

# UTRPP i3 Impact Evaluation Report

(USDOE Grant U411C140098)



**Bethany A. Bell, Ph.D.**

**Rachelle Curcio, Ph.D.**

November 20, 2020

## Abstract

UTRPP addressed the i3 **Development Grant** Absolute Priority 1, Subpart 2: Increase equitable access to effective teachers or principals for low-income and high-need students. UTRPP infused comprehensive, job-embedded professional development (PD) for participating Residents and other teachers; established triads and quads to support Residents; and delivered a prescriptive focus on teaching and learning in urban settings with specialized emphasis on approaches established by the partner school district to ensure a seamless transition to induction and beyond. The PD built instructional capacity and improved both the Residents' and Classroom Teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge. The strength of UTRPP was in its unique approach, which included (a) targeting undergraduates for admission into the residency rather than graduate-level participants; (b) placing Residents in the field for an extended time, (c) integrating field experience with coursework aligned to trending issues in urban education; and (d) exposing Residents to culturally relevant content and field experiences unique to an urban setting (what UTRPP called a "place-conscious" approach to preparing educators in urban settings). The ultimate goal of UTRPP was to increase the academic achievement of low-income, high-need students in the partner district.

## UTRPP i3 Impact Report

The Urban Teacher Residency Partnership Program (UTRPP) was a partnership between a large state university and large local school district in the Southeastern United States. The program created a pipeline from pre-service-to-practice in urban schools. It moved beyond traditional models of teacher preparation to a formalized extended residency program designed to change the staffing and support landscape for high-need schools. Unlike existing residency models that target graduate students, UTRPP began scaffolding field experiences with undergraduate elementary education majors. The model extended the length of pre-service, so the intensity and frequency of the residency experiences increased over a 2-year period.

UTRPP provided pre-service teachers (named “residents”) with comprehensive pre-service to practice, job-embedded professional development (PD) experience with a focus on teaching and learning in urban settings, including: triads comprised of residents, collaborating teachers, and university supervisors for 1<sup>st</sup>-year residents; quads comprised of residents, collaborating teachers (CTs), university supervisors, and university content coaches for 2<sup>nd</sup>-year residents; integrated university coursework and clinical experiences, differentiated PD for residents and all partnership school teachers, self-inquiry enhancement, and exposure to inclusive practices. Overall, the program was designed to improve content and pedagogical knowledge and ensure a seamless transition to induction in a high-needs, urban school setting. UTRPP residents attained priority hiring status, in the local school district that partnered with the university on the UTRPP program, upon successful completion of their second year in the program and all university degree requirements. Furthermore, UTRPP provided a model for other school districts that seek to increase and sustain the pool of teachers trained to meet the unique needs of students in urban settings and increase equitable access to effective teachers.

### UTRPP Goals

UTRPP addressed the i3 **Development Grant** Absolute Priority 1, Subpart 2: Increase equitable access to effective teachers or principals for low-income and high-need students. UTRPP creates a pipeline from pre-service-to-practice in urban schools. It moved beyond traditional models of teacher preparation to a formalized extended residency program designed to change the staffing and support landscape for high-need schools. Unlike existing residency models that targeted graduate students, UTRPP began the scaffolding of field experiences with undergraduate elementary education majors. The model extended the length of pre-service, so the intensity and frequency of the residency experiences increase over a 2-year period. UTRPP infused comprehensive, job-embedded professional development (PD) for participating Residents and other teachers; established triads and quads to support Residents (Collaborating Teacher [CT], Partnership Resource Teacher, University Content Coach, and Resident); and delivered a prescriptive focus on teaching and learning in urban settings with specialized emphasis on approaches established by the partner school district to ensure a seamless transition to induction and beyond. The PD built instructional capacity and improved both the Residents’ and CTs’ content and pedagogical knowledge.

Residents received coaching and support for 2 years in their established triad (first year) quad (final year), in addition to progressive, scaffolded field experiences. The inclusion of CTs and site-based staff in PD offerings further promoted the vital school-wide culture of learning necessary to tackle the obstacles presented by educating in urban partner school district settings. The content coaching quad configuration enhanced the customary pedagogical coaching that traditionally occurs in teacher preparation programs. Upon completion of the program, successful Residents had priority hiring status for full-time positions in the partner school district and received continued support. The CTs and other

teachers had the opportunity to earn a Teacher Leader certification, which is a higher step on the career ladder for teachers in the partner school district and aligns with the USDOE’s policy goals of implementing Teacher Leader Pathways that allow teachers to advance in their field while remaining in the classroom.

The strength of UTRPP was in its unique approach, which included (a) targeting undergraduates for admission into the residency rather than graduate-level participants; (b) placing Residents in the field for an extended time, (c) integrating field experience with coursework aligned to trending issues in urban education; and (d) exposing Residents to culturally relevant content and field experiences unique to an urban setting (what UTRPP called a “place-conscious” approach to preparing educators in urban settings). The ultimate goal of UTRPP was to increase the academic achievement of low-income, high-need students in the partner district.

### **UTRPP Logic Model and Key UTRPP Activities**

Three broad goals framed UTRPP: (1) Increase the effectiveness of teachers serving low-income, high-need students; (2) Increase the equitable distribution of effective teachers for low-income, high-need students across schools; and (3) Increase the academic achievement of low-income, high-need students.

The goals were supported by three key components (University Coursework, Residency Program, and university/partner school district Collaboration) with corresponding short, medium, and long-term outcomes. Therefore, all activities were part of an explicit plan designed to allow UTRPP to meet its stated goals and objectives.

Implementation of UTRPP was focused on three key program components listed in the logic model:

- University Coursework – Resident clinical experiences,
- Residency Program – Established triads (Resident-CT-PRT) for first-year residents, quads (Resident-CT-PRT-Content Coach) for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, and content-focus coaching for final-year residents; and
- University/Partner School District Collaboration – Partnership schools, teacher leadership certificate, and UTRPP Advisory Board meetings.

Threaded throughout these components were several key UTRPP features and activities. These items are described individually below.

1. **Integrated University Coursework and Clinical Experiences** – Throughout the duration of the grant, coursework was designed and then annually revised based on evaluation feedback. These activities were done in partnership between the University and partner school district. Coursework consisted of explicit and purposeful connections to the clinical experiences residents engaged in within partnership schools.
2. **Content-Focused Coaching** – All UTRPP residents engaged in extensive content-focused coaching. Coaching began in year one and expanded during year two. Residents had access to math, science, and literacy content coaches, and content coaches were also available to support Collaborating Teachers.
3. **Differentiated Collaborating Teacher Professional Development** - Professional development for Collaborating Teachers was developed based on the needs of the UTRPP CTs broadly, as well as by individual schools specifically. Individualized professional development was offered based on teachers’ individual needs, and Collaborating Teachers received in-service credits to

count towards recertification.

4. **Teacher Leader Certificate** - In addition to professional development experiences designed for Collaborating Teachers, all Collaborating Teachers had access to participate in the University Teacher Leader Certification program. This program provides teachers the opportunity to cultivate leadership skills, while maintaining status as a classroom teacher.
5. **Cultivating Practice of Self-Inquiry** - Throughout the duration of UTRPP all residents engaged in various experiences aimed at cultivating an inquiry stance. Residents in both year 1 and year 2 completed developmentally appropriate inquiry into their practice. Year 2 students continued to present at an annual Inquiry Conference, and Year 1 students presented their teacher inquiry within their cohort. Collaborating Teachers also conducted inquiry as part of their UTRPP professional development, as determined by the Principals at each site.
6. **Exposure to Inclusive Practices and Culturally-Relevant Content** – Culturally relevant content and pedagogy was purposefully integrated into all UTRPP coursework and field experiences. Residents were immersed in cultivating a culturally relevant stance. Additionally, inclusive practices and culturally-relevant content/pedagogy was integrated into Coaching Teacher professional development experiences.
7. **Preparation-to-Practice Pipeline** - Priority hiring status was extended from the partner school district to Residents who successfully completed UTRPP.
8. **UTRPP Advisory Board** - Representatives from all stakeholders met on a regular basis to discuss UTRPP progress, challenges, and future implications.

### **Project Evaluation Process and Results**

We worked closely with the partner school district and the University program managers to ensure that accurate UTRPP enrollment records were shared and up-to-date throughout the life of the project. Throughout the program, the evaluation team, the partner school district, and the University met annually to update measures, address challenges, and refine qualitative data collection protocols.

Throughout the program, the evaluation process involved three distinct phases:

1. **UTRPP Implementation Fidelity Monitoring.** This initial step in the measurement process determined whether the activities outlined by the UTRPP model were occurring as intended. Monitoring processes, including the acquisition of information such as coaching logs, professional development offering descriptions, observation data, and professional development attendance sheets, were implemented to collect evidence that funds were being utilized as proposed and to provide initial assessments of basic program fidelity. More details on this phase are provided in this report.
2. **Formative Evaluation Activities.** Formative evaluation activities represented the next step in the measurement process. The information collected as part of formative evaluation activities provided more qualitative information about program facets than information collected as part of the monitoring processes. Surveys, interviews, and focus groups with UTRPP Residents, partnership school administrators, UTRPP alumni, and Collaborating Teachers provided valuable information about UTRPP experiences. Insights into successful program aspects or areas that needed change or improvement helped to establish program fidelity, and also assisted in improving the quality of the program deployment.
3. **Summative Evaluation Activities.** Summative evaluation activities were the final step in the evaluation process. All summative evaluation work relied on quantitative district data that was

shared with the external evaluator. The quantitative data were used to examine each of the project performance measures annually as well as to complete this impact report.

### Implementation Fidelity

The implementation of the UTRPP i3 program was tracked and measured using the project Fidelity Matrix required by the evaluation guidelines for i3 grants. The matrix includes descriptors and indicators for the three key program components listed in the logic model: University Coursework, Residency Program, and University/Partner School District Collaboration. The matrix also specifies thresholds for adequate implementation, which vary depending on the program component. Per the matrix below, the following indicators were analyzed: resident clinical experiences, establishing triads for 1<sup>st</sup> year residents (not applicable in spring 2020 due to no 1<sup>st</sup> year residents), establishing quads for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, content-focused coaching for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, residents at partnership schools, and attendance at UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings.

**UTRPP i3 Fidelity Matrix**

Indicators	Definition	Unit of Implementation	Data Sources	Data collection	Score for Levels	Program-Level Implementation
<b>UNIVERSITY COURSEWORK</b>						
<b>Resident Clinical Experiences</b>	Resident attends clinical experiences each semester	Resident	Resident Clinical Log Hours	Attendance information provided by Partnership Resource Teachers (PRTs)*	Score based on % attendance at clinical experiences: 0 (low) = attends < 80% of clinical experiences 1 (moderate) = attends 80 - 89% of clinical experiences 2 (high) = attends ≥ 90% of clinical experiences	≥ 90% residents have adequate implementation score = 2
<b>RESIDENCY PROGRAM</b>						
<b>Establish Triads for Residents in their 1<sup>st</sup> year of residency</b>	Each 1 <sup>st</sup> year Resident is assigned a CT and PRT	Resident	Resident Placement List	Triad information provided by PRTs	Resident is assigned to a triad 0 (low) = Not assigned 2 (high) = assigned to quad	Adequate Implementation score = 6
<b>Establish Quads for Residents in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of residency</b>	Each 2 <sup>nd</sup> year Resident is assigned a CT, PRT, and	Resident	Resident Placement List	Quad information provided by PRTs	Resident is assigned to a quad 0 (low) = Not assigned 2 (high) = assigned to quad	

	multiple university Content Coaches					
<b>Content-Focused Coaching for Residents in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of residency</b>	Each 2 <sup>nd</sup> year Resident participates in a cycle of each content area (science, math, and literacy) each semester	Resident	Coaching Cycle Log	Coaching Cycle Log provided by PRTs	0 (low) = ≤ 3 cycles for the school year 1 (moderate) = 4-5 cycles for the school year 2 (high) ≥ 6 cycles for the school year	
<b>UNIVERSITY/PARTNER SCHOOL DISTRICT COLLABORATION</b>						
<b>Partnership Schools</b>	Each partnership school has residents (n=6)	Partner School District	Resident Placement List	Resident Placement list sent to Evaluators	Partnership school score 0 = no resident placed in school 1 = resident placed in school	Adequate Implementation = 2
<b>UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings</b>	University representatives, Partnership School Principals (or designee), and PRTs	UTRPP	Meeting Attendance Roster	Attendance Records provided by University Graduate Assistant each month	Score based on % of organizations in attendance at meetings. 0 (low) = ≤74% 1 (moderate) = 75 - 84% 2 (high) = ≥ 85%	

\* Within UTRPP, PRTs have roles similar to traditional university supervisors.



### UTRPP i3 Implementation Fidelity Results 2017, 2018

The results in the table below represent the UTRPP i3 Fidelity Matrix Results for Program Years 3 (2017) and 4 (2018). For years 3 and 4 the following indicators were analyzed: resident clinical experiences, establishing triads for 1<sup>st</sup> year residents, establishing quads for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, content-focused coaching for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, residents at partnership schools, and attendance at UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings.

During Program Year 3 (January 2017 to December 2017), UTRPP had low program implementation fidelity for University Coursework, and adequate implementation for the Residency Program and University/Partner School District Collaboration Components. In Program Year 4 (January-December 2018), UTRPP had adequate program implementation fidelity for University Coursework and University/Partner School District Collaboration Components, and adequate implementation for the Residency Program component.

Indicators	Implementation Fidelity Score at Unit Level	Unit Implementation Fidelity 2017	Unit Implementation Fidelity 2018	Program Level Thresholds	Program Level Fidelity
<b>UNIVERSITY COURSEWORK</b>					
<b>Resident Clinical Experiences</b>	2017 = 1 2018 = 2	<p><b>Moderate</b></p> <p><b>Overall, first-year residents and final-year residents (n=79)* completed 85% of expected clinical hours from January-December 2017</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42% (33/79) of all residents attended ≥ 90% of clinical experiences</li> <li>• 53% (42/79) of all residents attended 80 - 89% of clinical experiences</li> <li>• 5% (4/79) of all residents attended &lt; 80% of clinical experiences</li> </ul>	<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Overall, first-year residents and final-year residents (n=64) *** completed 95% of expected clinical hours**** from January-December 2018</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 92% (59/64) of all residents attended ≥ 90% of clinical experiences</li> <li>• 7% (5/64) of all residents attended 80 - 89% of clinical experiences</li> </ul>	≥ 90% residents have high implementation score = 2	<p><b>2017 Low Program Implementation (score=1)</b></p> <p><b>2018 Adequate Program Implementation (score=2)</b></p>
<b>RESIDENCY PROGRAM</b>					
<b>Establish Triads for Residents in their 1<sup>st</sup> year of residency</b>	2017 = 2 2018 = 2	<p><b>High</b></p> <p>100% of i3 1<sup>st</sup>-year Residents were part of a triad (Resident, CT, and PRT) (24 Residents for January-May 2017)</p>	<p><b>High</b></p> <p>100% of i3 1<sup>st</sup>-year Residents were part of a triad (Resident, CT, and PRT) (18 Residents for January-May 2018)</p>	≥ 90% of residents with high implementation score = 6	<b>2017 Adequate Implementation (score=6)</b>

		(21 Residents for August-December 2017)	(11 Residents for August-December 2018)		<b>2018 Adequate Implementation</b> (score=6)
<b>Establish Quads for Residents in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of residency</b>	2017 = 2 2018 = 2	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents were part of a quad (Resident, CT, PRT, Content Coaches) (12 Residents for January-May 2017) (22 Residents for August-December 2017)	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents were part of a quad (Resident, CT, PRT, Content Coaches) (21 Residents for January-May 2018) (14 Residents for August-December 2018)		
<b>Content-Focused Coaching for Residents in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of residency</b>	2017 = 2 2018 = 2	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents (n=22) participated in each content area (science, math, and literacy) from August-December 2017	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents (n=21) participated in coaching cycles for each content area (science, math, and literacy) from January-April 2018 93% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents (n=14) participated in coaching cycles for math and literacy ***** from August-December 2018 (Literacy 14/14 and Math 13/14)		
<b>UNIVERSITY/PARTNER SCHOOL DISTRICT COLLABORATION</b>					
<b>Partnership Schools</b>	2017 = 1 2018 = 1	<b>High</b> Residents were placed in 100% (n=6) of the partnership schools from January to December 2017.	<b>High</b> Residents were placed in 100% (January-April n=6, August-December n=5) of the partnership schools from January to December 2018.	Low (0) = < 100% of partnership schools have a resident High (1) = 100% of partnership schools have a resident	<b>2017 Adequate Program Implementation</b> (score=2)

<p><b>UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings**</b></p>	<p>2017 = 1 2018 = 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Moderate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All University representatives (faculty member, content coach, GA) were present at each meeting (total = 15/15)</li> <li>• Partner School District representative was present for 4/5 meetings.</li> <li>• 4/6 principals or designee were present at the January meeting, 5/6 principals were present for the February meeting, 3/6 principals or designee were present at the April meeting, 3/6 principals or designee were present at the May meeting, and 4/6 principals or a designee were present at the November meeting (total = 19/30)</li> <li>• 2/3 PRTs were present in the January meeting, all PRTs were present for the February, April, and May meetings (9/9), and 1/2 PRTs were present at the November 2017 meeting (total = 12/14)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Overall, 78% (50/64) of the representatives attended the Advisory Board Meetings.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>High</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All University representatives (faculty member, content coach, GA) were present at each meeting (total = 9/9)</li> <li>• Partner School District representative was present for 2/3 meetings.</li> <li>• 4/6 principals or designee were present at the January meeting, 5/6 principals were present for the March meeting, 3/4 principals or designee were present at the September meeting (total = 12/16) *****</li> <li>• All PRTs were present in the January, March, and September meetings, (total = 6/6)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Overall, 29/34 (85.3%) of the representatives attended the Advisory Board Meetings.</b></p>	<p>Low (0) = &lt;75% organizations attend meetings Moderate (1) = 75 - 84% organizations attend meetings High (2) ≥ 85% of organizations attend meeting</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2018 Adequate Program Implementation</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(score=3)</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

\* For January-April 2017, there were 36 total residents, and from August-December, there were 43 total residents.

\*\* There were five i3 UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings during Year 3 (January, February, April, May, and November 2017).

\*\*\*For January-April 2018, there were 39 total residents, and from August-December 2018, there were 25 total residents.

\*\*\*\* Based on school district policy, each resident was allocated four excused absent days a semester (32 hours).

\*\*\*\*\* Science coaching does not occur in the Fall semester.

There were three i3 UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings during Year 4 (January, March, and September 2018).

\*\*\*\*\* From January-April there were six UTRPP schools, and from August-December there were 5 schools with two schools having the same principal

### UTRPP i3 Implementation Fidelity Results 2019, 2020

The results in the table below represent the UTRPP i3 Fidelity Matrix Results for Program Year 5 (January – December 2019) and Program Year 6 (January - March 2020). For Program Years 5 and 6, the following indicators were analyzed: resident clinical experiences, establishing triads for 1<sup>st</sup> year residents, establishing quads for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, content-focused coaching for 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents, residents at partnership schools, and attendance at UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings.

Of note, is that Program Year 5 (2019), only had 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents during the fall 2019 semester. During Program Year 5 (January-December 2019), UTRPP had adequate program implementation fidelity for University Coursework and University/Partner School District Collaboration Components, and adequate implementation for the Residency Program component.

The 2020 data represent data collected in spring 2020 – this semester was the final semester for UTRPP and was supported through a no cost extension. Additionally, spring 2020 data represent adjusted data due to COVID-19. The week of March 23, 2020 e-learning began. During this time, residents participated in alternate clinical experiences and adjusted required hours from March 23, 2020 – April 17, 2020. During spring 2020, UTRPP had adequate program implementation fidelity for University Coursework and University/Partner School District Collaboration Components, and adequate implementation for the Residency Program component.

Indicators	Implementation Fidelity Score at Unit Level	Unit Implementation Fidelity 2019	Unit Implementation Fidelity 2020	Program Level Thresholds	Program Level Fidelity
<b>UNIVERSITY COURSEWORK</b>					
<b>Resident Clinical Experiences</b>	2019 = 2 2020 = 2	<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Overall, first-year and final-year residents (n=34) * completed 95% of expected clinical hours** from January-December 2019</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>92% (32/34) of all residents attended ≥ 90% of clinical experiences</li> <li>6% (2/34) of all residents attended 80 - 89% of clinical experiences</li> </ul>	<p><b>High</b></p> <p><b>Overall, all residents (n=10) * completed the expected clinical hours from January-April 2020.</b></p>	≥ 90% residents have high implementation score = 2	<p><b>2019 Adequate Program Implementation</b> (score=2)</p> <p><b>2020 Adequate Program Implementation</b> (score=2)</p>
<b>RESIDENCY PROGRAM</b>					
<b>Establish Triads for Residents in</b>	2019 = 2 2020 = N/A	<b>High</b>			<b>2019 Adequate Program Implementation</b>

their 1 <sup>st</sup> year of residency		100% of i3 1 <sup>st</sup> -year Residents were part of a triad (Resident, CT, and PRT) (11 Residents for January-April 2019***)	<b>Not Applicable</b>		(score=6)  <b>2020 Adequate Program Implementation</b>  (score=4)
<b>Establish Quads for Residents in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of residency</b>	2019 = 2 2020 = 2	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents were part of a quad (Resident, CT, PRT, Content Coaches) (14 Residents for January-April 2019) (10 Residents for August-December 2019)	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents were part of a quad (Resident, CT, PRT, Content Coaches) (10 Residents for January-March 2020)	≥90% of residents with high implementation score = 6	
<b>Content-Focused Coaching for Residents in their 2<sup>nd</sup> year of residency</b>	2019 = 2 2020 = 2	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents (n=14) participated in coaching cycles for each content area (science, math, and literacy) from January-April 2019 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents (n=10) participated in coaching cycles for math and literacy **** from August-December 2019.	<b>High</b> 100% of i3 2 <sup>nd</sup> -year Residents (n=10) participated in coaching cycles for each content area (science, math, and literacy) from January-March 2020.		
<b>UNIVERSITY/PARTNER SCHOOL DISTRICT COLLABORATION</b>					
<b>Partnership Schools</b>	2019 = 1 2020 = 1	<b>High</b> Residents were placed in 100% (January-April n=4, August-December n=3) of the partnership schools from January to December 2019.	<b>High</b> Residents were placed in 100% partnership schools from January – March 2020.	Low (0) = < 100% of partnership schools have a resident High (1) = 100% of partnership schools have a resident	<b>2019 Adequate Program Implementation</b>  (score=2)

<p><b>UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings**</b></p>	<p>2019 = 2 2020 =</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>High</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All University representatives (faculty member, content coach, GA) were present at each meeting (total = 9/9)</li> <li>• Partner school district representative was present for 3/3 meetings.</li> <li>• 2/4 principals or designee were present at the January meeting, 2/4 principals were present for the March meeting, 3/3 principals or designee were present at the November meeting (total = 7/11) *****</li> <li>• All PRTs were present in the January, March, and November meetings, (total = 6/6)</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Overall, 25/29 (86.3%) of the representatives attended the Advisory Board Meetings.</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>High*****</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All University representatives (faculty member, content coach, GA) were present at the meetings.</li> <li>• Partner School District representative was present for the meetings.</li> <li>• 3/3 principals or designee were present at the March meeting.</li> <li>• All PRTs were present in the March meeting.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Overall, 100% of the representatives attended the Advisory Board Meeting.</b></p>	<p>Low (0) = &lt;75% organizations attend meetings Moderate (1) = 75 - 84% organizations attend meetings High (2) ≥ 85% of organizations attend meeting</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2020 Adequate Program Implementation</b>  (score=2)</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

For January-April, there were 24 total residents that completed the residency hours, and from August-December, there were 10 total residents – all were 2<sup>nd</sup> year residents.

\*\* Based on school district policy, each resident was allocated four excused absent days a semester (32 hours).

\*\*\* Eleven first-year residents began the program. One student withdrew. Data for this indicator is reported on the original eleven placements.

\*\*\*\* Science coaching does not occur in the Fall semester.

\*\*\*\*\* There were three i3 UTRPP Advisory Board Meetings during Year 5 (January, March, and November 2019).

\*\*\*\*\* From January-April there were four UTRPP schools, and from August-December there were three schools.

## Summary of Formative Evaluation Activities

Throughout qualitative data collection residents noted that the increased field experiences provided a sense of preparedness for the classroom as driving factors for applying to UTRPP; however, residents consistently agreed that UTRPP was an intense and rigorous program. Whereas the increased field experiences and a sense of preparedness for the classroom were driving factors for applying to UTRPP, participants explicitly expressed that they felt “stressed,” “frustrated,” and “overwhelmed.” Many residents shared that they maintained outside jobs to manage their day-to-day finances and shared that the time dedicated to their jobs and families caused them to grapple with balancing coursework, residency, and daily life experiences. Whereas the residents recognized that their extended experiences in the classroom were potentially developing them into quality teachers, some residents openly shared they are questioning their choice of education as a profession. However, the majority of residents indicated that if they remain in teaching, they wished to teach in Title I settings and are thankful for the opportunity to impact their students as people and learners.

Additionally, the qualitative evaluation process identified the following UTRPP items as important findings:

- 1. Role of Consistent Coaching and Support** – UTRPP is a clinically-centered teacher preparation program that immerses residents in authentic classroom practice from the onset of the program. Throughout these experiences the residents are afforded consistent coaching and support from various university and school-based teacher educators – PRTs, CTs, university faculty content coaches, and other partner school district personnel. Residents engaged in explicit coaching conversations weekly. These coached experiences emerged as a program component that residents and alumni perceived as extremely influential on their enactment of content and pedagogy. When asked to identify the aspects of UTRPP that were most influential on their growth as a teacher, residents and alumni all discussed how the ability to engage in on-going coaching enhanced their UTRPP experience. They perceived these coaching sessions as a space to gain knowledge, openly ask questions, and learn from experienced mentors. When reflecting on UTRPP coaching, alumni noted that the extensive coaching they received as a resident helped them to feel comfortable asking for assistance and collaborating with school-based coaches as a classroom teacher.
- 2. Self-Efficacy and Confidence Entering the Classroom** – A key finding is that all interviewed alumni communicated a sense of self-confidence and high levels of self-efficacy regarding their role as a classroom teacher. When asked how UTRPP influenced their confidence as a teacher, particularly as a teacher within a Title I context, interviewed alumni noted the importance of their extensive opportunities to engage in authentic teaching in authentic settings. They shared that learning to teach in a Title I context helped them to better understand the backgrounds, cultures, and experiences their students bring to the classroom. Whereas they recognized that UTRPP was intense and often overwhelming, they perceived their experiences to have successfully prepared them for the realities of teaching and they noted they felt more confident as early career teachers than their like peers. Another aspect of UTRPP that contributed to alumni confidence was the direct connection to the partner school district evaluation system. Alumni were appreciative of their knowledge of the partner school district rubric and the opportunity to be observed often using the rubric – sharing they now better understood the strong emphasis on this as a resident and that the evaluation system was not an intimidating process.



**3. Challenges Encountered** - One challenge encountered throughout the duration of the program was UTRPP's inability to recruit the maximum number of allocated residents. The target number of 35 residents was not met in any implementation year, and only 41% of the of the original target number of 175 graduates from 2016-2020 was attained. UTRPP leadership attempted to enhance recruitment efforts, yet resident numbers remained low. Consistently, residents identified several challenges and stressors that may have added to low enrollment numbers. The UTRPP time commitment, and as a result, the financial strain weighed heavily on residents. Another emerging challenge connected to coherence and communication. A lesson learned throughout the program was the importance of coherence and communication across stakeholders and program requirements. Often residents discussed areas of confusion regarding coursework assignments and their alignment with partner school district expectations for teaching. Residents were extremely appreciative of assignments that directly connected to their experiences in the classroom, yet felt conflicted with assignments that did not seem to fit into the structure of their daily classroom experiences. Residents often felt that planning for the semester was difficult due to schedule changes and varying assignment expectations - residents shared how some assignments overlapped and that assignment due dates often conflicted.

Communication with and across instructors and with Collaborating Teachers proved to provide additional challenges. Residents wondered if all Collaborating Teachers, and course instructors, truly understood their role and the tasks they were to complete. Communication is key for projects to be successful. Communication was challenging due to competing demands. Thus, having a set communication plan was necessary. The most successful UTRPP years were those when leadership and the Advisory Council, met regularly and consistently with shared agendas and action steps between meetings. As team members and program needs changed the communication systems needed to adapt.

### **UTRRP Impact Evaluation**

Upon completion of the UTRPP Residency Program, district provided data were examined to determine if students taught by former UTRPP residents had different outcomes than students taught by teachers from traditional teacher preparation programs. Given the smaller than anticipated UTRPP cohorts and the large number of former residents that did not seek employment in the partner school district, as well as changes in achievement data that were available for kindergarten and first grade students, the methods originally planned for the impact evaluation were modified. Information on modifications are provided as they occurred.

For this report we examined if students taught by former UTRPP residents during their first year in the partner school district differed from students taught by first year teachers from traditional teacher preparation programs on the following outcomes: reading achievement, mathematics achievement, number of days students attended school, and suspensions. Inclusion in this report was dependent on what grade the former UTRPP residents taught. For 1617 and 1718, pre and post achievement data were available for grades 2 – 5 and in 1819 pre and post achievement data were available for grades K – 5. Because achievement data were not available for kindergarten or first grade in some years, as was originally proposed, this limited the number of former residents that were included. For example, although six former UTRPP residents were employed by the partner school district during the 1617 AY, only two, who both taught third grade, are included in the impact analyses – the other four taught

kindergarten and first grade. For the 1718 AY, two of the six former residents who were employed by the partner school district were also excluded from this analysis because they taught kindergarten. All four former residents working in the partner school district in 1819 were included in this analysis.

A total of 10 former UTRPP residents are included in these analyses. Two from 1617 (both who taught third grade), four from 1718 (one who taught second grade, one who taught third grade, and two who taught fourth grade), and four from 1819 (three who taught kindergarten and one who taught fifth grade). All of the former residents taught at Title I schools and were matched with first year teachers at Title I schools who were trained through traditional teacher preparation programs. Given the small number of residents to find matched classrooms for and the lack of teacher level data that was originally listed to use in a propensity score matching process, former residents and traditionally trained first year teachers were manually matched based on “baseline” reading and mathematics achievement data. In 1617 and 1718, Stanford-10 (for grades 2 and 3) and FCAT (for grades 4 and 5) achievement data from the prior spring were used as baseline data. In 1819, i-Ready data were used so the 2018 fall assessments were used as baseline data. All matched teachers had baseline assessment scores within 5 points of each other. Because different assessments were used for different grades and across the years, all achievement data were converted to z-scores by academic year, test type, and grade level. We also examined if students differed in their attendance, measured as days attended, and suspensions, measured as 0 days of suspension vs. 1 or more days of suspension. The SURVEYREG and SURVEYLOGISTIC procedures in SAS were used to account for the clustering of students within teachers.

## Results

Based on the regression models, no statistically significant differences were found in any of the outcomes. Results from the four regression models are provided in Table 1. In the results, the primary coefficient of interest is for the variable, UTRPP – those regression coefficients represent the differences in each outcome for students taught by former UTRPP residents and those taught by teachers from traditional teacher preparation programs. Remember, because the reading and mathematics achievement data were transformed to z-scores, the regression coefficients from those models are to be interpreted as differences in standardized means.

Table 1  
*Regression Analyses Results Examining Differences in Outcomes between Students Taught by Former UTRPP Residents and Those Taught by Teachers from Traditional Teacher Prep Programs*

		Estimate	Standard Error	t value	p-value
Reading Achievement					
	Intercept	103.78	5.66	18.33	<.0001
	UTRPP	1.93	7.94	0.24	0.8081
Mathematics Achievement					
	Intercept	-0.08	0.07	-1.16	0.2485
	UTRPP	0.04	0.11	0.36	0.7184

Days of School Attended					
	Intercept	103.78	5.66	18.33	<.0001
	UTRPP	1.93	7.94	0.24	0.8081
Suspended from School**					
	Intercept	2.72	0.25	-10.93	<.0001
	UTRPP	-0.67	0.40	-1.68	0.0931

Notes: \*\* Results are from logistic regression model predicting suspended = 1

### Conclusion

Although UTRPP had good implementation fidelity, given the low numbers of students who participated in the program and the low number of UTRPP residents that went on to work as teachers in the partner school district, it was not surprising to see no evidence in student outcomes. At the end of the funded i3 program the partner school district was planning to reimagine a more nimble and innovative program, based on the lessons learned during the current project, however, since then, the University that sponsored UTRPP has since closed its College of Education and will no longer be training teacher educators. Perhaps the partner school district can take some of the more successful practices (including content coaching and integrated elementary STEM lessons) and include them in their beginning teacher support and retention programs.