

# Cross-Institutional Collaboration and Reimagining toward Equity, Access, and Teacher Effectiveness: Expanding and Sustaining Project CREATE



## Table of Contents

### Introduction

#### Quality of Project Design

- A.1. Conceptual Framework and Details Underlying Programming from Goals 1 and 2
- A.2. Maximizing Effectiveness through Collaboration and Capacity Building
- A.3. Needs of Target Populations and how this Project Addresses Needs

#### Significance

- B.1. The Potential for Incorporation of Project Purposes, Activities, and Benefits into the Ongoing Program of the Agency or Organization
- B.2. The Importance/Magnitude of the Results Likely Attained
- B.3. Reasonable Costs in Relation to Numbers and Benefits
- B.4. Purposeful/Useful Dissemination of Results

#### Quality of the Management Plan

- C.1. Clearly Specified and Measurable Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes
- C.2. Management Plan (including responsibilities, timelines, and milestones)

#### Quality of the Project Evaluation

- D.1. Impact Evaluation: Rigorous approach that meets WWC Standards with Reservations
- D.2. Performance Feedback of Progress toward Achieving Intended Outcomes
- D.3. Evaluation of Implementation
- D.4. Valid and Reliable Performance Data
- D.5. Dissemination to Support Replication and Scaling

#### References

#### Appendices

- Appendix A: Documentation of Status as Eligible Applicant and Documentation of Sources
- Appendix B: Resumes/CVs of key personnel
- Appendix C: Certification of No Service Fees
- Appendix D: Letters of Support
- Appendix E: Proprietary Information
- Appendix F: Cost Share or Match Requirement Waiver, if applicable
- Appendix G: Technical Appendix
- Appendix H: Logic Model & Fidelity of Implementation Matrix
- Appendix I: Outcome Measures
- Appendix J.1: Research Studies Aligned with APs and CPPs
- Appendix J.2: Strategic Partner Goals Alignment with CREATE Logic Model/Project Plan
- Appendix J.3: Glossary of Terms
- Appendix J.4: Sample Curriculum

## **Cross-Institutional Collaboration and Reimagining toward Equity, Access, and Teacher Effectiveness: Expanding and Sustaining Project CREATE**

### INTRODUCTION

We write this grant guided by the current context in which we find ourselves—a world struggling to make sense of the horrific impacts of racism and violence on our collective humanity, most recently evidenced by shootings in Buffalo, Texas and California against Black and Brown adults and youth, just *10 days* apart. We write this grant with deep respect for teachers who found ways to take care of themselves in the face of senseless, inhuman acts, so they could enter schools ready to support students in doing the same. We write this grant acknowledging the physical, emotional, and intellectual trauma that violence and the global pandemic has had on all of us, especially people of color who experienced disproportionately high numbers of infections and loss of life during the pandemic. We understand these impacts as directly related to racist, oppressive institutional structures, including an educational system that does not provide equitable access to quality teachers and schooling. Importantly, we write this grant with the knowledge that this moment offers us an incredible opportunity for awakening--of teachers, school leaders, district staff, and beyond--as we work to catch up to where our youth need us to be. If we are to “freedom dream” (Love, 2019) of a world where teachers and students are able to *breathe deeply*, flourish, and tackle the most pressing issues of our times, then we must ensure that teacher preparation and support interrogates systems of privilege, oppression and racial injustice, and centers healing and action for teachers and youth.

To move towards these freedom dreams, Georgia State University’s (GSU’s) CREATE Teacher Residency program respectfully submits this proposal, in partnership with Atlanta Public Schools (APS) and several equity and wellness-centered local and national non-profit organizations (named below) that addresses Absolute Priority 1 [[API](#), supporting effective teachers from nontraditional pathways and providing teachers with evidence-based PD activities], as well as all 3 competitive preference priority areas—increasing educator diversity

[CPP1], promoting equity in student access [CPP2], and developing educator and school capacity to support social and emotional learning and capacity [CPP3]. We do this work through the expansion of an evidence-based 3-year teacher residency model with extensive cross-organizational, community-centered, transformative learning experiences for educators, leaders, teacher educators, and community stakeholders, driven by 4 primary goals, all tied to SEED grant program goals and to the particular priority areas outlined in the 2022 RFP:

- Goal 1: Recruit, support, and retain [AP1.1] early career educators—and particularly Black-identified educators [CPP1]—who embody justice-centered practices [CPP2] and are fiercely committed to working alongside their colleagues and the communities they serve to ensure equitable access to relevant and rigorous curriculum and classroom cultures that center healing and advocacy for all youth [CPP3]
- Goal 2: Design and enact transformative learning experiences for experienced educators working in those same schools [AP1.2], teacher educators, and university and district leaders, designed to support collaborative reimagining of publicly-funded education spaces for deep joy, flourishing [CPP3], and liberation for *all*, but particularly for historically marginalized youth [CPP2] and the teachers who serve them [CPP1]
- Goal 3: Sustain effective and financially viable models for educator recruitment, support, and retention [SEED RFP]--rooted in the principles espoused in Goals 1 and 2—and informed by knowledge (Goal 4), expertise, and commitments across institutions
- Goal 4: Ensure all research efforts are designed to benefit partner organizations via improved practices that are sustained and support useful dissemination so others may replicate this work in the future [SEED RFP]

Goals 1 and 2 are directly related to supporting and retaining a more diverse teacher workforce [CPP1] committed to promoting inclusive, equitable classroom spaces [CPP2] that support historically underserved students' social, emotional, and academic achievements [CPP3]. In short, we know critically conscious, supported, *well* teachers—and particularly teachers of color—are critical to this moment of/movement toward education for liberation for *all*. These first two goals ensure important *local impact*, namely the retention of 100 new teachers, the continued growth of an additional 300 experienced educators who will be positioned to *lead* equity and wellness work in their schools, and on the learning of up to 5,000 additional educators within the district. Goals 3 and 4 are discussed in the Significance section, as they are in service to Goals 1 and 2, and are related to sustaining and replicating this project. All key terms in this proposal

(i.e, flourishing, deep joy, achievement, equity-centered SEL) are included in [Appendix J.3](#)).

## QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN (GOALS 1 and 2)

### **A.1. Conceptual Framework and Details Underlying Programming from Goals 1 and 2**

The overall design of this proposed project (all programming and research) draws on evidence-based strategies from two studies—Young et al. (2017) and Glazerman et al. (2006), both of which meet What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards without reservations; on additional evidence-based practices and conceptual framings for teacher effectiveness especially as it relates to equity, access and wellness for teachers and youth; and on results from early years of CREATE programming previously funded through US Department of Education awards and philanthropic organizations. Goals 1 and 2 are guided by a 3-part conceptual framework that underlies project structures and activities: (1) an understanding of how teachers learn—informed by sociocultural theories of learning and WWC promising practices—that call for collaborative communities of practice for all educators and stakeholders; (2) our understanding of standards of effective practice that move us toward more justice and wellness centered schooling practices (Acosta et al, 2018; Dunn et al, 2020, Markowitz & Bouffard, 2020) that inform the content embedded in those structures; and (3) Fullan and Quinn’s (2016) coherence theory of change that provides the theoretical rationale that this proposed endeavor can be a vehicle for transformation.

#### **A.1.1. Quality, Intensity and Duration of Direct Services Provided**

As outlined below, securing funding for this project will allow us to **scale and sustain promising portions of this work**<sup>1</sup> via breadth at the individual teacher level (goal 1) including expansion beyond K-8 to include support for high school teacher residents and by breath and depth at the school level (goal 2), including expansion into more high needs schools while

---

<sup>1</sup> As outlined in the budget narrative, if we are awarded this grant, YR1 funding would go toward all expansion efforts (moving to a K-12 model, work with a psychologist re: trauma informed supports, deeper work with community organizations, etc.), while funding associated with YR2 and YR3 would support all components of the program outlined here, including sustainability work.

supporting experienced educators to lead equity and wellness work in current and new schools.

***Goal 1: Recruit/support/retain compassionate, skilled, anti-racist educators via residency***

The first goal of CREATE is to attend to Absolute Priority 1 [[AP1.1](#)] by preparing and supporting diverse teachers for work in high-needs schools through a three-year teacher residency program that will be expanded with additional funding to become a K-12 residency. This model includes three evidence-based practices developed by Teach for America (TFA) that were found to generate positive impacts on student achievement: 1) the recruitment of talented, committed individuals; 2) pre-service training that features a school-based, intensive 5-week summer learning experience; and 3) two years of inservice mentoring for residents. We draw on two studies—Glazerman et al. (2006) and Young et al. (2017)—that outline these practices in sufficient detail, meet WWC standards without reservations, and show positive impact on math achievement of students in urban schools comparable to CREATE schools (based on race and % of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch). What makes the residency model an exceptional approach to [AP1](#), however, are its enhancements of the TFA model, explored below.

***Recruitment.*** Since 1990, TFA has recruited, trained and placed thousands of high achieving graduates in high-needs schools. Unfortunately, most TFA corps members leave their positions during or just after their required two-year commitment (Anderson, 2020), a trend mirroring national teacher attrition patterns in schools serving majority low-income and majority Black and Brown students (Simon & Johnson, 2015). To address this attrition, CREATE draws residents from GSU’s undergraduate teacher preparation programs in K-8 education, where racial demographics approach the demographics of local schools, and where the majority of teacher candidates have deep knowledge of local context and the communities they aim to serve. Understanding critical teacher shortages in the US, and particularly Black-identified teachers for an increasingly diverse US student population, CREATE will expand recruitment efforts by:

- (1) Partnering with HBCUs to recruit recent graduates from colleges of arts and sciences to

- enroll in GSU's *alternative certification M.A.T. program* for 6-12 teachers [[API](#); [CPP1](#)].
- (2) An explicit focus on recruiting more special education, dual-cert teacher candidates, answering calls from district leaders for more fully certified special education teachers.
  - (3) Partnering with a national nonprofit to enroll black and BIPOC male educators with a high school diploma/GED into one of GSU's *undergraduate pathways* to teacher certification programs [[API](#), [CPP1](#)].

These shifts are purposeful; understanding the *urgent* need to recruit more committed teachers to work in high needs schools, we know we must expand our residency to include non-traditional, innovative pathways toward teacher certification [[CPP1](#)]. The partnership between GSU and APS is intentional; all GSU certification programs offer explicit instruction in adolescent development (especially as it relates to social, emotional, identity development), incorporates asset-based classroom leadership frameworks to help new teachers facilitate spaces that are safe, inclusive, culturally responsive and sustaining, and that centered deep joy for marginalized youth [[CPP2/CPP3](#)] (see [Appendix J.4](#) for sample curriculum from program coursework and [Appendix A](#) for documentation of services provided by GSU, the lead applicant).

***Supports for effectiveness and retention via a 3-year residency.*** CREATE's support for teachers in high needs schools goes beyond intentional recruitment efforts as we seek to create humanizing processes within the 3-year residency model currently supporting teacher retention. The three years of summer and school year residency experiences outlined in Table A.1 draw on TFA and New Teacher Center (NTC) models showing positive impacts on student achievement in schools with similar SES and racial demographics as those served by CREATE. TFA's model features a school-based, intensive 5-week summer experience, and TFA and NTC include two years of in-service mentoring for residents, by trained mentor teachers. CREATE utilizes and goes beyond *both* programming elements by including high quality in-school clinical experiences *for the entire year prior* to teachers becoming instructors of record in high needs schools [[CPP1](#)], including a community-based experience for preservice residents to support teachers in coming to know the communities they are about to serve. This full year experience is

followed by two additional years of support, including a year of paired-teaching (with 2 certified residents fully in charge of *one* classroom, decreasing the high student-teacher ratio found in some high-needs schools and offering new teachers peer support and coconspiratorship during their first certified year in the classroom), and a final year of supports when these new teacher residents become instructor of record in their own classroom. In all 3 years, full-time instructional mentors or coaches meet with residents weekly, use data-informed observation cycles and frequent formative feedback (similar to NTC and TFA WWC-approved approaches), and provide mentorship through observation cycles focused on unearthing inequitable and ineffective teaching practices, while also supporting residents in their journey to becoming culturally relevant, anti-racist educators [CPP2]. Importantly, all preservice and inservice programming aims to support teachers in developing the skills necessary for their own and their students' social and emotional learning and growth through the incorporation of equity-centered SEL strategies (Markowitz & Bouffard, 2020) [CPP3]. Drawing on our conceptual framework and theories of learning, we understand trauma work as key to success and flourishing for teachers and youth; as such, with new funding, we will have a full-time psychologist on staff to support our programming team and teachers who are directly supporting youth in their classrooms with trauma around community violence [CPP3]. More details on content, duration and intensity of residency programming across all 3 years, are outlined in the table below.

**Table A.1.1 Quality, Intensity and Duration of Residency (Goal 1) Services**

Program Component	Description of supports/services <i>(including intensity and duration)</i>
<b>Year 1 Summer Resident Academy (SRA1), community-based</b>	<i>One week</i> intensive summer academy (1 year prior to engagement as instructor of record) is focused on engagement with youth in <i>community settings</i> [CPP2]. Taught by university faculty and community leaders, focused on experiences and readings related to becoming a <i>community</i> educator
<b>Year 1 Residency Experiences (Y1), full year clinical experiences prior</b>	Y1 Residents enroll in evening courses taught at GSU ( <i>20 hrs/week in fall</i> ) focused on sociocultural contexts of schooling, adolescent development and rigorous/culturally responsive pedagogical practices [CPP3]. Engage in a <i>full year of clinical practice (20 hrs/wk in fall; 40 hrs/wk in spring)</i>

to being teacher of record	alongside a trained Cooperating Teacher (CT) and University Supervisor/Coach (USC) who act as a connective tissue between univ and district work (2 hrs/wk) Receive additional support via 10 full days of “Together Time” (TT) meetings to encourage connectedness with peers; experience equity-centered mindfulness training that supports social emotional learning and compassion toward self/others [CPP3]; explore racial identity and systemic privilege/oppression [CPP2]; work within/across racial affinity groups [CPP1] Financially supported with a \$18,000 stipend
Year 2 Summer Resident Academy (SRA2), summer school	Paid 5-week summer academy–30 hours each week—where newly certified teachers work alongside instructional mentors to facilitate summer school teaching, with the opportunity to lead the design and enactment of inclusive, equitable, unbiased, identity-safe environments for students [CPP2/CPP3] Taught by faculty, school-based educators, community leaders, and district reps
Year 2 Residency Experiences (Y2), now in a paired teaching context with another resident, with both listed as instructor of record	Two certified residents are paired as co-teachers, fully responsible for one classroom (40hrs/week), enabling them to collaborate and learn alongside a partner, focus on their social/emotional needs and those of their shared students [CPP3] while sharing planning, instruction, and assessment responsibilities Throughout the year each resident (a) attends TT sessions (8 full-day sessions), (b) work with a CREATE Instructional Mentor (IM) for 2hrs/week who supports them in mastery of content and equity-centered instructional practices and in using the equity-centered mindfulness skills they have been taught [CPP2/CPP3]; and (c) work with a School-Based Mentor (SBM) to develop a social connection to and sense of belonging with other equity-minded experienced educators [CPP1]
Year 3 Summer Resident Academy (SRA3), reflection from Yr1 and planning for Yr2	Two-week, paid summer academy, focused on reflection and planning for Y3 Taught by CREATE leaders and university faculty, week one involves reflection on the previous year to make meaning of what worked and where struggles persisted, while week two involves lesson-planning for Y3 that promotes students’ academic growth, social-emotional learning, and development as critically-conscious, engaged citizens [CPP2, CPP3] Optional learning experiences include institutes alongside experienced educators [CPP1] focused on access, equity and inclusion; intensive SEL work
Year 3 Residency Experiences (Y3), now serving as solo instructor of record	Final year of residency involves teaching in a classroom solo, while continuing to engage support structures of (a) several cohort “Together Time” sessions; (b) work with a CREATE IM 1-2 hr/week to accelerate mastery of content and instructional skills [CPP2]; and they can opt into (c) working with their SBM Full engagement in programming generates a \$7k stipend at the end of the year
Engagement in Alumni network	- Foster a community of connection and reflection for alumni [CPP1] via participation in bi-monthly PD to continue developing practice [CPP2/CPP3] - Includes a year long fellowship for alum who would like to solve a problem in education that affects their school, district or surrounding community

**Goal 2: Design and Enact Transformative Learning Opportunities for Experienced Educators, Teacher Educators, and Local Stakeholders**

Knowing that new teachers need access to colleagues doing similar equity and wellness

work at their schools, and leaders who can sustain these efforts, Goal 2 of CREATE brings together experienced educators, school and district leaders, and teacher educators to collaboratively reimagine publicly-funded education spaces (K-12 schools and teacher education) to ensure deep joy, flourishing [CPP3], and liberation for all, but particularly for historically marginalized youth [CPP2] and the teachers who serve them [CPP1]. These Goal 2 services– the institutes and PD experiences outlined in Table A.1.2– include advanced credentialing opportunities (an APS/GSU initiative) and use principles drawn from Acosta et al’s (2018) transformative learning framework and on Markowitz & Bouffard’s (2020) equity-centered SEL competencies. More specifically, Goal 2 activities are designed to support teachers in the examination of sources of inequities in schools and society [CPP2], to ensure that teachers have a deep understanding of adolescent development, including social and emotional needs of their students [CPP3] and to support their implementation of pedagogical practices that are inclusive [CPP2], supportive, trauma-free environments for all [CPP3]. Like Markowitz & Bouffard (2020), we know that educators understanding that race and institutional racism are *significant factors* that influence and mediate the interactions of students and teachers from different ethnic, cultural, language and social class groups, and that teachers need extensive professional development; one- or two-day workshops will not suffice. As such, our institutes include (1) week-long *Equity Centered Critical Friends (ECCF)* institutes, with follow-ups throughout the year; (2) multi-day *Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP) institutes* focused on curricular and classroom environment redesign; (3) week-long *Trauma-informed mindfulness training*, designed to ensure educators prioritize healing and wellness while engaging in the resistance and rebuilding work required to ensure equity and access for youth; (4) *year-long Equity Facilitation Fellowships (EFF)* for those who want to facilitate equity-centered work in schools; (5) *cooperating teacher training* for EEs serving as CTs; and (6) the design and enactment of *Intergenerational Learning Labs*, designed to elevate expertise of those historically

marginalized—primarily communities, youth, and teachers of color—with the explicit goal of leveraging decision-making power of others in these spaces to do something different back in their organizations toward real change in schools.

**Table A.1.2 Quality, Intensity and Duration of Experienced Educator, Teacher Educator and Stakeholder (Goal 2) Activities**

Program Component	Description of supports/services <i>(including intensity and duration)</i>
<b>Cooperating Teacher training (CTT)</b> , with opportunity for coach endorsement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PD for EEs who want to serve as CTs, focused on <b>WWC-approved</b> coaching techniques, with a commitment to compassion and equity-centered mentorship; <i>28 hours/year</i>, with full-day sessions and coaching check-in calls</li> <li>- Opportunity to take two-course sequence from GSU to earn a Teacher Support Coaching Endorsement, approved through state of GA (<i>6 credits; 2 semesters</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Equity-Centered Critical Friends (ECCF)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EE's collaborate to examine ideological, institutional, interpersonal, &amp; internalized privilege and oppression in the world and in schools, while engaging in identity work (Lyiscott, 2019) [CPP2]</li> <li>- Offered as <i>4-day institutes</i>, followed by <i>monthly</i> within school ECCF groups, <i>national conference attendance</i>, and <i>year-long support</i> for ECCF coaches</li> </ul>
<b>Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Institute (CRPI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PD for EEs who want to hone practices as culturally responsive (Ladson-Billings, 1995), sustaining (Paris, 2013), abolitionist teachers (Love, 2019); focused on curricular redesign alongside examination of classroom practices and culture to be more safe, inclusive, collaborative spaces [CPP2/3]</li> <li>- Offered as a) <i>4-day summer institutes</i> with <i>differentiated</i> follow-up by school throughout the year, with breakout sessions for context (within schools) and content (across schools but within similar content areas) in cohorts and b) <i>fall and spring 1 or 2 day mini-conferences</i> followed by <i>monthly coaching sessions</i></li> </ul>
<b>Liberatory/ Equity-centered SEL training</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PD for P-20 and non-traditional educators that promotes humanizing, anti-racist, equity-focused and liberatory experiences and practices, alongside facilitation and instruction that focuses on exploring skills, dispositions and embodiment of this framework in and out of schools [CPP3]. Offered as <i>4-day intensive institute</i>, with <i>fall and spring mini-conferences</i></li> </ul>
<b>Equity Facilitation Fellows (EFF)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PD for EEs who want to engage in deeper learning around equity and justice for historically marginalized youth, while learning facilitation skills to lead work at schools [CPP2] (<i>year-long fellowship, including school-based pilot project</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Black and BIPOC Male Educator Programming</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programming designed with Literacy Lab: Leading Men Fellowship; Profound Gentlemen-Atlanta; Annie E. Casey Foundation, designed to (1) cultivate a Black and BIPOC male educator hub in Atlanta; and (2) collaboratively map the Atlanta Black and BIPOC male educator landscape [CPP1]</li> <li>- Includes <i>2 convenings and 2 research summits/year</i>, <i>website/interface creation</i></li> </ul>

As outlined in Table A.1.2, these layered, scaffolded institutes for experienced educators

intentionally support participants' examination of self and systems, including understanding how

bias, socialization, privilege and oppression work within schools and communities, while *also* supporting educators in shifting harmful beliefs and pedagogical practices toward more humanizing, critical, relevant curriculum for youth who need it most (Acosta et al, 2018). Importantly, we understand this PD as impactful only if sustained, and include opportunities for educators to engage in year-long PD structures so that they may lead this work for years to come.

## **A.2. Maximizing Effectiveness through Collaboration and Capacity Building**

Fullan and Quinn’s (2016) coherence theory of change supports a project design aimed at transformative and lasting change. As the authors contend, individual and systems level change happens through deep collaboration and an understanding that all members of the system can effect change, if supported to do so. CREATE builds on the knowledge that strong, collaborative leaders at the individual, school and district level (Goals 1 and 2) are critical. However, Fullan and Quinn (2016) warn that, “collaboration, although important, is not enough. Groups are powerful, which means they can be powerfully wrong” and contend that collaborative work for change “must include the discipline and specificity of collective deliberation.” Authentic collaborative action and capacity building with our partners—in the cross-organizational structures and meeting spaces outlined here—is required for impactful programs that help effective, equity-centered, *well* teachers stay in schools.

### **A.2.1. Collaboration of appropriate partners for maximizing effectiveness of services**

As outlined above, we do the daily work of this project with multiple partners: (1) faculty, staff and leaders from GSU’s College of Education & Human Development (CEHD); (2) Atlanta Public Schools (APS) district, school leaders, and teachers; (3) representatives from local community organizations and academic advisors from local HBCUs; and (4) national non-profits including Literacy Lab: Leading Men Fellowship and National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR). In addition to the shared learning that happens in PD described above, we bring

together key stakeholders in three additional ways. First, as outlined in Table A.2.1, we support the development and evaluation of hybridized opportunities and roles within this work, where individuals are either hired into boundary crossing positions or participate in innovative boundary crossing work that supports individual stakeholders understanding of organizational culture, goals, priorities, while also supporting Goal 3 (explored below) related to the incorporation of project purposes and activities into home organizations. Second, with new funding, we will be able to implement intergenerational learning labs, connected to CRP institutes for experienced educators cited above. These learning labs—composed of Atlanta teachers, youth, community members, and programming staff—will help ensure that the work we are doing in Goals 1 and 2 is what is *actually* needed, serving as a feedback loop and uplifting the voices of those most impacted by harm in schools. These additional partnership structures can be seen as grassroots work, where policy and programming shifts are from the ground up, with all partners at the table, but especially those partners and stakeholders we aim to serve. As Fullan and Quinn (2016) suggest, for real change to happen, we must build in role alike support groups (our residency and veteran educator work in goals 1 and 2 designed to build local capacity), while also engaging vertical coherence teams, with cross-role groups composed of representatives from all levels within and outside organizations, to ensure equitable, justice-centered, trauma-informed wellness work across all organizations and stakeholder groups.

**Table A.2.1. Additional Collaborations for Project Partners toward Increased Effectiveness**

Collaboration Activity	Description of work <i>(including intensity and duration)</i>
<p><b>New hybrid positions and learning opportunities, in service to Goals 1, 2, and 3</b></p>	<p>Reimagined cross-organizational positions that span univ, schools, districts, including doctoral USCs who work in university and district spaces <i>(20hrs/wk)</i>            A psychologist who works with all partner organizations <i>(40hrs/wk)</i>; and a partially district funded coordinator of district-university partnership work, aimed at sustainability <i>(40hrs/wk, w/time split between organizational goals)</i>            Partnership with Literacy Lab: Leaning Men Fellowship for new pathways into teaching for Black and BIPOC males <i>(monthly meetings with internal staff)</i>            Co-teaching opportunities between university faculty, school-based teacher educators, and community organizers <i>(1 per semester, including summers)</i></p>

<b>Intergenerational Learning Lab, in service to all goals</b>	- Opportunities for Atlanta based teachers, youth (positioned as experts of their own experiences), leaders and community members to learn with and from one another toward collaborative action for change <i>(Monthly 3 hours meetings)</i>
<b>Other Cross-Organizational opportunities (embedded in Goals 3 and 4)</b>	- Sustainability summits: Partners from university, district, and state-level leadership meet to review research results and work to sustain impactful elements of this work in current funding streams <i>(monthly 2 hour meetings)</i> - Research summits: Evaluators <i>meet quarterly</i> with program staff, stakeholders and summit members to share results to inform practice, sustainability efforts

The final row lists other collaborative meeting structures designed to increase effectiveness, tied directly to goals 3 and 4. More details of those meetings are included in the sections below.

**A.2.2. Capacity building**

As we engage in project work, we keep one eye on day-to-day programming (via our management plan in section C), and one eye on various forms of capacity-building for programming. As such, all project goals guide our work to address an immediate need, while also working to build human, material, structural, and organizational capacity (TQPTA Center, 2017), as well as financial capacity (Torrez, 2019). Due to space limitations, we summarize a few key capacity-building elements as we move toward a more sustainable model.

**Table A.2.2. Capacity Building toward Sustained Results**

Capacity	Sample programming elements
<b>Human Capacity,</b> <i>“The knowledge, skills, will, and view of self...within and outside system”</i>	<u>Equity Facilitation Fellowship (EFF)</u> : The EFF program generates facilitators (18/year) for this work via year-long fellowships, ensuring schools sustain this work. These facilitators will co-design school specific PD, coaching and other supports for our CREATE schools. In addition, they will support CRP institutes, Black and BIPOC male educator work, and intergenerational learning lab work. - <u>Endorsement and Micro-Credentialing opportunities</u> : Answering district calls for more teacher leadership opportunities, we offer endorsement (i.e., coaching endorsement for educators, urban ed endorsement for residents) and micro-credentialing (i.e., CRP) that ensure teachers are prepared to continue work.
<b>Material and Financial Capacity:</b> <i>“The fiscal and staffing resources and other material supports,</i>	<u>University resources</u> : Several GSU divisions or individual faculty and staff have agreed to offer in-kind support for this work, including representatives from marketing and communications, university-level foundations office personnel, and program coordinators. GSU also supplies office and meeting space for project work. <u>District-level financial commitments</u> : Atlanta Public Schools (APS) has agreed to fund \$23,000 toward each Y2 residents’ pay, including new secondary teachers we aim to support if awarded funding, half salary for our coordinator of university-district partnerships; and has agreed to use current district funds to pay for several

<p><i>including matching funds, in-kind, space, and technological capacities.”</i></p>	<p>CREATE PD opportunities to be offered district wide.  <u>Foundation support:</u> CREATE has leveraged past federal grants to ignite new relationships with local and national foundations for matching funds, as well as local individuals for in-kind donations of time, meeting space, etc.  <u>CREATE Online:</u> This online platform will be a place for educators to access and explore content that is specifically curated in alignment with CREATE’s mission and vision. This content will include, but not be limited to talks, workshops (live and recorded), presentations, CREATE research and white papers.</p>
<p><b>Structural Capacity:</b>  <i>“Elements that exist independent of individuals, like practices and policies, etc.”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Intergenerational Learning Lab:</u> This learning lab is composed of community, student, university, and school voices, designed as a democratic space where stakeholders work together to re-imagine project components, practices. Labs will be tied to local school community contexts, and will create a structure for this work to continue even as individual stakeholders move in and out of these shared spaces.</li> <li>- <u>Shared leadership:</u> With recent support from national organizational sustainability consultants, project staff are organized into functional teams, with several co-directors serving on a leadership team designed to represent the needs of their expert teams. This structure is designed to be sustained even as key personnel leave.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Organization Capacity:</b>  <i>“Interactions among internal and external stakeholders which shape culture” that “determine the extent to which initiatives are sustained”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Programming for key stakeholders:</u> Each year CREATE will hold a retreat for school and district leaders to develop shared understandings of the long-term, money- saving, achievement-driving benefits of this work. Also, experienced educator PD is open to university, district, and community leaders</li> <li>- <u>Sustainability Summits:</u> As cited above, CREATE brings together induction partners, generating organizational capacity among external stakeholders.</li> <li>- <u>Black, BIPOC Male Educator Collaborative:</u> Building on current Black Male Educator work, we will partner with local organizations to focus on community mapping efforts and pathways for Black and BIPOC males to become educators</li> <li>- <u>Partnership with APS Center for Equity and Social Justice:</u> APS’s CESJ has invited CREATE to dream-imagine with them ways we can better and more strategically collaborate across all aspects of our organizations. This center consists of the Office of Equity Strategy &amp; Coherence (ESAC), Office of Federal Programs, Office of Family Engagement, Office of the Organizational Ombuds and works in partnership with the entire district.</li> </ul>

**A.3: Needs of Target Populations and how this Project Addresses Needs**

The proposed project—including all programming within goals 1 and 2, and associated cross-institutional collaboration and capacity building efforts shared above—is designed to support effective educator development and meet the needs of 3 key stakeholder groups: (1) Atlanta Public Schools—a district that employs over 75% teachers of color, serves 84% students of color, and 78% students who are eligible for free/reduced price lunch—aiming to increase equitable access and outcomes for youth in their schools; (2) teachers within APS schools aiming to create radically just, impactful classroom environments for their students; and (3) teacher

educators and college-level leaders in GSU's College of Education and Human Development who understand that university-based teacher preparation must be designed in partnership with districts and communities served. Of course, supporting the needs of these 3 target populations all happens in service of increased flourishing and achievement for youth as well as restored faith in public schooling as education for liberation for *all*, and we discuss how meeting the needs of these target populations through grant funds will have direct and positive impacts on K-12 youth and communities in Section B. Here, we highlight the critical needs of populations directly served, and how our project components support those needs. Additionally, [Appendix J.2](#) includes APS' and GSU's strategic plans alignment with program components.

***District needs.*** A national review of teacher turnover found that rates are highest in the south in schools serving students of color and from low-income families, especially among mathematics, special education and ESOL teachers, and that these turnover rates are due, in part, to lack of support, low salaries, and low-impact alternative certification routes (Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2019). Adding to this, an internal APS 2021 talent management survey found that only 63% of school leaders were satisfied with the applicant pool, and that there remain critical teacher shortages in the areas of special education and mathematics. With these data in mind, APS' 2022 talent management strategy—similar to many large urban districts nation-wide— includes expanded teacher residency programs and student teaching pipelines, as well as increased compensation. To meet these needs and address national teacher attrition problems, CREATE expands new teacher recruitment in the areas named above (through a K-12 residency program, and partnering with K-8 programs that provide opportunities for teachers to be dual certified in special education or ESOL). Moving beyond recruitment toward teacher retention and wellness, we know that many teachers nation-wide are citing high levels of personal stress (Oberle & Schonert-Reichl, 2016), and APS is no exception; for example, an internal APS 2021 equity survey found that the lowest scoring item on teacher well-being

surveys, consistently, is “my stress levels are manageable.” In fact, a 2022 state-wide survey of practicing Georgia teachers indicates that more than 30% of new hires are considering leaving the profession within the next five years (up from 12% in previous years), citing burnout as the number one reason for leaving. Every element of CREATE programming, including the expansion of a successful teacher residency program into more content areas, grade levels, and schools; stipends for teachers across all 3 years of the residency and/or for their roles as equity and wellness leaders at their schools; anti-racist SEL curriculum embedded in all experienced educator (including leaders) PD; and supports from a trauma-informed educational psychologist is designed to address these very specific teacher wellness needs. Additionally, expanding to 10 more schools on the southern side of Atlanta is also purposeful as teachers and leaders of these schools have determined that addressing issues of oppression stemming from deficit mindsets related to race and class, developing equity-centered, anti-racist SEL skills, and building capacity for collaboration is urgent, as reflected in APS’ strategic plans and the 2021 equity audit.

***Teacher needs.*** While general teacher burnout can leave districts with massive teacher shortages, teacher of color attrition is additionally influenced by low wages, overrepresentation in high-needs/ under-resourced schools, issues of racism, schools operating as hostile racial climates, and negative personal interactions with others (Achinstein, & Ogawa, 2011; Achinstein et al., 2010; Bartell et al., 2019; Dingus, 2008; Kohli, 2018; 2019). For teachers of color, “racial battle fatigue” can create feelings of doubt, anxiety, exhaustion, frustration, anger, and depression (Pizarro & Kohli, 2020). Results from these national studies are again reflected locally in Atlanta; results from the 2021 APS equity audit revealed that all stakeholders (teachers, leaders, community members) wanted more coverage of race and racism in class settings and amongst staff. With this in mind, CREATE includes a specific focus on anti-racist, liberatory supports for teachers, including work in racial affinity groups, supports for teachers facing racial trauma, and opportunities for white teachers and leaders to consider ways to

become allies/co-conspirators in this work. As noted in the sections that follow, supporting educator learning and wellness in these very specific ways can have direct impact on their effectiveness and ability to create inclusive, impactful learning environments for *all* youth.

*University needs.* Universities and districts are often pitted against one another, with continued narratives around theory-practice divide, prompting urgent calls for university teacher preparation faculty to be more embedded in and learn from the work of schools/school-based teacher educators and pushes for university-based teacher preparation programs to include more extensive clinical practices and new teacher induction work (Kretchmar & Zeichner, 2016).

While GSU has success in this area—see [Appendix A](#) for details—the CEHD strategic plan calls for university faculty and teacher preparation programs to maintain significant interactions with teachers, students and communities served; to create more innovative micro credentialing opportunities for graduates and others; and to support needed, impactful research—especially by researchers of color—alongside communities, all things supported by the various components of this proposal. Explored further below, the learning that happens in this project has the potential to impact many more teachers and teacher educators as GSU CEHD faculty and college-level leaders incorporate learnings back into their own organizations, and as several doctoral student facilitators of this work leave GSU to build similar programs at other universities.

## SIGNIFICANCE

### **B.1. The Potential for Incorporation of Project Purposes, Activities, and Benefits into the Ongoing Program of the Agency or Organization**

As mentioned above, Goal 2 is designed to impact over 5,000 teachers—and by extension the district’s 51,000 students—over the course of the project, including spread by depth (Coburn, 2003) in these schools to ensure sustainability of this work. We aim to accomplish this by ensuring that *all* APS educators have access to at least one full-day PD in the area of culturally responsive pedagogical practices and equity-centered SEL. Importantly, we know that for this

initiative to last, we aim to have least 2 teachers from every APS partner school (via participation in EFF fellowships, equity-centered SEL leader institutes, the Teacher Support and Coaching Endorsement 2 course sequence, and/or the micro credentialing CRP programming) positioned to *lead this work* in their schools. With piloted versions of this program in past years, we have seen great success in teachers leading very specific equity-centered initiatives in their schools (for example, one school developed and sustained racial affinity reading groups for teachers at a school grappling with racism and white fragility among staff), with support from EFF leaders. The design of the cross-institutional, intergenerational learning lab also has an eye on ensuring that the benefits of this work are built into the ongoing structures of our partner organizations by answering very specific calls from the recent 2022 APS equity audit for more authentic engagement with communities served. Importantly, while Goals 1 and 2 have immediate impact on our partner schools, teachers, and their students—with an eye on sustaining that work in schools through teacher and community leadership structures developed during the granting period—this proposal includes two additional innovative, *critical* goals, as follows:

- *Goal 3: Sustain effective and financially viable models for educator recruitment, support, and retention [SEED RFP]—rooted in the principles espoused in Goals 1 and 2 and informed by knowledge, expertise, and commitments across institutions*
- *Goal 4: Ensure all research efforts are designed to benefit partner organizations via improved practices that are sustained and support useful dissemination so others may replicate this work in the future [SEED RFP]*

Project Goal 3 is designed to ensure spread and sustainability at the systems level (authentic collaborations with more university, district, and community leaders, especially those who center Black excellence and healing in their work) that will move us toward a sustainable K-12 residency and experienced educator program that would have impacts well beyond grant funding. According to Coburn (2003), for a reform effort to be considered “at scale,” ownership over the reform must shift so that it is no longer an “external” reform, but rather becomes an “internal” reform with authority for the reform held by universities, districts, schools, teachers

and community members who have the capacity to sustain, spread, and deepen reform principles themselves. To do this work, sustainability summits will include leaders from all partner organizations, as well as a representative from the GA Department of Education, and—importantly—a financial sustainability expert from the National Center for Teacher Residencies (one of our partner organizations). Using their financial sustainability tool (Design for Impact, NCTR, 2018) and results from case studies with other partners designed to improve sustainability, we will engage in financial sustainability planning with project partners from the very beginning of the granting period, and document this work for others. Given past positive results on teacher retention and overall well being related to past CREATE work (see letter of support from ██████████, Appendix D), we are committed to building a sustainable model with additional grant funding focused on maximizing revenue and minimizing costs, always with an eye on sustaining work with impactful, positive results (NCTR, 2020). We see this as an effective way to ensure incorporation of project activities/benefits into work of APS and GSU.

Many have written about the gap between research and practice and, regrettably, universities and schools/districts are often framed as oppositional to one another (Flessner, 2014). With this in mind, project Goal 4 highlights our commitment to identifying shared research agendas across partners that not only aim to influence improvements within project Goals 1 and 2, but to ensure best practices identified by formative and summative research across the life of the project gets incorporated into the activities of partner organizations as well. To do this well, this project includes rigorous, WWC approved study designs that will document statistically significant impacts and other exploratory impacts of this work on teacher retention, student achievement, and overall wellness of populations served (see more details in Section D below, as well as a list of research studies that align with each Absolute and Competitive Priority area in [Appendix J.1](#)). Importantly, built into Goal 4 are research studies that are in alignment with district strategic plans (for example, APS’ Talent Strategy team called for evaluation of

teacher pipeline programs in order to refine recruitment and retention strategies). Designing our research studies with an eye on alignment ensures that project partners actually *want to engage* in this research process and are positioned to take action based on results of the proposed studies. Finally, as outlined in [Appendix J.1](#), qualitative research conducted by program researchers at GSU aims to provide important contextual and nuanced understanding of results of this work, shared in real time with project partners. The benefit of having researchers embedded in the design and enactment of project activities is that we can share emerging research findings from qualitative studies as we have them, while also shifting research agendas to match urgent needs of our partners to ensure the activities found to be most impactful are incorporated back into work at the university, district, and community level.

## **B.2. The Importance/Magnitude of the Results Likely Attained**

The importance/magnitude of results and outcomes likely to be attained by the proposed project fall into 2 categories: *numbers* of teachers and students impacted and what the attained outcomes could mean for students. First, *the numbers*: CREATE will recruit and retain 100 new teachers in 28 schools via sustained PD (including expansion into high schools) through WWC approved and enhanced programming within the teacher residency program (goal 1); provide intensive and sustained PD to 300 experienced educators, including up to 30 school leaders and university-based teacher educators, coming from the most high needs schools in the district, with the goal of expanding into 10 new schools by the end of the granting period, while offering district-wide PD that will impact the equity and anti-racist wellness practices of over 5,000 teachers. CREATE will also convene 10-15 teacher educators, school leaders, district staff, and community members through bi-monthly intergenerational learning lab experiences, bi-monthly sustainability summits, and bi-annual research summits that have the potential to additionally impact over 500 CEHD teacher candidates each year. Overall, this project is designed to have

impacts on over 72,000 APS students (K-12) over the grant period, and thousands more beyond the end of SEED funding as we move toward sustaining this work via Goal 3.

Next we examine the essential drivers of our work as outlined in our logic model (see [Appendix H](#)) and in Sections A and B above: (1) *What does increased teacher diversity, high teacher retention, pedagogical effectiveness, and teachers' fierce commitment to equity and anti-racist SEL practices in education mean for students?* and (2) *How do research and authentic sustainability efforts magnify the results achieved well beyond grant funding?* It is widely known that teacher turnover is high in high-needs schools, with up to 50% of teachers leaving high-needs schools within three years (Allensworth, Ponisciak, & Mazzeo, 2009). This is particularly alarming when one considers longitudinal studies that show that students impacted by high teacher turnover score lower in ELA and math (see, e.g., Ronfeldt, Loeb, & Wyckoff, 2012). As such, goal 1 of this project is designed to ensure that new teachers' are supported in their own development as effective and well teachers who *stay*, while also ensuring that new teachers are not positioned to experiment on our most marginalized and historically underserved youth. With this in mind, the most significant impact of this work is to recruit *and keep* effective, supported, flourishing new and experienced teachers teaching in high-needs schools. Considering the context of Atlanta--where schools showing the highest teacher attrition (and lowest income) also enroll majority Black students--it is also important to consider the retention of teachers of color and Black teachers in particular, as studies have shown that Black students who have Black teachers perform better on standardized tests, are less likely to drop out of school, and more likely to aspire to attend college (Dee, 2004; Gershenson et al., 2018). Importantly, teachers of color have also been found to hold higher levels of multicultural awareness and social justice commitments (Achinstein et al., 2010; Egalite et al., 2015; Hanushek et al., 2005; Kohli, 2019;

Tintiango-Cubales et al., 2015), that support the overall social and emotional well-being of historically marginalized youth. Finally, we know that residencies have positive impacts on teacher retention and student achievement (Torrez, 2020), with teachers trained through residency programs showing higher levels of effectiveness and retention in high needs schools. For these reasons, CREATE's focus on retention of teachers of color, and Black teachers in particular, is critical to serving majority Black schools in Atlanta.

However, teacher retention is only one piece of the puzzle. For example, we know that if teachers do stay, but show high levels of teacher occupational stress, students are negatively impacted (Oberle & Schonert-Reichl, 2016). We also know that *all* teachers who stay working in high needs schools need opportunities to engage in critical self-reflection and racial identity work (in racial affinity and across race), analyze forms of privilege and oppression in the world, and work alongside community-based organizations. When teachers engage in this important work they are better able to see how systemic inequities affect students (Matias, 2015); sustain students' cultures (Paris, 2012); help students explore social injustices and their own emerging identities (Conklin & Hughes, 2016); and draw on richly contextualized knowledge of community in their professional work with children and families (Murrell, 2001). We also know that teachers who engage in important and viable self-care through equity-centered, anti-racist SEL curriculum have decreased levels of stress (Laura, 2022), and also improve classroom climate and teacher-child relationships, particularly for historically marginalized youth (Gorski, 2015). The proposed project also aims to impact student achievement by providing teachers with opportunities to design and enact culturally relevant and sustaining curriculum informed by CREATE PD and localized information flowing from the cross-institutional, intergenerational learning labs, a final key lever in supporting achievement and wellness/flourishing in students.

As Noguera et al (2016) suggest, this more meaningful or “deep learning” is *essential* for closing the opportunity gap and serving all students equitably. Adding to this, offering leadership opportunities to experienced educators--such as CT training and coaching endorsements, equity fellows training, and micro-credentialing opportunities--has been found to increase retention of mid-career teachers (Grahn, 2018). Finally, in schools where there are high levels of social capital through sustained communities of practices (similar to those described in Goals 1 and 2 above), *all* student achievement is raised (Leana, 2011).

High level, this project is designed to meet the needs of historically marginalized youth who bear the brunt of an educational system designed to privilege some and marginalize others; with that in mind, we *know* this work cannot end after grant funding is depleted. Therefore, our project goals 3 and 4 around sustaining this work in Atlanta, and supporting research and dissemination practices tied directly to others replicating financially sustainable portions of this work dramatically increases the importance of this grant application and the results likely attained. For example, if results from our project show increased teacher retention in high needs schools and carefully documents ways to replicate financially sustainable portions of this work into other districts (via our confirmatory and exploratory research studies), results from this SEED project will greatly impact teacher recruitment and retention strategies, and ensure that district funding be reallocated for other important initiatives within the district (see cost-benefit section below). We also know that supporting doctoral students in this work– through research assistantships or as they work in a hybrid university supervisor coach role–means that this work will be spread to other universities and districts. We believe deeply that with this funding comes great responsibility to impact teacher effectiveness and youth flourishing locally and globally, and our efforts at sustainability and replication are always top of mind.

### **B.3 Reasonable Costs in Relation to Numbers and Benefits**

In this work, we think carefully about cost-benefit analysis. In designing the proposed budget for this project, we considered several factors. For example, when determining resident stipends, we considered cost-of-living in Atlanta and the benefits of teacher residents *not* taking on extra part-time jobs while studying to become teachers. Similarly, we engaged in a local salary study to ensure our project staff receive competitive salaries that are in alignment with district level staff as we move toward APS sustaining this model after grant funding. And while these factors are important to consider—and ground the work of our operations director—we also keep in mind the impact that this sort of programming and associated research will have on youth and communities; returning to the opening words of our narrative, we remind ourselves of the cost of *not* doing this work, as outlined in Section B.2 above. As such, our external evaluators (Empirical Education) will independently assess the annual per-student direct cost and the incremental full resource cost (time, space, and effort) by schools for CREATE, compared to the business-as-usual program. Using the “ingredients method” (Levin, McEwan, Belfield, Bowden, & Shand, 2017), Empirical will collect data and calculate costs for the primary “ingredients” used to implement CREATE. They will use CostOut (Hollands et al., 2015), to calculate total and per-participant costs, and estimate the cost effectiveness ratio. Interviews with CREATE, district, and GSU admin will yield costs of materials, training, staffing, space allocation and dollar costs of delivering the program and supports. They will then calculate the added-value of CREATE per unit cost as a ratio of impact to cost (direct and incremental). Teacher FTE and hiring costs will be obtained from publicly available data, and teacher and facilitator salaries will be obtained using U.S. DOE school and staffing surveys. Program costs for the controls will be obtained from publisher websites. For guidance Empirical will consult with the assistance offered through the “Cost Effectiveness in Practice” project funded through IES (Teachers College, n.d.).

However, what cost analysis and cost effectiveness studies cannot reveal is the short- and long-term societal return on investment (ROI) for implementing the CREATE program. For example, in an earlier study of CREATE, the retention probability of Black teachers in CREATE through their second year as teacher of record was 96%; while, the retention probability of Black teachers in the comparison group was just 63% (Jaciw, et al, 2021). The increase in retention probability due to CREATE programming is 33 percentage points. For cost effectiveness, dividing the incremental full-resource cost of CREATE by 33 points will reveal the cost-percentage-point-gain in retention probability, representing the cost effectiveness of the program. However, the ROI of this difference in retention of Black educators may be much greater.

As in Section B.2 above, we consider some of the implications and derivative benefits of retaining Black educators in teaching longer, especially for traditionally underserved students:

- (1) Greater ethnoracial matching: Shirrell et al. (2021) found that ethnoracial matching between students and teachers (e.g., Black students taught by Black educators) in elementary and middle school can decrease student suspensions. This study suggested that increasing the number of Black teachers for Black students by one standard deviation (from 40% to 80% in New York City) would result in 1,800 fewer suspensions for Black students over 10 years, and 9,000 more days in school (Shirrell et al., 2021).
- (2) Higher attendance: Lower rates of exclusionary discipline practices described in (1) means less absenteeism, which is fundamental to student success. More days in school can lead to better reading, math, and general knowledge outcomes for students (Romero & Lee, 2007), and may prevent continued patterns of absenteeism and drop-out (Hickman et al., 2007). More days in school also translates to more consistent access to school-based services like counselors, which is linked to academic and school climate outcomes like higher graduation rates and greater sense of safety, particularly in schools serving mostly Black and Brown students (Lapan et al., 2018; Lapan et al., 2001).
- (3) Higher-quality learning experience: Reduced absenteeism described above also translates to more time with *effective*

educators (IES NCES, 2009), who often have high immediacy (verbal & non-verbal behaviors that “reduce the perceived gap between themselves and their students”), which is linked to more motivated and higher achieving students (Liu, 2021). In short, sustained teacher retention—an expected impact of CREATE, especially among Black educators—is associated with a cascade of benefits and positive ripple effects on students, and especially on those traditionally underserved.

To examine outcomes such as these, and to assign a value to them, Empirical will conduct a benefit-cost analysis (BCA) study. There are three basic steps to BCA: (1) determine program cost, (2) collect impact data, and (3), calculate the value of program benefits (DeCesare & Fermanich, n.d.). To fulfill step 1, Empirical will conduct cost analysis work to understand which costs fall upon which stakeholders (e.g., districts, community partners) and which costs can be shared between stakeholders. For step 2, they will source data outlined in Section D of this proposal. The most novel work for the proposed BCA is for step 3, calculating the value of program benefits. To accomplish this, Empirical will use existing research about ROI, publicly available data, and existing data collection methods built into the impact study (Section D). For example, because past studies have shown that CREATE is linked to higher teacher retention, Empirical will survey district personnel to understand the cost to search for, hire, onboard, and train new teachers. In conjunction with teacher salary information that is publicly available in [Open Georgia](#), they will compare the cost to hire teachers versus the cost to retain teachers, which informs program benefits to APS. This calculator by the Learning Policy Institute estimates that in an urban district, the cost of losing 50 teachers each year is over \$1 million (Learning Policy Institute, 2017). Alternatively, higher retention of Black teachers may produce increased student achievement. Academic achievement may then be linked to the projected increase in lifetime earnings of students using existing research about ROI (DeCesare et al., 2017). For example, high school graduates earn \$260,000 more in lifetime earnings than high school drop-outs, and decrease their chances of living in poverty by more than half, impacting

individuals, families, and taxpayers (Breslow, 2012). Given that nearly 19,000 students did not graduate from high school in Georgia in 2021 (Georgia Department of Education [GaDOE], 2022; GaDOE, 2021), this cost is significant. However, residency programs can help. DeCesare et al. (2017) found that just from increased earnings over students' lifetime, their teacher residency program paid for itself nearly 15 times over. Thus, there are several approaches Empirical will explore to calculate the value of program benefits, and BCA outcomes, which are essential for discussions with stakeholders to negotiate sustained funding outside DOE.

While this proposal highlights possibilities with existing BCAs, the project team will also aim to conduct work that is rarely found in publicly available BCAs, like direct benefit to the families and communities CREATE aims to serve. For example, the American Psychiatric Association found that in the US, “employees with unresolved depression experience a 35% reduction in productivity” resulting in an economic loss of \$210.5 billion per year (McLean Hospital, 2020). While a staggering number, the team is also interested in exploring how increased wellness for teachers might benefit individuals and local communities. Having information about how CREATE is an asset to stakeholders (e.g., APS, community partners) will facilitate needed conversations to foster buy-in and long-term sustainability. Furthermore, understanding which costs can be shared, to lessen the burden on all stakeholders, is crucial.

#### **B.4 Purposeful/Useful Dissemination of Results**

Results from the CREATE initiative will advance knowledge and understandings in the fields of teacher preparation, induction, and university-school-district partnerships as we engage in sustained efforts to disseminate results in several critical educational and policy arenas. As outlined in Goal 4, our dissemination practices are designed with three primary aims: (a) share research in ways that support ongoing program improvements; (b) disseminate with local stakeholders to support our goal of local sustainability for this work at the end of the granting cycle; and (c) share research results in ways that are useful for those who want to replicate this

work. We outline our dissemination strategies below.

**Table B.4.1: Dissemination Strategies**

Strategy	Stakeholder Group	Description
Quarterly Research Summits	Internal CREATE staff and Sustainability Summit members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Quarterly</b> research summits with internal CREATE staff and local and state level stakeholders who also participate in the Sustainability Summits</li> <li>- Designed to share results from quarterly research reports that will support local programming improvements within Goals 1 and 2, and local sustainability efforts re: Goal 3</li> </ul>
Annual Atlanta Residency Convening	Other researchers and practitioners doing similar work in Atlanta	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>One proposal submitted</b> each year to the Annual Sources of Urban Educational Excellence Conference (in Atlanta)</li> <li>- Designed to bring together other organizations doing similar work in Atlanta for shared learning (i.e., Project NURTURE, GSU's UACM program, etc.)</li> </ul>
National Conference Presentations	Other researchers and practitioners doing this work (including SEED grantees and other residency providers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least <b>3 national conference presentations</b> per year, including presenting at EED summit or NCTR conference</li> <li>- Designed to share emerging best practices and research results for other practitioners and researchers doing this work, while also allowing researchers and practitioner presenters to get feedback from scholars in the field</li> </ul>
WWC study submission and peer reviewed journal publications	Other researchers and practitioners interested in doing similar work, especially prospective US DOE grantees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Submit <b>at least 2 journals</b> per year of the project, with the goal of having 4 published articles that come out of this work</li> <li>- Upon completion of the study, Empirical intends to publish at least <b>one WWC level research article</b> to a top-tier journal</li> <li>- Designed to reach a broad range of stakeholders aiming to do this work— teacher educators (i.e., JTE), ed policy makers (i.e., EPAA), and broader education community (i.e., AERJ)</li> </ul>
Policy Briefs	Individuals aiming to use project results to inform policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In partnership with GSU's Center for Equity and Justice in Teacher Education (CEJTE) and the National Scholars Strategies Network (SSN), project staff will ensure that research results are published in the form of policy briefs that ensure results are useful and accessible to policy makers at the local, state, and national levels.</li> </ul>
Research and practitioner book	Other researchers and practitioners interested in replicating this work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drawing on emerging and new research results, the CREATE team will work with Routledge and Teachers College Press to submit two book proposals aimed at replication (Goal 3)</li> <li>- One book will outline the research methods used across the project, highlighting the critical turn in educational research, while the other will be written for practitioners and teacher educators, focused on best practices and lessons learned</li> </ul>

Broad and varied dissemination efforts such as these are key to further development of our own work in Atlanta. Importantly, we hope that these varied forms of dissemination will positively impact the experiences of teachers and students across the nation.

## QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT PLAN

### C.1 Clearly Specified and Measurable Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Table C1.1 below outlines the goals, objectives, and projected outcomes of all project programming, including a list of measures used to evaluate progress towards outcomes.

**Table C1.1. CREATE goals, objectives, and outcomes (with measures)**

Objectives	Outcomes
<b>Goal 1: Recruit, support, and retain [AP1.1] new teachers, particularly Black teachers, who utilize equity-centered practices [CPP2] and create classroom cultures that center healing for youth [CPP3]</b>	
Increase teacher diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increased percentage of Black teachers (<i>Measure: Self-reported racial/ethnic identity on study surveys</i>)</li> </ul>
Increase yield of students from alt recruitment pathways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increased percentage of teacher candidates recruited from HBCUs to enroll into GSUs alternative route certification program for secondary teachers (<i>CREATE records</i>)</li> <li>● Increased percentage of teacher candidates recruited into high needs areas (math, ESOL, special education) (<i>CREATE program records</i>)</li> <li>● Increased percentage of teacher candidates recruited from Leading Men's fellowship into an undergraduate teacher preparation pathway (<i>CREATE program records</i>)</li> </ul>
Increase connections and wellness; increase understanding of inequities in high need schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Residents report enhanced feelings of connection and belonging (<i>Social Capital survey</i>)</li> <li>● Decreased stress (<i>Wellness logs, Maslach Teacher Burnout scale</i>)</li> <li>● Residents report incr. willingness to talk about equity issues in schools (<i>External evaluation surveys, interviews</i>)</li> <li>● Residents report deeper understandings of individual identity and systemic privilege and oppression, in relation to race/SES (<i>Interviews and observation protocols</i>)</li> </ul>
Increase pedagogical effectiveness and commitment to equity of new tchrs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Residents demonstrate improved instructional skills through the use of culturally relevant pedagogy and social-emotional learning (<i>Teacher effectiveness observations, including new tool, Yr2 case study of paired teaching</i>)</li> <li>● Residents report improved classroom climate, relationships w/ student (<i>Pride Teaching Environment Survey; Yr1 and Yr2 case studies</i>)</li> <li>● Students taught by residents show increased achievement (<i>Milestones tests</i>)</li> </ul>
Incr retention in high need schls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Residents/early career teachers commit to working in high-poverty schools during and beyond the granting period (<i>Retention data from APS Human Resources/Ga DOE</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal 2: Design and enact transformative learning experiences [AP1.2] designed to support collaborative reimagining toward deep joy, flourishing [CPP3] especially for historically marginalized youth [CPP2]</b>	
Increase connection of educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Educators report increased feeling of being respected for their craft knowledge (<i>SC survey</i>)</li> <li>● Educators report enhanced feelings of connection and belonging (<i>SC survey</i>)</li> </ul>
Increase commitment to equity in educ.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Educators report changes in classroom practices, a commitment to culturally relevant pedagogies, and incr. willingness to talk about equity issues in schools (<i>External evaluation survey, Interviews</i>)</li> </ul>

All stakeholders have better understanding of needs of communities and other stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School and district leaders, teacher educators, and univ. leaders report (1) deeper understanding of identity, privilege, oppression in systems, (2) increased understandings of the importance of teacher induction, and (3) clearer understanding of needs/desires of stakeholders served, including youth, parents (<i>Interviews, ethnographic study</i>)</li> <li>● Youth, parents, community members report increased sense of connectedness to and respect from school, district, university leadership (<i>Interviews, ethnographic study</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal 3: Sustain effective, financially viable models for tchr recruitment, support, retention [SEED RFP]</b>	
Increase collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increased knowledge sharing across partners (<i>Sustainability mtg agendas, reflections</i>)</li> <li>● Preliminary research finding presented to stakeholders in meetings (<i>Executive Summary</i>)</li> </ul>
Move toward sustainability of Goal 1 and 2 programming initiatives that are proven effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Movement toward sustainable residency model with increased support outside of federal funds (<i>case study with NCTR; implementation study</i>)</li> <li>● Financial and district/university cost-share contributions to the project increase over time (<i>Cost-share budget narrative</i>)</li> <li>● The cost of project as compared to traditional hiring/attrition is calculated and used to inform sustainability models for this work within APS (<i>cost analysis study</i>)</li> </ul>
<b>Goal 4: Ensure all research efforts are designed to benefit partner organizations and support useful dissemination so others may replicate this work [SEED RFP]</b>	
Project partners disseminate finding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Research findings presented to stakeholders regionally/nationally (<i>Presentations, publications</i>)</li> </ul>
Studies support replication efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Details are documented re: how to replicate this work (<i>via implementation and process evaluation study, ethnographic study, and case study details</i>)</li> </ul>

As outlined in the above table, our team works hard to ensure that all of our project goals, objectives, and outcomes are clear and measurable. For additional details on the inputs and outputs that support these outcomes, including the fidelity of implementation matrix for Goal 1, see the logic model in [Appendix H](#). [Appendix J.1](#) includes a description of overall project studies (that include these measures) and the connection to absolute and competitive priority areas.

## C.2 Management Plan (including responsibilities, timelines, and milestones)

Table C2.1 outlines the project management plan, highlighting key responsibilities, timelines and milestones. The skills of all key team members to lead the implementation and monitor CREATE's outcomes are highlighted in CVs (see Appendix B).

Milestone	Timeframe by School Year			Responsible Party
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	
Schedule resident cohort meetings, including "Together-Times" & ECCF	August	May of each school year		Residency Team & CREATE admitt.
IM and UCTIM mentor meetings	Weekly across grant			Mentor Lead, IMs, UCTIMs
Convene CREATE admitt team	Weekly during school year; bi-weekly in summer			Leadership Team & CREATE admitt.
Induction Collaborative (IC) Mtgs	Monthly during School Year			Leadership Team; IC members
Validate, publish teacher observ. tool for culturally-resp. pedagogy	Ongoing throughout grant period			GSU Faculty (NB), GRA, IMs
CT & SBM pairing with residents	Summer prior to SY and adjust as needed			Residency Team, school leaders
Select and train CTs and SBMs	Selection begins spring, training in summer			Residency team, school leaders, APS HR
CREATE school leaders' retreats to build buy-in, induction support skills	November of each year			Residency team, school leaders, university faculty
Redesign/adjust pre-service coursework and curric; co-instruct programming by hybridized IMs	Redesign all SY; adjusted courses taught in spring	Adjusted coursework and residency curriculum applied all school years		GSU faculty, IMs, UCTIMs, Mentor Lead
Plan Summer Resident Academy, 3 levels (SRA 1, SRA 2, SRA 3)	January through April of each school year			Mentor Lead, IM team, and GSU faculty, APS Prof development (Stroud)
Plan and conduct ECCF institutes	October, February, & June of each year			CECE team
Apply, plan, conduct Equity Facilitation Fellowship	Apply in July, monthly meetings during SY			CECE team
Plan, conduct Black Male Educator Collaborative (BMEC)	Fall & Spring of each year			CECE team & BMEC partners
CREATE team engages courses about identity, inclusion, equity	Monthly sessions across each school year			All CREATE faculty/staff
Sustainability Meetings	Monthly sessions across grant			S&D dir, leadership team, advisory council, NCTR, Empirical Education
Review evaluation reports; conduct PDSA cycles; adjust programming	Quarterly throughout grant period			Empirical Education; GSU research team; CREATE admin. team
Publish studies, present findings at local and national conferences	Ongoing throughout grant period			Empirical Education (quantitative) and GSU (qualitative) research teams

Our ability to successfully complete project tasks is not only supported by the detailed management plan shared above, but is related to the collaborative meeting structures designed for feedback and continuous improvement as we move through these tasks. Fundamentally, we believe that if programming is not working, it needs to change, and that making sense of what

does and does not work is a collaborative endeavor that happens via weekly leadership and staff team meetings, via monthly sustainability meetings, quarterly research meetings, and bi-annual critical advisor meetings (all explained in detail in the sections above). Adding to this, our ability to manage this project is supported by several years of successful efforts at project management. CREATE has been operationally successful for several years, managing programming that has been scaled from its 2012 cohort of eight residents in one school, to its current state of work with 70+ residents and hundreds of experienced educators across 15 schools (with the hope to expand to support many more high needs schools with additional funding). Our teams have never missed a reporting deadline across various federal and private foundation grants, and our implementation studies have shown high levels of fidelity to our proposed project plans. Our growth has been intentionally slow to ensure we have the capacity and expertise necessary to manage this program, and to know that the work that we are scaling is actually impactful (see letter of support from ██████████ for a summary of our past results). Adding to this, principals at all 15 schools report they are satisfied/very satisfied with CREATE programming, and all intend to grow their work with CREATE in future years (see Appendix D, letter of support, principals).

#### QUALITY OF PROJECT EVALUATION

Empirical Education Inc. (Empirical) has served as an independent evaluator of the CREATE Teacher Residency program since 2015 and we will build on this multi-year partnership with GSU, APS, GaDOE, and the CREATE team. We are deeply committed to designing and executing a rigorous and independent evaluation that will inform partner organizations, local stakeholders, and a national audience of the potential impact and replicability of a multifaceted program that centers equity and wellness for educators and students. Our evaluation of CREATE will **include process and impact studies to address research questions consistent with the Standards for Excellence in Education Research**

(SEER). In this proposal we refer to specific Standards in the order listed in <https://ies.ed.gov/seer/> (i.e., SEER 1 – 8).<sup>2</sup> Empirical has extensive experience conducting large-scale, rigorous, impact studies, as well as formative and process evaluations, including numerous evaluations for ED-funded projects (e.g., SEED and i3 grants). (CVs for Empirical team researchers are included in Appendix B). To support the four primary goals of this proposal (Sections A and B), the evaluation will include: (1) an impact study of CREATE using a design that meets WWC 4.1 Standards, (2) a study of Fidelity of Implementation (FOI) (SEER3&4), (3) a process study with frequent and rapid-cycle feedback to support CREATE reaching performance goals, with a particular focus on goals related to scaling and sustainability (SEER8), and (4) cost-analysis, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit studies (SEER5) also to support sustainability and to clarify how to achieve maximum benefit within a financially viable program model (cost-related studies are detailed in Section B.3).

**Timeline of evaluation.** Table D.0.1 shows the timeline for the evaluation and the main outcomes for CREATE residents (RES) in the three-year residency program and for whom confirmatory analysis will be conducted.

**Table D.0.1. Timeline for When Main Outcomes Will be Assessed for CREATE Residents**

	2022/23 School Year	2023/24 School Year	2024/25 School Year
RES Cohort 1*	<i>1<sup>st</sup> yr as teacher of record</i> Quality in Instruction & Equitable Instruction Student Achievement Retention Survey outcomes	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> yr as teacher of record</i> <b>Quality in Instruction &amp; Equitable Instruction</b> <b>Student Achievement</b> <b>Retention</b> Survey outcomes	

<sup>2</sup> SEER1=Pre-register studies, SEER2= Make findings, methods, and data open. SEED3= Identify interventions' components, SEED4= Document treatment implementation and contrast, SEED5= Analyze interventions' costs, SEED6= Use high-quality outcome measures, SEED7= Facilitate generalization of study findings, SEED8= Support scaling of promising interventions.

RES Cohort 2*	<i>Graduation from GSU-CEHD</i>	<i>1<sup>st</sup> yr as teacher of record</i> Quality in Instruction & Equitable Instruction Retention Student Achievement Survey outcomes	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> yr as teacher of record</i> <b>Quality in Instruction &amp; Equitable Instruction</b> <b>Student Achievement</b> <b>Retention</b> Survey outcomes
RES Cohort 3		<i>Graduation from GSU-CEHD</i> Survey outcomes	<i>1<sup>st</sup> yr as teacher of record</i> <b>Quality in Instruction &amp; Equitable Instruction</b> <b>Student Achievement</b> <b>Retention</b> Survey outcomes
RES Cohort 4			<i>Graduation from GSU-CEHD</i> Survey outcomes

**Notes.** \*Cohorts 1 and 2 will have had initial exposure to CREATE through prior funding. The proposed project will allow evaluation of their full-term outcomes and impacts in 2023/24 and 2024/25. Approximately 23 CREATE residents will be added to the study each year. **Analysis of outcomes in bold will be confirmatory.** Confirmatory analyses are planned depending on when we expect to observe minimally detectable effects. For classroom observation-based outcomes (quality in instruction) this will be by the second year, and impacts will be evaluated across Cohorts 1- 3. For retention and achievement we expect to detect impacts in the third year, and they will be evaluated for Cohorts 1 and 2 only.

Each year of the project, approximately 40 Cooperating Teachers (CT) will join CREATE and participate in intensive professional learning sessions, receive ongoing coaching support, and mentor a CREATE resident. Similarly, approximately 310 Experienced Educators (EE) will participate and collaborate in various sustained CREATE professional learning experiences. See Table A.1.2 in section A for more detail on each professional learning experience. Analysis of outcomes for CTs and EEs will be exploratory. For CTs, we will explore impacts on their quality in instruction and equitable instruction (via classroom observations), retention in teaching, student achievement of the students they teach, and various survey outcomes (see list of mediating impacts in Table D1.1). For EEs, we will explore trends over time descriptively for various survey outcomes (see list of mediating impacts in Table D1.1).

### D.1. Impact Evaluation: Rigorous approach that meets WWC Standards with Reservations

**D1.1. Confirmatory and exploratory research questions for CREATE.** CREATE is a comprehensive teacher residency program emphasizing cultural responsiveness of classroom pedagogy, development of socioemotional competencies and resilience, and the interruption and rebuilding of structures that have traditionally been barriers for historically marginalized youth. The impact evaluation will assess the causal impacts of CREATE on critical mediators, (e.g., equitable instructional practice, perceived levels of wellness) and distal confirmatory outcomes (e.g., retention in teaching, and math and ELA achievement of their students, for the full sample and for the sample of Black educators and students). The impact study employs “high-quality outcome measures” (SEER 6) designed to meet WWC standards with reservations, and prioritizes outcome domains eligible for review under several WWC review protocols. Confirmatory contrasts, including design details, research questions, analytic models, and computer code will be pre-registered through REES (SEER1) and anonymized data will be made available to allow reproduction and supports replication (Chinn et al. 2018, Steiner et al, 2019) (SEER2) where allowable based on district and IRB requirements. Confirmatory and exploratory research questions are listed in Table D.1.1.

**Table D1.1. Confirmatory and Exploratory Research Questions for CREATE**

Confirmatory Research Questions:
<p>Is there a positive impact of CREATE on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Student achievement</b> in grades 4 - 8 (Math &amp; English Language Arts) among students of CREATE residents? (When: In second year as teacher of record across all available cohorts) <i>(GA Milestones, alpha = 0.88-0.94)</i></li> <li>2. <b>Student achievement</b> in grades 4 - 8 (Math &amp; English Language Arts) among Black students of CREATE residents (~80% of the student sample)? (When: In second year as teacher of record across all available cohorts.) <i>(GA Milestones, alpha = 0.88-0.94)</i></li> <li>3. Residents’ <b>teaching effectiveness</b> (classroom environment and quality of instruction domains)? (When: In first or second year as teacher of record across all available cohorts.) <i>(Framework for Teaching (FFT (Danielson)) [Classroom Environment and Instruction dimensions], reliability = .60 - .84)</i></li> <li>4. Residents’ <b>uninterrupted retention in teaching</b> in Georgia? (When: three years after the start of residency across all available cohorts.) <i>(GA DOE, Open Georgia)</i></li> <li>5. Black educators’ <b>uninterrupted retention in teaching</b> (When: three years after the start of residency across all available cohorts.)? <i>(GA DOE, Open Georgia)</i></li> </ol>

## Exploratory Research Questions:

**Additional impacts:** Is there a positive impact of CREATE on:

6. **Equitable and effective teaching by residents** (*Framework for Equitable and Effective Teaching (FEET)*) (del Carmen Salazar 2018) This is a recently developed instrument with reliability data not reported in standard metrics used by WWC. We will pilot the instrument in the first year of the grant to obtain IRR statistics, and deploy for the full sample if adequate reliability is achieved. (When: In second year as teacher of record across all available cohorts.)

7. **Student achievement** in science and social studies (in grades 5 and 8) among students of CREATE residents? (*Ga Milestones, alpha = 0.90-0.94*)

8. **Graduation rate** from GSU-CEHD?

9. Residents' **equitable and effective teaching** for years when confirmatory impacts are not assessed? (*FFT(Danielson), reliability = .60 - .84; FEET*)

10. Cooperating Teachers' **retention in teaching at the school**, compared to matched counterparts in schools housing GSU non-CREATE graduates? (*GA DOE, Open Georgia*)

11. Cooperating Teachers' **equitable and effective teaching**? (*FFT, reliability = .60 - .84; FEET*)

12. **Student achievement** in math, ELA, science and social studies among students of CREATE CTs? (*Ga Milestones, alpha = 0.90-0.94*)

**Trends in survey outcomes:**

13. What are the **descriptive trends** of survey outcomes over time among Experienced Educators in CREATE schools? (*See surveys listed under "mediating impacts" below.*)

**Mediating impacts:**

Is there a positive impact of CREATE on **potential critical mediators of the program** for CREATE residents and Cooperating Teachers, including:

14. Levels of connection and belonging? (*Teachers Social Capital Scale, alpha = .74-.96*)

15. Teachers' perceived levels of quality of school climate and community? (*PRIDE Teacher Environment Scale, alpha > .70*)

16. Levels of collaboration? (*PRIDE Teacher Environment Scale, alpha > .70*)

17. Self-compassion? (*Self-compassion Scale, alpha = .78-.81*)

18. Teacher burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishment)? (*Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators, alpha = 0.71-0.90*)

19. Racial equity? (*Racial Equity Scale, alpha = .73*)

**Moderating/differential impacts:**

20. Is there a **differential impact** of CREATE on teacher and student outcomes based on teacher and student baseline characteristics, including incoming achievement & motivation for entering teaching?

**Notes:** CREATE will be scaled-up to high schools over the course of the grant; however, high schools will enter into the study in 2023/24, which precludes examining impacts on students of CREATE residents in their second year as teacher of record at the high school level or retention of CREATE residents within the three year period of the grant. These may be examined as exploratory. If the renewal grant is approved for year 4 and 5 these samples may be integrated with prior cohorts to support exploratory analysis of impacts for the combined sample.

### D.1.2 Impact study designed to meet WWC standards with reservations (DESIGN).

We describe the approaches to matching, statistical power, impact models and methods.

**Matching.** CREATE residents will be matched, within cohort, to their respective comparison groups using Euclidean or Mahalanobis distances (MatchIt function in R).

Covariates will be from baseline surveys ([Appendix G](#) describes this step in detail). Students will be matched following the approaches by Turner, Goodman, Adachi, Brite, & Decker (2012) in their quasi-experimental study of the impact of Teach for America. Propensity scores will be computed within each grade level (or across adjacent grade levels if sample sizes at a given grade level are small), using a logistic regression model. All covariates will be obtained from the year prior to entering classes of study teachers, and will include students' race/ethnicity, economically disadvantaged status, special education status, limited English proficiency, and incoming achievement. We will explore both sub-classification and one-to-one matching with replacement. With sub-classification, we will use the approach described in Michaelopoulos, Bloom, and Hill (2004) and in Dehejia and Wahba (1999), including use of specification tests for balance within subclasses and re-specification of propensity score generating equations, if needed. For math and ELA, we anticipate about 1,280 students retained for analysis after matching (960 Black students). Data for student-level matching will be obtained from GADOE. Because the study is designed to meet WWC standards with reservations, we will monitor whether matching results in baseline equivalence on covariates that are important for review under WWC topic area protocols. Where baseline equivalence is not achieved, we will implement alternative matching procedures until baseline equivalence is established.

***Recruitment, Sample sizes and Statistical Power.*** Potential participants will be introduced to CREATE and invited to apply by the CREATE project director. As we have with prior evaluations of CREATE, we will work with the GSU-CEHD to recruit study participants from both the CREATE and comparison groups, with consenting and baseline assessment conducted at point of recruitment (details of recruitment are provided in [Appendix G](#)).

For the power analysis we calculated Minimum Detectable Effects Sizes (MDESs) that are achievable for the available sample size after matching, assuming power of 80% and Type-1 error of 5% (or 2.5% with adjustment for multiple comparisons where there are two contrasts –

full sample and Black educator (student) samples). Details of the power calculations are in [Appendix G](#). For impacts on Teacher Effectiveness we will observe outcomes for 50 CREATE residents and 50 matched comparison cases (MDES=.32); for assessing impacts on retention in teaching we expect 40 CREATE residents and 40 matched comparison cases (MDES = .33, expressed as Cox Index) and 20 CREATE residents and 20 matched comparison cases (MDES = .32, expressed as Cox Index) when limited to Black educators; For impacts on student achievement we expect 640 students among 40 CREATE residents and 640 among 40 comparison teachers (after matching residents and students) (MDES=.21), and 480 students among 40 CREATE residents and 480 among 40 comparison teachers after matching for impacts on Black students (MDES=.22). The MDESs are in the same range of magnitude as observed in past impact evaluations of similar programs on similar/same outcomes, including teacher effectiveness (Garrett et al., 2019), retention (Jaciw et al., 2021), achievement (Glazerman, Mayer, & Decker, 2006; Clark et al., 2013). (The full details of the power analyses are provided in [Appendix G](#), including ICCs and R<sup>2</sup> values.)

***Impact Estimation.*** Teacher outcomes. The distribution of each scale will be determined in order to select the most appropriate model (linear (surveys), linear probability and logistic (retention), linear or cumulative logistic (ratings for teacher effectiveness)). Each outcome will be expressed through the appropriate link function as a linear combination of a dummy variable for condition (CREATE=1, comparison=0), a series of teacher-level covariates drawing on the extensive baseline survey and including an indicator for cohort, and fixed effects for school membership. (Impact models are detailed in [Appendix G](#)). Student Achievement. With the sub-classification approach, we will create five subclasses based on the quintile distribution of estimated treatment group propensity scores and conduct specification tests to assess balance within subclasses on covariates, until an adequate number of strata is arrived at (following Michalopoulos, Bloom, and Hill, 2004). We will then conduct within-stratum regressions

(achievement scores will be z-transformed within grade to be put on a common scale, as recommended by May et al. [2009] and Somers et al. [2011]) and take a weighted sum over the strata to arrive at average impact estimates (weights being set to the proportion of treatment teachers in each stratum). Regressions will be of individual student scores against the indicator of treatment status, student covariates (e.g., pretest), and teacher covariates (e.g., baseline survey responses); also, we will include a teacher random effect to adjust for clustering of students in teachers (HL models are provided in [Appendix G](#)).

*Other analyses.* Differential impacts will be assessed by adding a term for the interaction between the indicator of treatment status and the hypothesized moderator to the regression models. Questions of impact on key mediators (e.g., levels of teacher resilience) will be extended to formal mediator analyses using a multilevel regression framework (Krull & MacKinnon, 2001), and other methods that require fewer assumptions concerning the causal relationship between mediator and outcome variables, including principal stratification approach (Frangakis & Rubin, 2002; Jo, Stuart, MacKinnon, & Vinokur, 2011; Page, 2012). The mediation analyses will help to determine the active paths in the logic model (see [Appendix H](#)). Power may be limited for these analyses; therefore, we consider them exploratory. Analyses will be conducted using PROC MIXED and GLIMMIX in SAS as well as specialized programs such as Remediation (Tofighi & MacKinnon, 2011) and mediation in R (Imai, Keele, Tingley, & Yamamoto, 2010). Robustness checks for impact findings will include use of OLS and HL models, linear probability modeling as alternatives to logistic regression, and alternative estimation algorithms (REML vs ML). For the confirmatory impact analyses, we will follow WWC topic area review protocols reporting all statistics necessary for WWC review, including sample sizes, and baseline equivalence for analysis samples.

## **D.2. Performance Feedback of Progress toward Achieving Intended Outcomes**

We will provide formative feedback to the program team on a regular basis for two

purposes. **First, to support successful implementation** (SEER4) we will conduct Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles (Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2017). During each semester, CREATE will identify programmatic needs for improvement to achieve implementation targets, and in each PDSA cycles, we will plan, implement, study, and scale change efforts to achieve this goal. For example, CREATE’s Goal 3 includes achieving effective and financially viable models of their program that involve commitment across institutions. Under this proposed SEED project, Empirical will evaluate current implementation for costs and levels of inter-institutional collaboration and work closely with CREATE to plan improvement strategies (e.g., to restructure expensive program elements to achieve greater value, and to facilitate regular and productive inter-institutional collaboration) with clear and measurable targets, measure resulting changes, and inform consequent actions. All program components marked for improvement will be assessed regularly, summarized each semester, and reported and discussed with CREATE Co-directors. **Second, to support replication and broader scaling beyond the study sample** (SEER8), Empirical will use surveys and interviews of CREATE Co-Directors, school leaders, CTs, EEs and RESs to identify obstacles to reaching implementation targets (SEER4) that builds on but goes beyond attainment of FOI targets. The interviews will cover important topics pertaining to the aims of CREATE, including fulfillment of anti-oppressive, anti-racist, social justice and equity-centered education and practices. This feedback will support strengthening the program model for schools over the grant period and inform a replicable model, including specification of a refined program logic model “as achieved” compared to as initially posited.

### **D.3. Evaluation of Implementation**

Research questions for the implementation study are listed in Table D3.1 and are detailed further in the text sections just below the table.

**Table D3.1. Research Questions for the Implementation Study (SEER 3, 4).**

Research Questions for the Implementation Study
A. To what extent are CREATE activities implemented, resulting in the outputs specified in the logic model? Are key components implemented with fidelity?
B. What important implementation barriers and supports are encountered in different contexts? What are the contextual factors that promote fidelity of implementation and support impact?
C. What are the observed variations in the implementation of CREATE? How is variation in implementation related to (1) barriers and supports encountered and (2) perceived effectiveness of the program?
D. How do the experiences of the non-CREATE GSU pre-service teachers compare with those of CREATE residents? What is the achieved Treatment-Comparison service contrast?
E. What is the potential for CREATE to become integrated into the school and districts systems once grant supports are lifted, and what is the potential for CREATE to scale-up in terms of its spread and depth of practice within and across settings?

**A: Fidelity of implementation** The implementation study (SEER3,4) takes advantage of the fidelity of implementation (FOI) reporting system (following the i3/EIR model), as it is a proven model for identifying S(pecific) M(easurable) A(ttainable) R(ealistic) T(imely) goals/thresholds for monitoring **objective performance measures**, and for giving feedback to CREATE. We focus on assessing adherence to and ongoing adaptation of the program logic model ([Appendix H](#)) including key components, activities/outputs related to inputs/services, and attainment of fidelity thresholds (SEER 3,4), For example, key components of the CREATE residents' experience (Goal 1) include: (1) Recruitment of new teacher residents, with a specific focus on recruiting Black teachers; (2) Summer Resident Academy; (3) Progressive classroom roles in three-year residency model; (4) Monthly cohort meetings (Together Time) focused on equity-centered mindfulness training and exploration of racial identity and systemic privilege/oppression; and (5) Layered Mentorship. Indicators of FOI and corresponding minimum thresholds for Goal 1 (which corresponds to confirmatory outcomes) that must be met to achieve FOI are summarized in Table D3.2 below (with a detailed FOI matrix included in [Appendix H](#)). We will establish additional FOI matrices related to Goal 2-4 during the project. Findings (paired with periodic feedback from participants collected from surveys and interviews)

will be shared with CREATE on a quarterly basis to determine whether specific key components and fidelity thresholds should be modified.

**Table D3.2: Fidelity of Implementation Matrix**

Component	Indicators of Fidelity	Measurable Threshold for Fidelity at Component Level
<b>Recruitment of new teacher residents, with a specific focus on recruiting Black teachers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit and enroll 100 new teacher residents</li> <li>Recruit racially diverse composition of residents, with 70% of residents identifying as Black teachers</li> <li>25% of recruited residents will be from HBCUs or non-traditional pathways</li> </ul>	All indicators meet fidelity
<b>Summer Resident Academy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Year 1 residents attend one-week SRA</li> <li>Year 2 residents attend five-week SRA</li> <li>Year 3 residents attend two-week SRA</li> </ul>	<u>Y1, Y2, and Y3</u> : 90% of residents attend 80% or more of total SRA meetings offered
<b>Progressive Core Classroom Roles</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident is: paired with another Y1 resident in Y1; co-teaching in Y2; solo teaching in Y3</li> <li>Y1 resident is placed in classroom of a CREATE-trained CT; Y2 and Y3 resident is teaching subject area/grade level in which they are certified</li> <li>Resident is in a CREATE school</li> </ul>	All three must be met: <u>Y1</u> : 90% or more of residents meet fidelity on 2+ indicators <u>Y2</u> : 85% or more of residents meet fidelity on 2+ indicators <u>Y3</u> : 85% or more of residents meet fidelity on 2+ indicators
<b>Monthly cohort meetings</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resident attends Together Time mtgs and racial affinity group mtgs</li> </ul>	<u>Y1, Y2, and Y3</u> : All indicators meet fidelity
<b>Layered mentorship</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>University Supervisor Coach (USC) meets with Y1 resident for 2hrs./week</li> <li>Instructional Mentor (IM) meetings with Y2 and Y3 resident for 1-2hrs./week</li> <li>School-Based Mentor (SBM) meet with Y2 resident bi-monthly</li> </ul>	<u>Y1</u> : 90% of residents meet with USC for 55+ hours <u>Y2</u> : 90% of residents meet with IM for 55+ hours, and 90% of residents meet with SBM for 18 or more meetings <u>Y3</u> : 90% of residents meet with IM for 30+ hours
<b>Note.</b> Y1, Y2, and Y3 in the table below refers to Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 of residency.		

**B and C: Variation in implementation.** To understand contextual factors influencing implementation of CREATE (SEER4), including ones that facilitate or are obstacles to implementation, we will survey residents (quarterly), CTs (twice per year), and experienced educators (annually) about existing structures and systems, types and levels of perceived support

and collaboration (from CREATE and within their schools), and their own commitment and ability to center equity and wellness in their roles as effective educators. We will also characterize participants' perceptions of the value of each of the programming components that they experience. An important rationale for this aspect of the implementation study is to better understand the conditions and mechanism for impacts from a prior study of CREATE, which has *preliminarily demonstrated* a trend of positive impact on uninterrupted retention for all residents through graduation and second year of teaching, *and a positive and statistically significant* impact for retention for Black educators (Jaciw, et al., 2021). The proposed project provides opportunities to build, deepen and sustain new and existing program components, as well as to analyze the process and mechanism to support replication and scalability of impacts (SEER8).

**D: Treatment-Control Contrast.** To present a full picture of implementation (SEER4), we will document the counterfactual condition by surveying comparison group teachers (quarterly) to assess the extent of common components of CREATE and non-CREATE programs to establish the planned and realized Treatment – Control (service) contrast (Cordray & Pion, 1993; Cordray & Hulleman, 2009; Weiss, Bloom, & Brock, 2014) and achieved relative strength of the intervention (Hulleman & Cordray, 2009).

**E: Potential for Sustainability and Scale-Up.** To address CREATE Goal 3 (*sustain effective and financially viable models for educator recruitment, support, and retention*) (SEER8), Empirical will serve as a thought partner to CREATE to provide frequent and actionable formative feedback affecting factors related to scaling the intervention in terms of depth, spread, sustainability, and shift in reform ownership (Coburn, 2003). Surveys and interviews of program participants and personnel will inform the conditions for successful scaling. This includes evaluating support for sustainability of CREATE practices, including inter- and intra-organizational factors that become institutionalized—with ownership shifted to districts, schools, and teachers—and what their potential is to continue after the grant is over

(Coburn, 2003). We will also analyze surveys and interviews of experienced educators and administrators (annually) to understand their motivations for and commitment to integrating CREATE program components into their structures and practices. These data (with B and C above) will inform within-school sustainability and spread (SEER8) and ultimately yield documentation to support replication and scaling for new contexts.

**D.4. Valid and Reliable Performance Data.** For each research question (confirmatory and exploratory outcomes), we have identified the *valid and reliable* outcome measures (see [Appendix I](#)) with reliability information summarized in Table D.1.1 and detailed in [Appendix G](#).

**D.5. Dissemination to Support Replication and Scaling.** In addition to dissemination efforts outlined in section B4, Empirical will produce internal summary reports to the developer and submit results to conferences (e.g., SREE, AERA) and academic journals (e.g., Journal of Mixed Methods Research, JREE, Education Policy Analysis Archives, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, and the Journal of Occupational Health.) including all data necessary to support WWC review. Critically, Empirical will also pre-register on REES (SEER1) with all information necessary to allow both reproducibility and replication of planned analysis, including about: contextual factors, geographic location, the study sample (students, teachers, schools); program components, implementation levels and qualitative process data about implementation, the counterfactual condition, inclusion and exclusion criteria, achieved MDES, analytic models and estimation methods with computer code, and safeguards used to assure independence of evaluation, and strategies used to limit threats to validity of inferences (in Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, 2002). Frameworks for replication in Chinn et al. (2018) and Steiner et al. (2019) will structure the effort ensuring all information to allow eventual replication as specified in IES CFDA 84.305R.

## CONCLUSION

As noted in the introduction, our current context is one full of complexity—from senseless acts of racial terrorism to more global acts of violence. Day after day, teachers—working alongside parents, administrators, and community—try to support students academically and social-emotionally to better grasp the world they encounter. This conclusion, a speculative freedom dream, moves beyond what is to what should and *can be*. If we recruit, train, and adequately support new teachers who embody justice-centered practices, while also designing and enacting transformative learning experiences for experienced teachers to lead equity and wellness work in their schools, then we will have teachers and students who will not only survive schooling, but *thrive*. This freedom dream *is* possible; we will see, feel, and hear deep joy and flourishing that will reverberate throughout schools. Teachers and their students will be free to breathe deeply, tackle *the most pressing issues* of our time, and reimagine new ways forward.

## REFERENCES

- Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., Sexton, D., & Freitas, C. (2010). Retaining teachers of color: A pressing problem and a potential strategy for “hard-to-staff” schools. *Review of educational research, 80*(1), 71-107
- Achinstein, B., & Ogawa, R. (2011). *Change(d) agents: New teachers of Color in urban schools*. Teachers College Press.
- Acosta et al. (2018). “Why seek the living among the dead?” African American pedagogical excellence: Exemplar practice for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 69*(4), 341–353.
- Allensworth, E., Ponisciak, S., & Mazzeo, C. (2009). *The Schools Teachers Leave: Teacher Mobility in Chicago Public Schools*. Consortium on Chicago School Research.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505882>
- Anderson, A. B. (2020). Expanding the research terrain: Teach for America and the problem with one-dimensional research. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 94*, 1-20.
- Bartell, T., Cho, C., Drake, C., Petchauer, E., & Richmond, G. (2019). Teacher agency and resilience in the age of neoliberalism. *Journal of Teacher Education, 70*(4), 302-305.
- Breslow, J. M. (2012, September 21). *By the numbers: Dropping out of high school*. Public Broadcasting Service Frontline. <https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/by-the-numbers-dropping-out-of-high-school/>
- Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2017). *Learning to Improve*. Harvard Education Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). The trouble with teacher turnover: How teacher attrition affects students and schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*, 36.  
<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3699>
- Chin, C. S., Taylor, K. A., & Wei, W. S. (2018). Supporting a culture of replication: an examination of education and special education research grants funded by the institute of education sciences. *Educational Researcher, 47*(9), 594-605. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X18788047>

- Clark, M. A., Chiang, H. S., Silva, T., McConnell, S., Sonnenfeld, K., Erbe, A., & Puma, M. (2013). The effectiveness of secondary math teachers from Teach For America and the Teaching Fellows programs (NCEE 2013-4015). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED544171.pdf>.
- Conklin, H. G., & Hughes, H. E. (2016). Practices of compassionate, critical, justice-oriented teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(1), 47-60.
- Coburn, C.E. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educ. Researcher*, 32(6), 3-12. Retrieved June 8, 2020 from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0013189X032006003>
- Cordray, D. S., & Pion, G. M. (1993). Psychosocial rehabilitation assessment: A broader perspective. In R. Glueckauf, G. Bond, L. Sechrest, & B. McDonel (Eds.), *Improving assessment in rehabilitation and health* (pp. 215-240). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cordray, D. S. & Hulleman, C. (2009, June). *Assessing intervention fidelity: Models, methods and modes of analysis*. Presentation at the Institute for Education Sciences 2009 Research Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument: 2013 edition*. Princeton, NJ: The Danielson Group.
- del Carmen Salazar, M. (2018). Interrogating teacher evaluation: Unveiling whiteness as the normative center and moving the margins. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(5), 463-476. doi:10.1177/0022487118764347
- DeCesare, D., & Fermanich, M., (n.d.). *Cost-effectiveness, cost and cost-- feasibility, benefit methods* [PowerPoint slides]. The Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Central. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/central/pdf/slides-cost-analysis-methods.pdf>
- DeCesare, D., McClelland, A., & Randel, B. (2017). *Impacts of the retired mentors for new teachers program* (REL 2017-225). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Central. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>
- Dee, T. (2004). Teachers, race, and student achievement in a randomized experiment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 195-210.
- Dehejia, R. H., & Wahba, S. (1999). Causal effects in nonexperimental studies: Reevaluating the evaluation of training programs. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94, 1053-1062.
- Dingus, J. E. (2008). "I'm learning the trade" mentoring networks of Black women teachers. *Urban Education*, 43(3), 361- 377.
- Dunn, D., Chisholm, A, Spaulding, E., Love, B. (2021). A radical doctrine: Abolition education in hard times. *Educational Studies*, 57(3), 211-223.
- Egalite, A., Kisida, B., & Winters, M. (2015). Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 45, 44-52.
- Farrell, C., & Coburn, C. (2016). Absorptive capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding district center office learning. *Journal for Educational Change*.
- Flessner, R. (2014). Revisiting reflection: Utilizing third spaces in teacher education. *Scholarship and Professional Work Education*, Paper 37.
- Frangakis, C. E. & Rubin, D. B. (2002, March). Principal stratification in causal inference. *Biometrics*, 58(1), 21-29.
- Fullan, F., & Quinn, J. (2016). *Coherence: The Right Drivers in Action for Schools, Districts, and Systems*. Corwin.
- Garrett, R., Citkowitz, M., & Williams, R. (2019). How responsive is a teacher's classroom practice to intervention? A meta-analysis of randomized field studies. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 106-137. doi:10.3102/0091732X19830634
- Georgia Department of Education. (2021, October). *Validity and Reliability for the 2020-2021 Georgia Milestones Assessment System*. Retrieved May 16, 2022 from <https://www.gadoe.org/Curriculum->

[Instruction-and-Assessment/Assessment/Documents/Milestones/Technical Documents/2020-21 GA Milestones Validity Reliability Brief.pdf](#)

- Georgia Department of Education. (2021, October 21). *Georgia's 2021 graduation rate holds steady at 83 percent*. <https://www.gadoe.org/External-Affairs-and-Policy/communications/Pages/PressReleaseDetails.aspx?PressView=default&pid=904>
- Georgia Department of Education. (2022, May 24). *Student enrollment by grade level (PK-12)*. [https://oraapp.doe.k12.ga.us/ows-bin/owa/fte\\_pack\\_enrollgrade.entry\\_form](https://oraapp.doe.k12.ga.us/ows-bin/owa/fte_pack_enrollgrade.entry_form)
- Gershenson, S., Hart, C., Hyman, J., Lindsay, C., & Papageorge, N. W. (2018). *The Long-Run Impacts of Same-Race Teachers* (No. w25254). National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://ftp.iza.org/dp10630.pdf>
- Glazerman, S., Mayer, D., & Decker, P. (2006). Alternative routes to teaching: The impacts of Teach for America on student achievement and other outcomes. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 25(1), 75–96.
- Glazerman, S., S. Dolfen, M. Bleeker, A. Johnson, E. Isenberg, J. Lugo-Gil, M. Grider, E. Britton (2006). *Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Results from the First Year of a Randomized Controlled Study*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- Gorski, P. (2015). Relieving burnout and the “martyr syndrome” among social justice education activists: The implications and effects of mindfulness. *Urban Review*, 47, 696-716.
- Grahn, L. (2018). Teachers taking the lead: Increasing teacher retention through leadership opportunities. *The Language Educator*, 34-37.
- Hanushek, E., Kain, J., O'Brien, D., & Rivkin, S. (2005). The market for teacher quality (No. w11154). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Hickman, G.P., Bartholomew, M., and Mathwig, J. (2007). *The differential development trajectories of rural high school dropouts and graduates: Executive summary*. The College of Teacher Education and Leadership at the Arizona State at the West Campus.
- Hollands, F. M., Hanisch-Cerda, B., Levin, H. M., Belfield, C. R., Menon, A., Shand, R., Pan, Y., Bakir, I., & Cheng, H. (2015). *CostOut - the CBCSE Cost Tool Kit*. New York: Center for Benefit-Cost Studies of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from: [www.cbcsecosttoolkit.org](http://www.cbcsecosttoolkit.org)
- Hulleman, C. S., & Cordray, D. S. (2009). Moving from the lab to the field: The role of fidelity and achieved relative intervention strength. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(1), 88-110.
- Imai, K., Keele, L., Tingley, D., & Yamamoto, T. (2010). Causal Mediation Analysis Using R. *Advances in Social Science Research Using R*, ed. H. D. Vinod, New York: Springer (Lecture Notes in Statistics), 129-154.
- Institute of Education Sciences National Center for Educational Statistics. (2019, February). *Why does attendance matter?* <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/attendancedata/chapter1a.asp>
- Institute of Education Sciences. (2020). *Cost analysis: A toolkit* (IES 2020-001). U.S. Department of Education. <https://ies.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=IES2020001rev>
- Jaciw, A. P., Wingard, A., Zacamy, J., Lin, L., & Lau, S. (2021). *Final Report of the i3 Evaluation of the Collaboration and Reflection to Enhance Atlanta Teacher Effectiveness (CREATE) Teacher Residency Program: A Quasi-Experiment in Georgia*. (Empirical Education Rep. No. Empirical\_GSU-7031-FR1-2021-O.1). Empirical Education Inc. <https://www.empiricaleducation.com/create/>
- Jo, B., Stuart, E. A., MacKinnon, D. P., & Vinokur, A. D. (2011). The use of propensity scores in mediation analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 46, 425–452.
- Kohli, R. (2018). Behind school doors: The impact of hostile racial climates on urban teachers of color. *Urban Education*, 53(3), 307-333.
- Kohli, R. (2019). Lessons for teacher education: The role of critical professional development in teacher of color retention. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 70(1), 39-50.

- Kretchmar, K., & Zeichner, K. (2016). Teacher prep 3.0: A vision for teacher education to impact social transformation. *Journal of Education for teaching*, 42(4), 417-433.
- Krull, J. L., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2001). Multilevel modeling of individual and group level mediated effects. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 36, 249–277.
- Leana, C. R. (2011). The missing link in school reform. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 34.
- Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., & Petroski, G. F. (2001). Helping seventh graders be safe and successful: A statewide study of the impact of comprehensive guidance and counseling programs. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 79(3), 320-330. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01977.x>
- Lapan, R. T., Gysbers, N. C., Stanley, B., & Pierce, M. E. (2012). Missouri professional school counselors: Ratios matter, especially in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X0001600207>
- Laura, D. (2022). Healing Racial Injustice with Mindfulness Research, Training, & Practice. Mindfulness Studies Theses. [https://digitalcommons.lesley.edu/mindfulness\\_theses/57](https://digitalcommons.lesley.edu/mindfulness_theses/57)
- Learning Policy Institute. (2017, September 13). *What's the cost of teacher turnover?* <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/the-cost-of-teacher-turnover>
- Levin, H. M., McEwan, P. J., Belfield, C., Bowden, A. B., & Shand, R. (2017). *Economic Evaluation in Education: Cost-Effectiveness and Benefit-Cost Analysis, Third Edition*. Washington, D.C.: SAGE Publications, Inc. Retrieved from <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/economic-evaluation-in-education/book245161#contents>
- Liu, W. (2021). Does teacher immediacy affect students? A systematic review of the association between teacher verbal and non-verbal immediacy and student motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 2475. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713978>
- Love, B. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.
- Markowitz, N. , & Bouffard, S. (2020). *Teaching with a Social, Emotional, and Cultural Lens: A Framework for Educators and Teacher Educators*. Harvard Education Press.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (2018). *Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual: Fourth Edition*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Matias, C. E. (2015): “Why do you make me hate myself?”: Re-teaching Whiteness, abuse, and love in urban teacher education. *Teaching Education*, 1-18.
- May, C. R. et al. (2009). Development of a theory of implementation and integration: normalization process theory. *Implementation Science*, 4(29). ISSN 1748-5908. Retrieved June 7, 2017 from <http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/5944/1/1748-5908-4-29.pdf>
- McLean Hospital. (2020, September 1). *What employers need to know about mental health in the workplace*.<https://www.mcleanhospital.org/essential/what-employers-need-know-about-mental-health-workplace#:~:text=According%20to%20data%20supplied%20by,reduced%20productivity%2C%20and%20medical%20costs>
- Michalopoulos, C., Bloom, H. S., & Hill, C. J. (2004). Can propensity-score methods match the findings from a random assignment evaluation of mandatory welfare-to-work programs? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86, 156-179.
- Minckler, C.H. (2011). *Teacher Social Capital: The Development of a Conceptual Model and Measurement Framework with Application to Educational Leadership and Teacher Efficacy*. A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Education.
- Murrell, P. C. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Neff, K. D. (2003). Development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and Identity*, 2, 223-250

- Noguera, Pedro, Darling-Hammond, L., & Friedlaender, D. (2016). *Equal Opportunity for Deeper Learning. Students at the Center: Deeper Learning Research Series*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Oberle, E., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2016). Stress contagion in the classroom? The link between classroom teacher burnout and morning cortisol in elementary school students. *School Science & Medicine, 159*, 30-37.
- Page, L.C. (2012). Principal stratification as a framework for investigating mediational processes in experimental settings. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 5*(3), 215-244, DOI: 10.1080/19345747.2012.688410
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93-97.
- Pizarro, M., & Kohli, R. (2020). "I stopped sleeping": Teachers of color and the impact of racial battle fatigue. *Urban Education, 55*(7), 967-991.
- Pride Surveys. (2011). *Research Documentation: Pride Teaching Environment Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.pridesurveys.com/index.php/the-pride-teaching-environment-survey/>
- Romero, M., & Lee, Y. S. (2007). *A national portrait of chronic absenteeism in the early grades*. The National Center for Children in Poverty. <https://doi.org/10.7916/D89C7650>
- Ronfeldt, M., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2013). How teacher turnover harms student achievement. *AERJ Journal, 50*(1), 4-36.
- Shadish, W., Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (2002). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Shirrell, M., Bristol, T. J., & Britton, T. A. (2021). *The effects of student-teacher ethnoracial matching on exclusionary discipline for Asian American, Black, and Latinx students: Evidence from New York City* (EdWorkingPaper No. 21-475). Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED616750>
- Steiner, P. M., Wong, V. C., & Anglin, K. (2019). A causal replication framework for designing and assessing replication efforts. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 227*(4), 280-292. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000385>
- Simon, N. S., & Johnson, S. M. (2015). Teacher turnover in high-poverty schools: What we know and can do. *Teachers College Record, 117*(3), 1-36.
- Somers, M., Zhu, P., & Wong, E. (2011). *Whether and how to use state tests to measure student achievement in a multi-state randomized experiment: An empirical assessment based on four recent evaluations*. NCEE Reference Report 2012-4015. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved May 18, 2020 from <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20124015/pdf/20124015.pdf>
- Tintiango-Cubales, A., Kohli, R., Sacramento, J., Henning, N., Agarwal-Rangnath, R., & Sleeter, C. (2015). Toward an Ethnic Studies pedagogy: Implications for K-12 schools from the research. *Urban Review, 47*(1), 104-125.
- Teachers College. (n.d.) Cost Analysis in Practice (CAP) Project. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved June 10, 2020 from <https://capproject.org/>
- Tofighi, D., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2011). RMediation: An R package for mediation analysis confidence intervals. *Behavior Research Methods, 43*, 692-700. doi:10.3758/s13428-011-0076-x.
- Torrez, C. & Krebs, M. (2019). *The Teacher Residency Model: Core Components for High Impact on Student Achievement*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Turner, H. M., Goodman, D., Adachi, E., Brite, J., & Decker, L. E. (2012). *Evaluation of Teach For America in Texas schools*. San Antonio, TX: Edvance Research, Inc.
- Weiss, M. J., Bloom, H. S., & Brock, T. (2014). A conceptual framework for studying the sources of variation in program effects. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 33*, 778 -808.
- Young, V. M., Schmidt, R., Wang, H., Cassidy, L., & Laguarda, K. (2017, December). *A comprehensive model of teacher induction: Implementation and impact on teachers and students*. Evaluation of

the New Teacher Center's i3 Validation grant, final report. Prepared for the New Teacher Center.  
Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.