher does not respond to families' concerns, neither professionally nor in a timely manner. Teacher's communication with families is not conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner. Teacher's communication is one-way, not interactive. Teacher only communicates with families for behavioral concerns or about academic failure.</td>
<td>Teacher rarely communicates with families to inform them of class activities, to convey information about an individual student's progress, and/or to solicit the family's support in relationship to grade level expectations. Teacher engages families in the instructional program only for attendance at activities or events. Teacher sometimes responds to families' concerns in a professional and/or timely manner. Teacher's communication with families is not always appropriate to the cultural norms of students' families. Teacher's communication is interactive only when a family member initiates communication.</td>
<td>Teacher regularly communicates with families in a two-way interactive manner to discuss class activities, individual student's progress, and to solicit the family's support in relationship to grade level expectations. Teacher meaningfully engages families as partners in the instructional program (e.g. through classroom volunteering, working at home with their child, and involvement in class projects in and out of school). Teacher responds to families’ concerns professionally and in a timely manner. Teacher’s communication with families is appropriate to the cultural norms and needs of the students’ families.</td>
<td>Teacher frequently communicates with families to convey information about class and individual activities, individual student's progress and to solicit and utilize the family's support in student learning. Teacher meaningfully and successfully engages families as partners in the instructional program (e.g. through class and home volunteering, working at home with their child, involvement in class and school projects in and out of school, and parent workshops and training). Teacher responds to families’ concerns professionally and in a timely manner, providing resources and solutions to address the concerns. Teacher’s communication with families is sensitive to cultural norms and needs, with students contributing to the communication as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **4d: Growing and Developing Professionally**   | Teacher rarely, if at all, engages in professional growth activities to enhance content knowledge or pedagogical skill to improve practice. Teacher rarely meets and collaborates with colleagues or resists meeting and collaborating with colleagues. Teacher rarely, if ever, makes an effort to participate in team-based professional inquiry to advance student learning. Teacher does not volunteer to participate in a leadership and/or teaching team. Teacher resists feedback from colleagues or administrators and makes no effort to incorporate it to improve practice and advance student learning. | Teacher participates in required professional growth activities to enhance content knowledge or pedagogical skill to a limited extent and/or when it is convenient, using new knowledge inconsistently to improve practice. Teacher reluctantly meets to collaborate with colleagues, and reluctantly provides or accepts support to/from them. Teacher participates in team-based professional inquiry to advance student learning and participates in a leadership and/or teaching team only when invited. Teacher accepts feedback from colleagues and administrators with some reluctance, using feedback inconsistently to improve practice and advance student learning. | Teacher seeks opportunities for professional growth to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill and uses new knowledge to improve practice. Teacher regularly collaborates with and provides/receives support to/from colleagues. Teacher participates actively in team-based professional inquiry that advances student learning and makes substantial contribution to the school leadership team and/or grade-level/content/department teaching team. Teacher accepts and consistently uses feedback from colleagues and administrators to improve practice and advance student learning. | Teacher initiates opportunities for professional growth and makes a systematic effort to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill of self and colleagues. S/he uses new knowledge to improve practice of self and colleagues. Teacher invites meetings and initiates collaborations with colleagues. Teacher provides and accepts collegial support and feedback from colleagues. Teacher participates in and facilitates professional inquiry with school team to advance student learning and serves on a leadership and/or teaching team. Teacher welcomes and uses feedback from a variety of stakeholders (e.g. colleagues, administrators, students, parents, external education partners) to improve practice and advance student learning. |
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## The CPS Framework for Teaching

Adapted from the Danielson *Framework for Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4e: Demonstrating Professionalism</td>
<td>Teacher does not hold student or required school information confidential, and is dishonest in professional and student/family interactions. The teacher is not alert to students' needs, contributes to practices that result in some students being ill-served, and does not ensure that students are prepared to succeed in school, college, career, and life. Teacher makes decisions and recommendations that are based on self-serving interests. Teacher does not comply with school and district regulations. Teacher does not have a responsible or professional attendance record.</td>
<td>Teacher holds student and required school information confidential, and is honest in professional and student/family interactions most of the time. The teacher's attempts to serve students are inconsistent, and unknowingly contribute to some students being ill-served. Teacher sometimes ensures students are prepared to succeed in school, college, career, and life. The teacher's decisions and recommendations are based on limited, though genuinely professional, considerations. Teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by. Teacher has a minimally responsible or professional attendance record.</td>
<td>Teacher always holds student and required school information confidential, and displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public. The teacher is active in serving students and works to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed in school, college, career, and life. The teacher maintains an open mind in decision-making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on professional considerations. Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations. Teacher has a responsible and professional attendance record.</td>
<td>Teacher has the highest standards of integrity, always holds student and required school information confidential, and is honest in professional and student/family interactions. The teacher is proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed. The teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices so that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school and prepared for success in school, college, career, and life. Teacher takes a leadership role in decision-making for the school and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional considerations. Teacher complies fully and takes a leadership role with school and district regulations. Teacher has a responsible and professional attendance record.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMOTERS Constructs & Example Items

### Modeling
- Adult expressions of emotions and displays of regulation strategies
- The teacher vocally expresses and labels own **positive** emotions.
  - Teacher laughs or uses positive language (e.g., "Hurrah, it's Thursday!") but does not use an emotion label. (1)
  - Teacher uses emotion label (e.g., "I'm happy!") to describe his/her positive emotion (2)

### Instructing
- Information about the nature of emotions or emotional content
- The teacher labels and describes emotions during book reading (or recorded book reading). **(Check all that apply.)**
  - N/A - Teacher did not read a book or play a book recording. (0)
  - Book reading is observed, but the book does not have any obviously emotional content. (1)
  - Teacher reads books with obviously emotional content but does not expand on the emotional content of the book with the children. (2)
  - Teacher expands on emotional content of the book (labeling and/or describing emotions and emotional situations in a story (e.g., "See his tears? That means he's sad. I wonder if he's sad because his bike broke?")). (3)

### Responding
- Teachers’ reactions to children’s expressions/displays of emotion
- When the teacher perceives a behavior problem, how does s/he respond?
  - There were no perceived behavior problems (0)
  - The teacher addresses the behavior without addressing an emotion ("We don't throw blocks.") (1)
  - The teacher addresses an emotion related to the behavior problem ("That's not safe. Are you throwing things because you're frustrated?") (2)

### Relating
- Behaviors that reflect and promote positive teacher–child relationships in the classroom
- Children approach teacher for comfort ("I miss my mommy.") or affirmation ("Look at this!").
  - Not seen, no child seeks comfort or affirmation. (0)
  - At least one child does (on one or more occasions). (1)

---

**PR/Award # U3365190035**

Page e227
Swivl Camera and Cloud System Details

The Swivl™ system is comprised of a robotic swiveling base that connects to any mobile iOS or Android device, an audio recording "marker" that tracks a teacher’s movement throughout a classroom with an infra-red sensor, and a mobile app that synchronously records multiple audio and video streams around the classroom. In the current IES funded EMOTERS development grant, we use this tool to collect videos of everyday preschool classrooms for later observation and analysis.

Our configuration of this tool utilizes the motion-tracking swiveling base (Figure 1) connected to an iPad mini for recording and a single marker to capture teachers’ movement and audio. Once the Swivl is set up in the room, it can capture audio and video without further monitoring of the device. At the end of a recording session, the videos and audio data collected by this tool are securely uploaded to the Swivl™ Cloud (Figure 2) storage system over a secure internet connection where they can then be inventoried, viewed, and shared. This cloud storage system is operated by Swivl™ and maintains strict security and privacy policies like FERPA and COPPA compliances. The use of this technology and storage has been approved previously by the UIC institutional review board. A detailed view of their Privacy Policy can be reviewed here: https://www.swivl.com/privacy/. Storing our video data on the Swivl Cloud storage system provides a secure and reliable way to view and monitor our data.
Figure 1: Swivl Robot

Figure 2: Example Screen shot of Swivl Cloud interface with coaching comments on right