

Investing In Innovation (i3) Fund

Scaling Teach For America:
Growing the Talent Force Working to Ensure *All* Our Nation's
Students Have Access to a Quality Education

TEACHFORAMERICA



Submitted to:
The U.S. Department of Education Office of Innovation and Improvement

May 11, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| A. NEED FOR THE PROJECT AND QUALITY OF THE PROJECT DESIGN | 1 |
| A(1) AN EXCEPTIONAL APPROACH TO THE PRIORITIES | 3 |
| A(2) PROJECT DESIGN: REACHING 850,000 STUDENTS BY THE 2014-15 SCHOOL YEAR | 7 |
| B. STRENGTH OF RESEARCH, SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECT, AND MAGNITUDE OF EFFECT | 16 |
| B(1) STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE ON TEACH FOR AMERICA'S IMPACT | 16 |
| B(2) MAGNITUDE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE POTENTIAL EFFECTS | 23 |
| C. EXPERIENCE OF THE ELIGIBLE APPLICANT AND PARTNERS | 27 |
| C(1) PAST PERFORMANCE DEVELOPING, EXECUTING AND GROWING A PROVEN MODEL | 27 |
| C(2) COMPELLING EVIDENCE OF IMPACT ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT | 40 |
| D. QUALITY OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION | 42 |
| D(1) WELL-DESIGNED EXPERIMENTAL STUDY | 43 |
| D(2) EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE PRACTICE AT SCALE | 46 |
| D(3) IMPLEMENTATION DATA AND PERIODIC FEEDBACK | 46 |
| D(4) INFORMATION PERTINENT TO REPLICATION AND TESTING | 47 |
| D(5) SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY | 48 |
| D(6) INDEPENDENCE OF THE EVALUATOR | 48 |
| E. STRATEGY AND CAPACITY TO BRING TO SCALE | 50 |
| E(1) NUMBER OF STUDENTS REACHED | 50 |
| E(2) CAPACITY TO SCALE | 52 |
| E(3) REPLICATING THE PROJECT | 54 |
| E(4) START-UP AND OPERATING COSTS PER STUDENT PER YEAR | 55 |
| E(5) DISSEMINATING KNOWLEDGE AND BEST PRACTICES | 57 |
| F. SUSTAINABILITY | 60 |
| F(1) SUSTAINING GROWTH THROUGH 2015 AND BEYOND | 60 |
| F(2) IMPACT BEYOND THE SCALE-UP GRANT | 67 |
| G. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PERSONNEL | 69 |
| G(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN | 69 |
| G(2) QUALIFICATIONS OF TEACH FOR AMERICA STAFF | 73 |
| G(3) QUALIFICATIONS OF PROJECT EVALUATION STAFF: MATHEMATICA POLICY RESEARCH | 76 |
| COMPETITIVE PRIORITIES | 78 |
| COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 5 – INNOVATIONS FOR IMPROVING EARLY LEARNING OUTCOMES | 78 |
| COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 7 – INNOVATIONS TO ADDRESS THE UNIQUE LEARNING NEEDS OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS | 81 |
| COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY 8 – INNOVATIONS THAT SERVE SCHOOLS IN RURAL LEAS | 84 |

A. Need for the Project and Quality of the Project Design

In America, education is supposed to be the great equalizer and the primary vehicle for upward mobility. But, the reality today is that all too often, where children are born determines their educational prospects. Across the country, the 14 million children living in poverty¹ have academic and, therefore, life prospects that are dramatically different than those of their peers in wealthier communities. This gap starts early: children living in low-income communities are already two to three grades behind their higher-income peers by the time they reach fourth grade.² And it widens as students progress to high school: about 50% of students in low-income communities will not graduate from high school by the time they are 18 years old³; those who do graduate perform, on average, at the level of eighth graders in higher-income communities.⁴ By age 24, only 9% of young people from low-income communities have attained a bachelor's degree, compared with 75% of people from high-income families.⁵

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, "Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2008," 2009.

² U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009 Reading Assessments.

³ Editorial Projects in Education / Education Week, "Diploma Counts," 2009.

⁴ On average, 12th graders whose family income makes them eligible for free or reduced lunch scored at roughly the same level on the 2005 NAEP reading assessments as 8th graders from wealthier families.

⁵ Kati Haycock, "Promise Abandoned: How Policy Choices and Institutional Practices Restrict College Opportunities," Education Trust, 2006.

President Obama said in a landmark speech on education last year, “From the moment students enter a school, the most important factor in their success is not the color of their skin or the income of their parents, it’s the person standing at the front of the classroom.”⁶ Research consistently shows that teacher quality has the most important school-based effect on student outcomes.⁷ Yet schools serving low-income students struggle to attract sufficient numbers of highly effective teachers. Students growing up in poverty need truly exceptional teachers to help them overcome the extra challenges they face relative to their wealthier peers. They need more teachers with the conviction, skills, and abilities to change the academic and life trajectories of students. This project will provide more of those teachers.

Teach For America serves the highest-need students in the country. In the schools where we place teachers⁸, about 90% of students are African American or Latino/Hispanic and roughly

⁶ Barack Obama, “Remarks by the President to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce on a Complete and Competitive American Education,” March 10, 2009.

⁷ See for example, Steven G. Rivkin, Eric A. Hanushek, and John F. Kain. “Teachers, Schools, and Academic Achievement.” *Econometrica* 73 (2005): 417-458.

⁸ Teach For America places teachers in around 140 school districts and an additional 200 charter schools. For this i3 grant, we are partnering with 148 LEAs. We anticipate adding additional LEAs as partners through outreach to other current placement districts over the summer and to new sites throughout the project period. We will add LEA partners based several criteria including student achievement gaps, the concentration of high-need students, the vision for education reform in the local community, and capacity to place Teach For America teachers. The new site development team makes recommendations to the operating committee, which formally approves new site partners.

80% receive free or reduced-price lunch.⁹ According to a 2004 study by Mathematica Research Inc., students in Teach For America teachers' classrooms began the year, on average, at the 14th percentile against the national norm.¹⁰

Teach For America fills critical needs for the highest-poverty districts in the country. Currently, Teach For America teachers represent between 10% and 15% of new teachers hired in high-poverty schools across our 35 regions, covering most of the country's major urban and rural areas. (Teach For America's "regions" are cities or contiguous rural areas. These regions often contain multiple LEAs. See Appendix H for a list of all of our regions and the LEAs and charter partners within them.) As more and more districts place a strong emphasis on significantly advancing student achievement, they seek more teachers with the same orientation. Teach For America meets our partners' need for a steady, reliable source of highly effective, student-achievement-focused teachers.

As our teacher corps continues to grow, we not only will increase the supply of quality teachers for students in need, but also will expand dramatically the pipeline of future school and district leaders with the experience, skills, and conviction to effect transformational change.

A(1) An exceptional approach to the priorities

Absolute priority number one. Since 1990, Teach For America has recruited, selected, trained and supported around 25,000 new public school teachers for all subject areas and grade

⁹ The demographic information comes from the websites greatschools.org and schoolmatters.com. Using these websites, we looked up the demographic information for each school in which we placed corps members during the 2008-09 school year.

¹⁰ Paul T. Decker, Daniel P. Mayer, and Steven Glazerman, "The Effects of Teach For America on Students: Findings from a National Evaluation," Mathematica Research Inc., 2004.

levels, placing them with partner schools and districts serving the highest-need students in the country. Teach For America's work, and the work proposed in our Investing in Innovation scale-up project described in detail below, explicitly addresses Absolute Priority 1 – Innovations that Support Effective Teachers and Principals.

This i3 project also will allow Teach For America to have a broader and deeper impact in the following competitive priorities, discussed in more detail later in this proposal:

- Competitive Preference Priority 5 – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
- Competitive Preference Priority 7 – Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students
- Competitive Preference Priority 8 – Innovations that Serve Schools in Rural LEAs

Teach For America's approach. Teach For America brings a unique combination of methodology, experience, and capacity to address the need for additional effective teachers and leaders in high-need schools and districts. While many LEAs now access new teachers from local alternate routes, Teach For America remains the sole source for exceptional national prospects, with a comprehensive and aligned training and support program that works closely with teachers for two years of classroom teaching and beyond.

At a high level, there are six distinctive characteristics that make Teach For America's approach exceptional in serving the highest-need students across the country:

1. **Grounded in student achievement outcomes, with multiple rating categories of effectiveness:** We measure the success of our teachers by the degree to which their students achieve academic gains, with the expectation that they will lead their students

forward at least 1.5 years in one academic year. Additionally, we recruit and select individuals based on their potential to be highly effective teachers in low-income communities, and we train, support, and develop them to do so. With more than a decade of experience explicitly linking student gains data to our recruitment, selection, training, and support practices, we have accumulated significant knowledge regarding what it takes to produce highly effective teachers for high-need schools. This central focus on student achievement places more students on the path to academic and life success.

- 2. A national infrastructure, strategy, and brand for recruiting the most committed leaders from across the country to teach in LEAs in low-income communities:** We recruit and select top recent college graduates to the classroom, most of whom would not otherwise have considered teaching. Stephanie Day, the recently named Washington, D.C., teacher of the year, provides a case in point: “I was considering the Ph.D. program in sociology at the University of Oregon and Teach For America contacted me. We had a conversation about the education challenges of students in the District of Columbia. That conversation changed my life and I eventually moved to Washington, D.C., to begin my teaching career.” Our national infrastructure and reputation allow us to compete for talent with the best recruiters in the country – top private companies and prestigious programs such as the Peace Corps. Thus, through a strong brand, aggressive outreach, and careful selection, we provide high-need LEAs with access to a unique national pipeline of new teachers.

- 3. Pre-service and ongoing professional development based on practical experience in low-income schools with a clear vision and road map for success in this context:** With thousands of teachers in hundreds of underserved schools across the country, our

curriculum and support models have emerged from, and continue to be informed by, practical experience in a specific context: students disproportionately affected by the achievement gap growing up in low-income communities. At the cornerstone of our program is our Teaching As Leadership framework, which maps out what successful teaching looks like in this context at increasing stages of proficiency.¹¹

4. **Explicit focus on recruiting, placing, training, and supporting diverse, effective teachers who fill our most pressing needs within high-need schools:** Teach For America is deeply committed to increasing the racial and economic diversity of our corps to ensure that more high-need students have positive role models who share their backgrounds and experiences. We also work to build a force of teachers to meet our nation's most pressing needs in early childhood, special education, and math and science – as well as in remote rural communities.
5. **Demonstrated ability to grow rapidly to meet the demand for great new teachers and educational leaders.** By leveraging significant private funding, and working closely with our LEA partners, Teach For America has grown from placing 875 new teachers in the 1999-00 school year to nearly 4,100 in the 2009-10 school year.
6. **Experience developing the mindsets, skills, knowledge, and opportunities that foster the leadership of alumni in closing the achievement gap.** Teach For America recruits individuals with leadership skills, ensures they gain the foundational experiences and insights that are critical to great educational leadership and advocacy, and then works in partnership with other educational institutions to accelerate their career paths as excellent

¹¹ Please see Appendix H for detailed information about the Teaching As Leadership framework and rubric.

teachers, school principals and district administrators, policy and advocacy leaders, innovators and leaders in other sectors working to address educational inequity. Our teachers become members of a community that reinforces their long-term commitment to advancing student achievement and educational opportunities for all students.

Collectively, these characteristics create a student-achievement-centered, data-driven, scalable model for supplying the highest-need schools with a growing and unique source of effective teachers who are recruited, trained, and supported to lead their students to significant academic achievement, even in their first year in the classroom, where they also gain the experience and conviction required to become the next generation of educational leaders.

A(2) Project design: Reaching 850,000 students by the 2014-15 school year

Teach For America teachers, whom we call corps members, teach for two years in low-income urban and rural communities across the country; today, corps members reach approximately 450,000 students in 28 states and Washington, D.C. At the same time, there are 5,000 “alumni” teachers (alumni are individuals who completed our two-year program) serving hundreds of thousands of students directly and 460 alumni who are school leaders reaching an estimated 500,000 high-need students. Through this i3 project, Teach For America – in partnership with 148 LEAs nationwide and with broad support from public and private sector champions – will grow our teacher corps by more than 80% by September 2014. During this four-year project (payment to the evaluator will extend into a fifth year), more than 28,000¹² talented, young leaders will enter high-need classrooms as new teachers via Teach For America, and we will achieve the following outcomes:

¹² This figure includes an estimated 5,300 in the 2011-12 school year, 6,000 in 2012-13, 6,700 in 2013-14, and 7,500 in 2014-15.

- Grow our corps to 13,500 teachers (first- and second-year corps members) reaching 850,000 students in high-need schools
- Train and support teachers so that a majority of them earn the rating of “highly effective”¹³ during their first or second year of teaching
- Establish proven pipelines for recruiting, training, placing, and developing “highly effective” teachers in 52-54 regions across the country, spanning at least 35 states and Washington, D.C., and accounting for approximately 20% of new hires in high-need schools across these regions

Section C details the methods and strategies Teach for America has developed over the past 20 years to identify, recruit, select, place, train, and develop highly effective teachers and accelerate their impact as leaders. It also outlines our past success scaling this approach. In this section, we lay out our goals and strategy to scale up our unique and proven approach.

Specifically, we will pursue the following goals to increase the supply of effective teachers and leaders in the highest need schools and communities:

Table 1: I3 Program Goals

| Grant period | October 2010 – September 2014 | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| School year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
| Growth Goals | | | | | | |
| Number of students impacted | 450,000 | 500,000 | 600,000 | 675,000 | 750,000 | 850,000 |
| New teachers recruited, selected, trained, and placed for coming year | 4,500 | 5,300 | 6,000 | 6,700 | 7,500 | 8,000 |

¹³ We define “highly effective” teachers as those who move their students forward at least one-and-a-half years and “effective” teachers as those who move their students forward at least one year. Please see page 34 for more detailed information about how we define these categories.

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total teachers (1 st and 2 nd year) | 7,300 | 8,300 | 9,600 | 11,000 | 12,300 | 13,500 |
| Number of regions | 35 | 39 | 43-44 | 46-47 | 49-50 | 52-54 |
| <u>Impact Goals</u> | | | | | | |
| % of highly effective teachers (1st years/2nd years) | 44%/55% | 45%/56% | 46%/57% | 47%/58% | 48%/59% | 50%/60% |
| # of highly effective teachers (1 st year and 2 nd years) | 3,600 | 41,00 | 4,900 | 5,700 | 6,500 | 7,500 |
| % of highly effective and effective teachers (1st years/2nd years) | 70%/80% | 71%/81% | 72%/82% | 73%/83% | 74%/84% | 75%/85% |
| # of highly effective and effective teachers (1 st years and 2 nd years) | 5,500 | 6,300 | 7,300 | 8,500 | 9,600 | 10,900 |

This project will focus on scaling our core program strategies and activities: recruiting and selecting high potential teachers; partnering with LEAs to ensure our teachers are placed in the highest-need schools; training our new teachers, providing intensive professional development during their two years in the classroom, and measuring and managing their impact on student achievement; and accelerating their leadership for educational progress.

Recruitment and selection. Through a national recruitment effort that spans 370 college campuses and nearly 130 recruitment partner organizations, Teach For America recruits, selects, and matriculates outstanding recent college graduates, only one in six of whom would have

entered the teaching profession if not for Teach For America¹⁴, to teach in schools serving low-income communities. To field a corps of 8,000 first-year teachers by the 2014-15 school year, maintaining quality as we grow, we must increase applications, though at a slower rate than in the past. This year, over 46,000 individuals applied to our program for just over 4,500 positions. Since we currently have a wait list of over 1,000 applicants who would be admitted under our selection criteria, we will attain some growth without growing applications, but by 2012, we will need to see annual growth in applications of at least 10% (we have grown applications between 32% to 42% each of the last three years).

We will scale our recruitment and selection efforts effectively and efficiently by:

- **Gathering, analyzing, and utilizing significant amounts of data to identify the most promising prospects and personally convince them to apply to Teach For America.**

We will build a database of more than 300,000 prospective applicants each year to enable proactive, targeted outreach to the most desirable candidates. This academic year, we held one-on-one meetings with 24,700 college seniors; we have already met with nearly 5,000 undergraduates interested in applying in future years.

- **Seizing untapped potential on college campuses.** Across the universe of undergraduate campuses, we see significant opportunity to emulate our success at our top performing schools. For instance, Harvard College is our leading Ivy League campus (18% of the senior class applied to Teach For America), the University of North Carolina is our leading “most selective” public university (7.7% of the senior class applied), and the University of Wisconsin-Madison is our leading “more selective” public university

¹⁴ This figure is based on a survey distributed to individuals who were accepted to the 2010 corps.

partner (5.7% of the senior class applied). By replicating strategies used on these campuses, we will increase applications at their peer institutions. We also will grow by increasing the number of full-time campus recruiters from less than 60 in the fall of 2010 to nearly 80 in the fall of 2014, which will allow us to double our presence on the highest potential campuses and increase applications from college seniors by 30% to 35%.

- **Continuing to grow applications among graduate students and professionals at the early stages of their careers.** Since 2007, applications from graduate students and professionals have more than quadrupled; this year over 18,000 graduate students and professionals applied to Teach For America. We have just begun developing targeted outreach to these markets through on-campus meetings, strategic partnerships with professional networks, and tapping into online social media strategies and faith-based communities and see great potential in building upon our brand and reputation to refine and expand our efforts.

Our strong reputation and track record of success gives us confidence we will be able to achieve our recruitment and selection goals. College students recently ranked Teach For America as the #9 most desirable employer on a survey of all employers (Google was #1, and Teach For America was ahead of prominent private companies such as Microsoft and Goldman Sachs).¹⁵ Additionally, Teach For America was the top employer on 25 college campuses last year, including Dartmouth, Georgetown, Marquette, Pepperdine, Spelman, Tulane, Vanderbilt, University of Chicago, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Building on this strong foundation, we are optimistic about executing our plan.

¹⁵ BusinessWeek, “The Hottest Employers 2010,” April 30, 2010.

Placements in LEA districts and opening new regions. We will secure the necessary placements to grow to 13,500 first- and second-year teachers in the 2014-15 school year by closely monitoring, managing, and responding to demand from new and existing communities, districts, and charter schools.

- We will open at least 12 new regions by the 2014-15 school year (3 to 5 per year), placing at least 1,000 new teachers in regions that do not currently have Teach For America teachers. We will focus initially on 20 prospective regions that have expressed interest and demonstrated need.
- We will work closely with our 35 existing regions to grow their LEA partnerships and placements. Twenty of our 35 regions currently have concrete plans and strong potential to grow in 2011 and beyond.
- We will seize new opportunities for growth created by Race To The Top (RTTT) and increased demand for effective teachers in state plans. Funding for human capital strategies that include Teach For America were proposed by 11 of the 16 finalists (CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, IL, KY, LA, NC, RI, and TN)¹⁶, including both of the first-round winners. Were every application to be fully funded, demand associated with these RTTT applications would result in estimated incremental growth in our corps in these regions of nearly 2,000 teachers between now and 2015.

¹⁶ In all of these instances, Teach For America was either explicitly mentioned in state budgets or would be competitive for human capital funding pending a state level procurement process.

- We will closely monitor local placement and funding landscapes – how many placements and LEA contracts we have secured, and the prospects and probability for additional placements – growing or contracting our local teacher corps according to demand.

In addition to the growing demand for our teachers and our 20 years of experience partnering with LEAs and opening new regions, our recent placement success supports the viability of our plan. Despite significant state and district budget cuts and unfavorable hiring landscapes in many states, we opened six new regions and placed 4,100 new teachers this past school year, up from 3,700 the previous year. This coming school year we will open four new regions and place a still larger corps.

Training and support of teachers to ensure effectiveness. We will continue to produce more highly effective teachers each year by scaling our core infrastructure, particularly our summer training institute and program director¹⁷ models; making more effective use of high-touch technology; and continuously improving our measurement system, trainings, and supports.

- We will open an additional summer training institute in 2012 and another in 2014 to accommodate our growing corps, utilizing the systems and processes developed in successfully opening five new institutes in the last five years.
- We will hire and train additional program directors each year, continuously improving the quality of our coaching model and taking advantage of our growing alumni base – currently 17,000 strong – as a readily accessible and high-quality pool of talent.

¹⁷ Program directors are regional program staff members who were successful corps members themselves and who serve as instructional coaches for corps members. For more information about our program directors, please see page 33.

- We will expand and enhance our online Teaching and Learning Center, based on very positive and constructive feedback from corps members, program staff, and alumni teachers. The Teaching and Learning Center is part of a an online portal called TFA Net where corps members and alumni have access to information, tools, and resources designed to enhance their effectiveness as teachers and where corps members can exchange ideas and questions with one another.
- We will develop, refine, and roll out a new approach to measuring and managing the effectiveness of our teachers, based on their performance relative to top teachers nationwide. As the common core standards and assessments work develops, we will incorporate those into our approach.
- We will offer more and better subject- and grade-level specific training and support through more tailored planning and instructional tools, online communities and resources, and more specialized program director assignments (e.g. in larger regions, program directors will increasingly specialize according to grade levels or subject matter expertise when possible).
- We will work to ensure that every corps member has a full suite of rigorous diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments to inform and improve classroom instruction.
- We will continue to research the drivers of teacher performance and improvement to inform program design and development, including our selection model and recruitment approach.

These strategies will enable us not only to scale our teacher training and development model as our teacher corps grows, but also to continue to increase the number and percentage of “highly effective” teachers each year by providing them with ready access to high-quality,

increasingly tailored resources, learning communities, and support while holding them accountable for achieving results with their students on par with the most effective teachers across the country.

Accelerating alumni leadership. We will continue to provide support to alumni who remain as teachers in classrooms, and to accelerate and increase the impact of our alumni who aspire to become leaders in schools and school systems through expanding our educational leadership initiatives. This is particularly critical as our alumni force will grow from 17,000 to over 30,000 during the course of this project. We will:

- Pilot alumni teacher activities related to recognizing top performing teachers through a national teacher awards program, facilitating opportunities for having a voice in the education reform movement, and supporting professional growth
- Deepen relationships with principals, district leaders, and charter management organizations to help them attract and retain our alumni in their talent pipelines
- Work with states and LEA partners develop and launch a district leadership initiative to meet the demand for individuals with the skills and experiences necessary to be transformational leaders

Thus, in growing our corps by more than 80% over the course of this project, we will be expanding the pool of highly effective teachers, and of future school and district leaders, for many years to come.

B. Strength of Research, Significance of Effect, and Magnitude of Effect

B(1) Strength of the evidence on Teach For America's impact

There is a growing body of research documenting the positive effect that Teach For America teachers have on their students' academic achievement. Research consistently shows that corps members' students' academic results are stronger than those of students of other novice teachers at statistically significant levels. Additionally, some studies show that students of corps members outperform students of veteran teachers. These results are confirmed by both a large-scale experimental study as well as numerous quasi-experimental studies.

Experimental.

At the elementary-school level, Teach For America corps members' positive impact on student achievement is most rigorously supported in a 2004 large-scale randomized controlled study published by Mathematica Policy Research Inc., a highly regarded research firm with extensive experience in successfully implementing experimental education studies.¹⁸

The Mathematica researchers concluded that Teach For America corps members had a positive impact on their students' achievement in math: "Average math scores were significantly higher among TFA students than among control students." Teach For America teachers achieved larger math achievement gains than did the non-Teach For America teachers, including experienced teachers; in comparing the growth of Teach For America students and the growth of non-Teach For America students, the difference was statistically significant. The researchers concluded that the impact of Teach For America teachers was equivalent to an effect size of about 0.15, or approximately one additional month of instruction.

¹⁸ Decker, Mayer, and Glazerman.

When the Teach For America teachers were compared only to the novice non-Teach For America teachers (novice teachers were defined as being in their first three years of teaching), the effect size was 0.26. The authors noted that this impact of having a Teach For America teacher compared with another novice teacher was roughly equivalent to reducing class size by eight students.

In reading, the students of Teach For America teachers experienced about the same growth as the students of non-Teach For America teachers.

In the study, researchers compared student outcomes of Teach For America teachers with student outcomes of other teachers in the same schools and at the same grades. The researchers randomly assigned students in grades 1 to 5 to their classrooms before the start of the school year to ensure that the classes were essentially identical in terms of average characteristics of the students – that way, any differences in average student outcomes could be attributed to differences in teachers.

The study was done in two stages. First, the researchers conducted a pilot study in our Baltimore region during the 2001-02 school year. Then, they conducted a full-scale evaluation in five additional urban and rural regions during the 2002-03 school year: Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, New Orleans, and the Mississippi Delta. (This sample included 6 of the 15 regions in which Teach For America placed teachers at the time the study was designed.)

The strength of this research design reinforces the causal conclusions of the study (high internal validity) as well as the ability to generalize the findings to represent the impact of Teach For America teachers on student achievement on a national scale (high external validity).

Quasi-Experimental.

North Carolina (high school): The most persuasive study documenting the impact of Teach For America corps members on student achievement at the high-school level was conducted in 2008 (and updated in 2009) by the Urban Institute and the National Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER).¹⁹ Researchers found that when looking across eight subjects at the high school level, the impact of a Teach For America teacher is equivalent to an effect size of 0.10. This impact was two to three times the size of the impact of having a teacher with three or more years of experience relative to a novice teacher. When looking at science only, the effect of Teach For America teachers over non-Teach For America teachers was 0.18. Concluding that corps members had a stronger impact on student achievement than all other non-Teach For America teachers, including teachers certified in their field and more experienced teachers, researchers wrote: “Disadvantaged secondary students would be better off with TFA teachers, especially in math and science, than with fully licensed in-field teachers with three or more years of experience.”

Using end-of-course exam data from the 2000-01 to 2006-07 school years from 23 LEAs in the state, researchers estimated the effect of Teach For America teachers compared to traditional-route teachers. They were able to link end-of-course state exam data to individual teachers for eight subjects. Teach For America teachers in this study were first- and second-year corps members; the non-Teach For America teachers in this study were experienced and novice teachers, all certified.

¹⁹ Zeyu Xu, Jane Hannaway, and Colin Taylor, “Making a Difference? The Effects of Teach for America in High School,” Urban Institute/CALDER, 2008-09.

This quasi-experimental study used a sophisticated methodology developed by well regarded researchers²⁰ for analyzing outcome data without prior year test scores²¹ that concluded that student ability varies little by subject in North Carolina high schools. The Urban Institute/CALDER researchers also found that Teach For America teachers are assigned to more academically challenged classrooms and, on average, their classes have a much higher concentration of minority students. The study was reviewed by the Institute for Educational Sciences' What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), which concluded it meets the WWC evidence standards with reservations.²² The researchers re-analyzed the data in 2009 with a larger sample and with additional comparison groups and came to the same conclusions.

²⁰ Charles T. Clotfelter, Helen F. Ladd, and Jacob L. Vigdor, "Teacher Credentials and Student Achievement in High School: A Cross-Subject Analysis with Student Fixed Effects," Urban Institute/CALDER, 2007.

²¹ Given the nature of high school courses (typically a student only takes a subject once) there are no lagged or prior year test scores available, so the researchers identified alternate models for isolating teacher impact.

²² The What Works Clearinghouse reviewers noted that students in the high school classrooms may have been non-randomly assigned to teachers and as a result differences in student abilities may influence the results attributed to individual teachers. Teach For America corps members are assigned to classrooms with lower-performing students. Therefore, this scenario would likely underestimate the corps members' impact on student achievement, not overestimate it. The reviewers also noted that the teacher-student links are not based on classroom rosters for specific courses taught. However, the researchers underwent significant efforts to ensure that the

In addition to these two larger studies, there are a growing number of smaller-scale studies from across the country showing that Teach For America teachers have a positive impact on their students' achievement.

New York City (middle school): In 2009, a value-added study of middle-school math teachers in New York City found that Teach For America math teachers are more effective than other beginning math teachers.²³ The study included new teachers from traditional teacher-preparation programs, the NYC Teaching Fellows, the NYC Teaching Fellows Math Immersion program, and Teach For America. Researchers concluded that Teach For America teachers' impact on student achievement relative to all other new teachers teaching middle-school math was positive and statistically significant. The study also found that the students of Teach For America corps members were entering their classrooms significantly further behind than students taught by teachers from any other pathway.

New Teacher Comparisons. Several states have begun to look at the effectiveness of particular teacher pathways into the profession. When Teach For America is one of the programs included in comparative analysis, our teachers are among the strongest new teachers using measures of student achievement.

matching data was adequate, including running analyses only for those teachers for whom they had a confident match, and the results were consistent.

²³ Don Boyd, Pam Grossman, Karen Hammerness, Hamp Lankford, Susanna Loeb, Matt Ronfeldt, and Jim Wyckoff, "Recruiting Effective Math Teachers, How Do Math Immersion Teachers Compare?: Evidence from New York City," 2009.

Louisiana: For the last several years, the state of Louisiana has been conducting a value-added study of teacher-preparation programs to assess the effectiveness of each preparation program based on the achievement of students taught by new teachers from that program.²⁴

In 2009, the researchers conducted an analysis of Teach For America teachers using data of students in grades 4 to 9 from the 2004-5 to 2006-07 school years from longitudinal databases linking students, teachers, and courses.²⁵ (The researchers used grades 4 through 9 because those are the grade levels in which state-administered standardized tests are available for each spring and the preceding year.) The Teach For America teachers were compared to all non-Teach For America teachers, and also separately to veteran non-Teach For America teachers, and to novice non-Teach For America teachers.

Researchers found that Teach For America teachers were more effective than novice non-Teach For America teachers, and were as effective as veteran non-Teach For America teachers across the state in math, science, reading, and language arts. The researchers concluded that the positive results surpassed what traditionally would be expected of new or, in many cases, veteran teachers: “Overall, the data suggest that TFA corps members may be more comparable to experienced certified teachers than new teachers in their effectiveness.”

²⁴ The reports from the Value-Added Teacher Preparation Program Assessment Model are available on Louisiana’s Board of Regents’ website.

²⁵ George H. Noell and Kristin A. Gansle, “Teach For America Teachers’ Contribution to Student Achievement in Louisiana in Grades 4-9: 2004-2005 to 2006-2007,” 2009.

North Carolina: In 2010, researchers from the University of North Carolina system completed a study of pathways into teaching in North Carolina.²⁶ The study was designed to understand better the impact on student achievement of graduates from the UNC traditional teacher preparation system, which is the leading provider of teachers in the state, compared with individuals from other pathways, including Teach For America. The researchers' sample included more than 700,000 students and more than 18,000 teachers with less than five years of teaching from all school districts in North Carolina.

The researchers conducted 99 different analyses to compare the UNC graduates with teachers from other pathways. Teachers from other pathways had a bigger impact on student achievement that did the UNC graduates in only eight of those comparisons – and of those eight comparisons, five were comparisons with Teach For America corps members.

The researchers concluded that Teach For America corps members had a greater impact on student achievement than traditionally prepared UNC graduates in middle school math and in high school math, science, and English. At every grade level and subject studied, Teach For America corps members did as well as or better than the traditionally prepared UNC graduates. The researchers suggested that Teach For America “represents an opportunity for UNC and North Carolina to learn and improve” and recommended that UNC identify elements of the Teach For America model that would be “portable and scalable” to UNC preparation programs. The results are consistent with the above study by CALDER/Urban Institute but include more recent data and additional subject areas than were available in the prior study.

²⁶ Gary T. Henry and Charles L. Thompson, “Impacts of Teacher Preparation on Student Test Scores in North Carolina: Teacher Portals,” The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill / Carolina Institute for Public Policy, 2010.

The research literature on teacher experience has found that, on average, novice teachers do not perform as well as more experienced teachers. Given that high-poverty schools are more likely to have inexperienced teachers than lower poverty schools, this means low-income students may bear a larger burden of any negative effects of teacher inexperience. However, as the research above demonstrates, new teachers from Teach For America typically do better than other new teachers and do as well as, or often better, than experienced teachers in advancing student achievement.

B(2) Magnitude and importance of the potential effects

Research has shown that most educational interventions yield low to moderate effect sizes. The effect sizes from the most rigorous studies on Teach For America as discussed above are among the highest of those found for popular educational interventions. Notably, since conducting rigorous research on teacher performance may require several years of data, many existing studies focus on corps members who participated in the program several years ago. Given the significant organizational resources we have dedicated in recent years and will continue to dedicate to improving the effectiveness of our corps members, we are optimistic we will see even larger effects in the coming years through this scale-up effort.

The effect sizes for several common education interventions are as follows:

- **National Board Certified Teachers:** Two longitudinal state-level studies of the impact of having a National Board certified teacher in Florida and North Carolina detected effect sizes of .02-.04 in reading and .01-.07 in math.²⁷

²⁷ Dan Goldhaber and Emily Anthony, “National Board Certification as a Signal of Effective Teaching,” Urban Institute, 2006; Douglas N. Harris and Tim R. Sass, “The Effects of NBPTS-Certified Teachers on Student Achievement,” Urban Institute, 2008.

- **Charter schools:** A recent study of New York City charter schools conducted by Caroline Hoxby of Stanford found the average gain per year spent in a charter school is .09 in math and .06 in English.²⁸
- **Class size reduction:** Using the most widely cited research on class-size reduction, an experimental study in Tennessee found the impact of reducing class size from 22-26 students to 13-17 at the early grades ranged from .1 to .2 in reading and math.²⁹ A study on teacher credentials in North Carolina found that the impact of a class size reduction of five students was .01 to .025 – much smaller than the impact above and than the effect of teacher quality measures.³⁰
- **Master’s degree:** Most research on teachers having master’s degrees as a measure of teacher quality finds no impact.³¹

²⁸ Caroline M. Hoxby, Sonali Murarka, and Jenny Kang, “How New York City Charter Schools Affect Achievement,” New York Charter Schools Project, 2009.

²⁹ Barbara Nye, Larry V. Hedges, and Spyros Konstantopoulos, “The effects of small classes on academic achievement: the results of the Tennessee class size experiment,” *American Educational Research Journal* 37 (2000): 123-51

³⁰ Charles Clotfelder, Helen F. Ladd, and Jacob L. Vigdor, “Teacher Credentials and Student Achievement in High School: A Cross-Subject Analysis with Student Fixed Effects,” Urban Institute/CALDER, 2007.

³¹ Daniel Aaronson, Lisa Barrow and William Sander, “Teachers and Student Achievement in the Chicago Public High Schools.” *Journal of Labor Economics* 25 (2007): 95-135.; David W. Grissmer, Ann Flanagan, Jennifer H. Kawata, and Stephanie Williamson. *Improving Student*

- **Comprehensive teacher induction:** A 2009 experimental study of structured comprehensive teacher induction programs found no impact on student test scores (relative to teachers who received whatever typical district-based induction program was available).³²

Teach For America effect sizes are as follows:

- The 2004 experimental study by Mathematica Policy Research found an effect size of .15 in math when comparing Teach For America corps members with all other teachers in the study, including more experienced teachers. When compared only with other novice teachers, the effect size of having a Teach For America corps member was .26.
- In their 2008-09 study, researchers from the Urban Institute/CALDER found that the effect size across subject areas in high school was .10, with a larger effect size of .18 in science. This impact was two to three times the size of the impact of having an experienced teacher relative to a novice teacher.
- In their 2010 study, researchers from the University of North Carolina found that the effect size for Teach For America corps members relative to traditionally prepared UNC graduates across high school subject areas was .13. For middle school math the effect

Achievement: What State NAEP Scores Tell Us. Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corporation, 2000; Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain.

³² Eric Isenberg, Steven Glazerman, Martha Bleeker, Amy Johnson, Julieta Lugo-Gil, Mary Grider, Sarah Dolfen, and Edward Britton, “Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Results from the Second Year of a Randomized Controlled Study,” U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 2009.

size was .15, and researchers found that the positive impact on student test scores was roughly the equivalent of 90 days of additional instruction – or an additional half year of learning.

Because evidence shows that Teach For America teachers on average effect greater student achievement gains than the teachers that students would otherwise have, because we continue to improve our selection, training, and support program to produce even more highly effective teachers, and because Teach For America will grow teacher placements by 80% to serve 850,000 students by the end of the project period, we believe the project will have significant impact on the high-need students and LEA partners we serve. We look forward to working with Mathematica Policy Research to examine these impacts more fully.

C. Experience of the Eligible Applicant and Partners

C(1) Past performance developing, executing and growing a proven model

Over the past 20 years, Teach For America has developed a comprehensive, data-driven approach to identifying, recruiting, selecting, placing, training, and developing talented recent college graduates to teach successfully in low-income communities, with the expectation that they will achieve at least 1.5 years of academic growth and put their students on the path to college and life success. According to Education Trust President Kati Haycock, “From its very beginnings, Teach For America has invested more energy in understanding effective teaching than any teacher preparation program I know. And year after year, they have fed that information back into their own selection processes and teacher supports with a single goal: producing more teachers who can change the life chances of poor children.”

Over the last decade, while continuing to refine and improve our model for attracting and developing effective teachers, and supporting them as alumni, we have implemented two large-scale, multi-year growth plans. In doing so, we have grown the organization from 1,200 teachers in 15 regions to 7,300 teachers in 35 regions – significantly increasing the number of LEA partners and new teacher placements and attracting the necessary resources to support larger scale. The remainder of this section highlights our deep experience implementing and scaling our program model and executing against growth plans.

Recruitment and selection. Teach For America enlists exceptional college graduates to commit to teach for at least two years in the highest-need urban and rural public schools. We identify top students from all majors and fields and proactively reach out to convince them to apply, even if they have not expressed a previous interest in teaching.

Recruitment. Our recruitment teams, led by over 60 recruitment directors (the majority of whom are alumni), focus on the following activities:

- Building a database of potential prospects sourced from campus registrars, campus and conference presentations and events, grassroots efforts and referrals from professors, campus leaders, clubs, social networks, and from national partner organizations such as Golden Key, Hispanic Scholarship Fund, and National Society of Collegiate Scholars. This database includes important information on each prospect – GPA, leadership roles, diversity, interest level, notes from personal meetings or references – which is used to identify the highest potential prospects and track our outreach and engagement.
- Reaching out to high potential prospects and having one-on-one meetings to discuss the achievement gap and Teach For America with the most outstanding students on approximately 370 college campuses, including over 200 private schools and over 160 state universities.
- Working with undergraduate “campus campaign coordinators” on 165 of the 370 campuses. These coordinators help gather data and build the pipeline of candidates by executing major publicity campaigns, organizing events, networking with professors and student organizations, and identifying and reaching out to high potential prospects of all backgrounds and majors.

Selection. We select, through a rigorous screening process and from a large and diverse pool of candidates, those individuals who have qualities that we have found are predictive of success teaching in high-need schools. For 20 years, Teach For America has studied program participants who have had the most success in advancing student achievement and, working with experts from higher education and business, used these analyses to build a set of selection criteria

based on qualities that we have found are predictive of success teaching in low-income communities:

- Leadership and achievement in academic, professional, or extracurricular settings
- Perseverance in the face of challenges
- Strong critical thinking skills: making accurate linkages between cause and effect, analyzing and utilizing data, and generating relevant solutions to problems
- The ability to influence and motivate others
- Organizational ability: planning well, meeting deadlines, and working efficiently
- Respect for students and families in low-income communities
- An understanding of Teach For America's vision and the desire to work relentlessly

Highly trained selectors evaluate applicants against these criteria at each stage of the admissions process – online application, phone interview, and daylong in-person interview, including sample teaching – advancing only those who increasingly provide evidence that they have the personal characteristics and demonstrated capabilities that would lead to success as a teacher in a high-need school.

Since 2005, we also have used statistical modeling to help evaluate candidates. We analyze historical recruitment, selection, and student achievement data to identify which observable personal characteristics and behaviors are most predictive of success, adding new data each year to test and refine our understanding. Starting with assessments of our teachers when they are in the classroom, we look backwards at their traits and rankings during the admissions process and adjust our selection model to make it more predictive. We use data collected throughout the admissions process to rank candidates based on this model, accepting those who are most likely to lead students to dramatic academic progress.

Experience scaling recruitment and selection: Since 2000, we have increased applications from 4,000 to 46,000, increased our selectivity, and enrolled the overwhelming majority of admitted applicants (approximately 75% of accepted applicants matriculated in 2009, on par with Harvard College’s matriculation rate³³). Between 2000 and 2005, we climbed a steep learning curve on the recruitment front, quadrupling the number of applications while fielding a larger and larger teacher corps that was consistently more diverse than the student population on the campuses where we primarily recruited.³⁴ Since then, we have continued to grow in scale and diversity while maintaining quality – in 2009, our corps members had an average GPA of 3.6 and average SAT of 1344, with nearly one-third people of color and approximately one-quarter from families with low-socioeconomic status. Additionally, 89% held a position of leadership in college, and 70% graduated from “very competitive” schools. As we have grown, we have also increased efficiency, cutting the average recruitment cost per applicant in half over the last three years (from \$533 in 2008 to \$252 in 2010).

Teacher training and support and measures of effectiveness. Teach For America trains and develops individuals with little to no formal teaching training or experience to become highly effective teachers in low-income schools. We set expectations that all teachers, even in

³³ Jillian K. Kushner, “Yield Holds Steady For 2013,” The Harvard Crimson, May 8, 2009.

³⁴ Among 2009 corps members, 29% are people of color (of which 9% are African American and 7% are Hispanic) and 25% are from low-income backgrounds. In comparison, among the students enrolling at the 340 most selective colleges, 5.2% are African American, 6% are Hispanic, and 17.3% are from low socioeconomic backgrounds, according to the U.S. Department’s National Center for Education Statistics’ Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.

their first year, will lead their students to significant academic gains, which we define as 1.5 years of growth. We provide our teachers and those who coach them with a roadmap for how to become highly effective teachers in our context, and we measure teacher effectiveness through corps members' demonstrated ability to make progress with their students according to rigorous assessments of student learning, utilizing a transparent system for setting, managing, and measuring classroom goals.

Through a professional development curriculum centered on experiential classroom learning; core instructional, classroom management, content, and pedagogical knowledge; robust performance support tools; and observations of excellent teaching, we help corps members develop the knowledge, skills, and mindsets to teach successfully. Our Teaching As Leadership framework, rigorous summer training, standardized and tailored ongoing support, and transparent measurement system form the foundation of our training and support program:

- **Teaching As Leadership framework and rubric:** Through observation and analysis of around 25,000 corps members across multiple urban and rural settings over the last 20 years, Teach For America has developed a framework that isolates the approaches that distinguish teachers achieving exceptional outcomes from their peers. Developed by program leaders, who are former Teach For America corps members, in consultation with teachers, program directors, and academics, the framework is based on six key principles, and the accompanying rubric breaks out these principles into 28 discrete teacher actions which are differentiated across five levels of proficiency – pre-novice to exemplary – essentially creating a roadmap for leading students to success in the classroom.³⁵

³⁵ Please see Appendix H for an example of a teacher action across the levels of proficiency.

- **Pre-service summer training:** We provide novice teachers with critical foundational knowledge and tools through an intensive, experiential, and outcome-oriented pre-service summer program. Operated in partnership with school districts and university hosts, Teach For America runs five-week summer institutes for new corps members, scheduling 14-hour days that result in the equivalent of approximately nine to 10 weeks of learning. Prior to attending institute, corps members complete 30 to 40 hours of independent work. During institute, corps members:
 - Teach summer school students under the supervision of experienced teachers
 - Receive extensive support and written and oral feedback on their teaching from advisors and a faculty of Teach For America alumni and other veteran teachers
 - Participate in interactive courses, rehearsal and reflection sessions, and lesson planning and curriculum clinics led primarily by Teach For America’s highest-performing alumni

Throughout institute, corps members work towards measurably increasing the academic performance of their summer school students. Following summer institute, one-to-two week induction programs familiarize corps members with their placement school and district-specific policies and curricula, reinforce institute learning, and provide planning time for the school year.

- **Ongoing support and development:** Teach For America supports corps members throughout their two years in the classroom by providing each of them with a well-trained instructional coach (called a program director), access to high-quality online resources, and a local learning community.

- Program directors: Every corps member works closely with a program director who observes, evaluates, coaches and supports them in becoming effective teachers. Program directors work with cohorts of approximately 34 teachers. Program directors also work closely with school principals to align professional development resources with school-based support.
- Online tools and resources: We provide teachers and program directors with “on demand” assistance, trainings, and tools, including video examples of model classrooms and teachers performing at all levels of proficiency on the Teaching As Leadership rubric; a resource exchange containing over 26,000 assessments, lessons plans, and curricula, each rated for quality and usefulness³⁶; and expert blogs, communities, and online courses specifically designed to meet the needs of our teachers.
- Learning teams: Corps members meet regularly in content and/or grade-level specific learning teams led by experienced teachers. These meetings are venues for sharing best practices and materials, modeling exemplary teaching, and collaborating around student progress and data.
- **Evaluation system for measuring teacher effectiveness and student growth**: Over the last decade, Teach For America has developed an internal “significant gains” system that enables us to measure academic progress on an ongoing basis as consistently as possible across our 35 regions, all subject areas (more than 40, plus special education, bilingual

³⁶ Since we launched the resource exchange, 94% of corps members have downloaded at least one document; in total we have had more than one million downloads.

education, and early childhood education), and grade levels (pre-Kindergarten through 12).

This unique, transparent system simultaneously supports classroom learning by helping corps members and program directors set and manage toward ambitious yet feasible and measurable goals for their students while providing the necessary data to drive program improvements.

Over time, with significant input from our teachers, program staff, and principals, we have developed three categories of internal metrics for articulating what “narrowing the achievement gap” looks like on classroom level assessments: growth, mastery of content, and gap closure (e.g., closing the performance gap between our students and students in well-served schools on the same assessment). Our measurement system currently has four performance categories – significant gains (the equivalent of “highly effective” under the i3 criteria), solid gains (“effective”), limited gains, and undetermined gains – to enable standardization across the different assessments and metrics used to measure student achievement:

Table 2: Measurement System

| | Significant Gains | Solid Gains | Limited Gains | Undetermined Gains |
|------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Growth measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.5+ yrs (at the elementary level) or the equivalent growth on a rubric • 2+ yrs (at the secondary level) or equivalent growth on a rubric | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-1.4 years (at the elementary level) or the equivalent growth on a rubric • 1-2 years (at the secondary level) or equivalent growth on a rubric | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-0.9 years or the equivalent growth on a rubric | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient evidence to categorize a CM with strong confidence |
| Mastery measure | 80% proficiency in prioritized standards or the equivalent proficiency level on a rubric | 70-79% proficiency in prioritized standards or the equivalent proficiency level on a rubric | <70% proficiency in prioritized standards or the equivalent proficiency level on a rubric | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|--|
| Gap closure measure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24%+ of gap closed (elementary level) • 20%+ of gap closed (secondary level) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10-23% of gap closed (elementary level) • 10-19% of gap closed (secondary level) | <10% of gap closed | |
|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------|--|

Throughout the recruitment and selection process, applicants are made aware of our emphasis on measurable student achievement and expectations that our teachers will achieve significant gains with their students. Corps members are introduced to the significant gains measurement system and the Teaching As Leadership framework and rubric during summer institute. It is made clear to them that student achievement is the primary factor for determining their overall effectiveness, that Teaching As Leadership is the central approach for ensuring students achieve, and that our rubric and associated resources are foundational supports for managing and developing them into highly effective teachers.

Experience scaling teacher training, support, and effectiveness: As we have grown, we have also increased our corps members’ impact on student achievement – increasing the percentage of teachers achieving significant gains from 13% in 2001 to a projected 48% in 2010, even as we have increased the rigor of the underlying assessments and standards for achieving significant gains. To effectively train and support our growing corps, we have opened five new summer institutes between 2005 and 2010, dramatically increased the number of program directors, and created new performance management tools, training programs, and a layer of management for program directors – enabling us to scale the program director model while improving quality. Additionally, we have built, and continuously refined and improved, data systems, rubrics, and processes designed to increase our impact and productivity at scale – including our selection model and evaluation rubric as well as our significant gains measurement

system and Teaching As Leadership rubric. These models and systems provide a common language and understanding across the organization, which is especially critical in times of rapid growth, while allowing us to ground decisions in data that can be used to inform current strategies, manage complexity, and drive long-term improvement.

Teacher placement and retention. Teach For America places highly effective teachers in the highest-need schools and retains approximately 90% of them through a two-year commitment, with most teachers staying in the classroom beyond that time (and around two-thirds of alumni staying in education as a long-term career). We place teachers in 35 urban and rural regions, within more 2,500 schools across the country. Once corps members are placed, we work aggressively to help our LEA partners (who are the actual employers of our teachers) retain their corps members through two years of teaching, and 90% of Teach For America corps members completed at least two years of teaching.

To achieve our placement goals, we build strong relationships with district and school leaders, match the geographic and teaching interests and qualifications of our pool of teachers with the needs and certification requirements of our district partners, and expand into new geographies and districts each year based on demonstrated need and community support. We measure need according to the number and percent of students who receive free and reduced-price lunch as well as non-graduation rates, ensuring that we continue to prioritize the highest need schools.

Experience scaling teacher placements and retention. Teach For America placed nearly 4,100 new teachers for the 2009-10 school year, 500 more than the previous year and more than 2.5 times the number of new Teach For America teachers placed just five years ago (our total corps of first- and second-year teachers is now 7,300). We now place more new teachers

annually than we placed cumulatively over our entire first decade from 1990 to 2000. As we have grown, we have also improved second-year retention from 84% in 2004-05 to 90% last year, significantly surpassing both the national average of 86% and the national average for high poverty schools of 82%.³⁷ Notably, even in an environment of state and district budget cuts, we are continuing to grow and place and retain teachers because we are filling a clear need for dedicated, effective teachers in hard-to-staff schools and in high-need subject areas. Moreover, we have built a nationally monitored but highly decentralized system for managing district relationships at the regional level, such that we have systems in place to add new regions and grow in existing ones that can be replicated across the country.

Alumni teachers and leaders. Today, over 5,000 Teach For America alumni, nearly one-third of the total alumni population (dating back to 1990), remain in the classroom as teachers, the vast majority serving high-need students. According to a 2008 Harvard study, 61% of Teach For America corps members continue to teach beyond their two-year corps

³⁷ The 86 percent figure comes from the 2003 report “No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America’s Children” published by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF). The 82 percent figure is derived from the NCTAF report, which uses analysis by Richard M. Ingersoll on annual teacher turnover and attrition rates of beginning teachers. In that analysis, the proportion of “leavers” – i.e., those who leave the profession altogether (vs. those who “migrate” to other schools) – is about 20 percent higher in high-poverty schools than it is in public schools overall.

commitment, which is similar to retention estimates for other new teachers in low-income communities.³⁸

In addition to our alumni teachers, about 460 alumni serve as school principals or district leaders and another one-third of our alumni work or study full-time in education. Through our education leadership initiatives, we build a community of support for our alumni teachers and work to promote teacher leadership and accelerate the path to school and district leadership by partnering with districts, charters, and graduate schools on both the national and regional levels. These relationships offer alumni ready access to teacher-leader, school management, and professional development opportunities. At the same time, we collaborate with our district and charter partners to share best practices regarding recruiting, developing, and retaining highly effective teachers and to ensure we are helping them meet their broad needs for talent.

Experience scaling support of alumni teachers and leaders: We first set explicit goals for alumni leadership in 2005, when we knew of fewer than 160 alumni in school leader positions. Since then, we have built the infrastructure and partnerships necessary to significantly accelerate the path to school leadership and elected office for our alumni, resulting in about 460 school leaders and 40 elected officials (predominantly school board members) today. Additionally, we launched a Teacher Leadership Initiative, through which we are piloting a national board certification partnership as well as projects in New Orleans and Houston to test strategies around identifying and retaining the most effective new teachers.

³⁸ Morgaen L. Donaldson, “Teach for America Teachers’ Careers: Whether, When and Why They Leave Low-Income Schools and the Teaching Profession,” The Project on the Next Generation of Teachers, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2008.

Executing growth plans: experience with rapid and sustainable growth. Teach For

America has successfully implemented two large-scale, multi-year growth plans over the last decade, growing the organization from 1,200 teachers in 15 regions to 7,300 teachers in 35 regions. In 2000, we secured \$24 million from private foundations to launch a plan to grow from 900 to 2000 new teachers annually by 2005. In 2005, having successfully achieved the major underlying goals of this plan, we developed another five-year plan to grow from 2,200 new teachers per year to at least 4,000, raising an additional \$65 million in growth funding to pursue that vision. As described above, in executing both growth plans, we have been able to grow the number of interested applicants, the number of district and school partners and placements, and the impact of our teachers as measured by internal and external studies, while accelerating the leadership and impact of an ever-expanding alumni community.

Table 3: Historical growth data

| | Applicants | Incoming Teachers Selected | Total Teachers in Schools | Regions |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| FY2000 | 4,000 | 870 | 1,300 | 15 |
| FY2005 | 17,000 | 2,100 | 3,000 | 22 |
| FY2010 | 46,000 | 4,400-4,500 | 7,300 | 39 |

To support the rapid expansion and effectiveness of our program, we have increased the strength and stability of our organization by growing our annual operating revenues while improving our infrastructure and fostering the development and engagement of our staff and alumni. Teach For America is currently on track to raise \$189 million this fiscal year – more than four times our \$40 million in operating revenues in 2005 and 17 times the \$10.5 million we raised in 2000, when we were preparing to launch our first growth plan. At the same time, we have maintained an operating reserve of 25% of our annual budget, and secured \$100 million in long-term endowment funds pledged or received. And our staff has grown from 390 individuals

in 2005 to about 1,300 in 2010, yet our fundraising and administrative costs remain at or below national nonprofit averages, resulting in a four-star rating for efficiency by Charity Navigator.³⁹

Thus, we have ensured that we were not only growing, but growing sustainably.

With a strong foundation and base of experience, we believe we are sitting on the cusp of an historic opportunity to grow again and achieve the kind of scale that will have a truly catalytic impact on the schools and communities we serve.

C(2) Compelling evidence of impact on student achievement

Despite the challenging contexts in which our teachers teach, there is substantial evidence of the positive impact that our teachers are having on their students and the effectiveness of our program model. As described above, Teach For America has achieved the following outcomes through our work over the last 20 years:

- **Partnered with the highest-need LEAs and schools in the country:** Mathematica’s 2004 study showed that students of our teachers enter the year, on average, at the 14th percentile, and 80% of our students receive free or reduced-price lunch. We currently have 148 LEA partners for this i3 project, with whom we work to place our teachers in the highest-need settings.
- **Developed teachers that show significant impact on internal metrics including:**
 - Nearly 50% of first- and second-year teachers achieving significant gains (“highly effective”) with students, with the vast majority achieving the equivalent of at least one year of gains with their students (“effective”)

³⁹ Teach For America’s fundraising costs as a percentage of dollars raised are 10.1% while the national average is 9.6%. Administrative costs as a percentage of total costs are 7%, compared to the median of all charities of 11%.

- Two-year retention rate of more than 90%, exceeding national norms
- **Provided teachers that significantly improve student achievement as demonstrated through extensive external studies:**
 - Experimental study finding Teach For America teachers effect greater gains than other teachers including veteran and certified teachers⁴⁰
 - Quasi-experimental studies (Urban Institute, 2009; New York, 2009) showing significant impact on student growth compared to other teachers⁴¹
 - Pipeline studies (Louisiana 2009, North Carolina 2010) showing Teach For America is at the top of teacher preparation programs in preparing new teachers to advance student achievement⁴²
- **Met our LEA partners’ need for effective new teachers, as evidenced by principal responses to a survey administered by Policy Study Associates⁴³ every two years:**
 - Nearly two-thirds of principals rated our teachers as more effective than other beginning teachers, and 95% considered them at least as effective
 - 97% expressed overall satisfaction with Teach For America teachers

⁴⁰ Decker, Mayer, and Glazerman.

⁴¹ Xu, Hannaway, and Taylor; Boyd, Grossman, Hammerness, Lankford, Loeb, Ronfeldt, and Wyckoff.

⁴² Noell and Gansle; Henry and Thompson.

⁴³ Policy Studies Associates, “Teach For America 2009 National Principal Survey,” 2009.

D. Quality of the Project Evaluation

Teach For America will contract Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. to conduct a \$5 million, large-scale study to evaluate the Innovation Fund project. The evaluation will address two key research questions: 1) what are the features of the scale-up implementation and was it successful in increasing the number of Teach For America teachers during the grant period; and 2) are the corps members brought on as part of the scale-up more effective than their non-Teach For America counterparts. An implementation analysis will address the first question and an experimental analysis will address the second question, focusing on impact on student achievement in grades pre-K through five. The evaluation design can flexibly incorporate additional evaluation elements for comparison across projects funded by i3 and will cover all requirements of the grant.

Table 4: Relationship of grant criteria to evaluation design

| Grant criterion | Evaluation design |
|--|---|
| D(1): The well-designed experimental study and evaluation are rigorous and independent | Random assignment of students to Teach For America and non-Teach For America teachers will be independently executed by Mathematica |
| D(2): The studies of the practice, strategy, or program will be conducted at scale | The evaluation will occur across multiple regions and multiple years as the teacher corps scales from serving 450,000 students to 850,000 students |
| D(3): Methods of evaluation will provide high-quality implementation data and performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes | Implementation analysis will provide annual feedback following the end of each school year on scale-up implementation to assess whether target numbers of teachers and students are being reached |
| | Experimental analysis will also provide annual feedback on teacher performance to gauge potential changes in student achievement |
| D(4): The evaluation will provide sufficient information about the key elements and approach of the project so as to facilitate replication or testing in other settings | Implementation analyses will describe in detail the scaled-up model and the processes involved in the scale-up |

D(1) Well-designed experimental study

A multi-year, multi-site experimental analysis is the core of the project evaluation. This study will assess both the effectiveness of Teach For America teachers recruited and trained as a result of the scale-up effort and the comparative question of whether these teachers are more effective at increasing student achievement than their non-Teach For America counterparts. Mathematica will recruit districts to participate in the study from a variety of Teach For America regions and for a range of grade levels. The experimental design builds on Mathematica's experience with the Evaluation of the Impact on Secondary Student Math Achievement of Highly Selective Routes to Alternative Certification (HSAC), which is currently underway to examine the effectiveness of Teach For America math teachers in middle and high schools, and on the 2004 impact evaluation Mathematica conducted on Teach For America teachers in elementary school.

Mathematica will examine the student achievement impacts of a pooled sample of Teach For America teachers recruited and trained under the scale-up compared to their non-Teach For America counterparts. Specifically, researchers will examine the combined impacts of Teach For America teachers in both their first and second years. The study sample will include the subset of Teach For America and control teachers in the implementation sample in grades pre-K through five. For each Teach For America teacher, all non-Teach For America teachers in the same school and grade will be selected to serve as controls. The control group will include both relatively experienced and novice teachers because, in the absence of Teach For America, the students would be taught by a mix of veteran and novice teachers.

In schools and grades for which there is a Teach For America -non- Teach For America teacher "block" (which may be composed of more than two teachers), students will be randomly

assigned to these teachers' classrooms at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year. This year represents the second year for the first cohort of Teach For America teachers recruited as part of the scale-up and the first year for the second cohort of Teach For America teachers. At the end of the school year, pooled impacts on achievement will be examined for the students of all Teach For America teachers versus their non-Teach For America controls.

The impact analysis will focus on grades pre-K through five for several reasons. First, there is limited research on the effectiveness of Teach For America at the pre-K level.⁴⁴ Second, research on the effectiveness of Teach For America at the elementary level is based on a much earlier program model from the mid 1990s, as opposed to the more mature model that will be scaled up during the grant period. Third, the HSAC study currently underway examines impacts of Teach For America on student math achievement at grades six through 12. Mathematica will aggregate data across all the grades in order to obtain a large enough sample for desirable statistical power.

The experimental evaluation will use existing state and district assessment data where possible, as described in Table 5. Mathematica anticipates that this data will be available in reading and math for grades three through five in most participating districts; they will collect it for science as well when possible.

Since grades pre-K through two are not tested in most districts, the study team will administer standardized assessments of study students in those grades in the spring of 2013. The specific assessments to be used are still under consideration, but they might include the Peabody

⁴⁴ The exception is a non-experimental study conducted by Nicholas Zill, "Achievement Levels and Growth in D.C. Preschool and Pre-K Classes Taught By Teach For America Teachers," Westat, Inc., 2008.

Picture Vocabulary Test or Woodcock Johnson Letter Word Identification and Applied Problems.

Additionally, the experimental evaluation will include teacher self-reports of classroom practices. The study team will collect teacher-reported classroom practices, attitudes and expectations about students in spring of 2012 and 2013 from Teach For America and control teachers in the experiment via surveys. A comparison of classroom practices, attitudes and expectations between Teach For America and non-Teach For America teachers will be used to supplement the first-year impact analysis of teacher effectiveness. It will also be used to provide intermediate feedback on performance to Teach For America teachers.

The target sample sizes are 108 schools and 5,804 students in grades pre-K through five; this assumes one Teach For America and one non-Teach For America teacher per school in grades pre-K through two and 1.5 Teach For America and 1.5 non-Teach For America teachers per school in grades three through five, similar to the Mathematica study conducted in 2004. The sample sizes were chosen to ensure that a statistically significant impact of about two months of learning (an effect size of 0.15) could be detected.

Table 5: Experimental Evaluation Component, Data, and Uses for Data

| Data | Data will inform understanding of: |
|--|--|
| State/district student records data (spring test scores as available in math, reading and science) for the subset of implementation sample in grades 3-5 | Teach For America scale-up impact on student achievement compared to non- Teach For America teachers |
| Mathematica-administered standardized student assessments (spring test scores) for the subset of implementation sample in pre-K through grade two | Teach For America scale-up impact on student achievement compared to non-Teach For America teachers |
| Teacher survey of Teach For America and control teachers for the subset of implementation sample in elementary grades | Classroom practices, attitudes and expectations about students |

D(2) Experimental study of the practice at scale

The experimental component of the study will be conducted throughout the 2012-13 school year. This will be in the third year of the four-year i3 project, providing assessment of the effectiveness of Teach For America's corps at a significantly larger scale than today. While the current cohort is approximately 7,300 teachers across 35 regions, in 2012-13 the corps will be over 11,000 teachers across 46 to 47 regions. Additionally, Teach For America at that point will be implementing all of the scaled practices in recruitment, training and support contemplated in the project design. As such, the experimental study will answer the question of the effectiveness of Teach For America teachers when brought in through the project at a much larger scale.

D(3) Implementation data and periodic feedback

The implementation analysis will describe in detail the outcomes related to the new corps of Teach For America teachers recruited and trained through the scale-up. This information will be used to provide feedback to Teach For America after each year following the scale-up, helping us assess our progress to goals and providing analysis to facilitate replication and expansion of our project in future years. In particular, Mathematica will examine and share annual information on the following outcomes of the scale-up, using data described in Table 6:

- **Scale:** The number of new Teach For America teachers accepted, trained, and placed in classrooms in the fall of 2011 and the fall of 2012, and the number of students they teach.
- **Teacher characteristics:** Characteristics of Teach For America teachers after the scale-up and how they compare to the characteristics of previous cohorts of Teach For America teachers. This analysis will provide information on whether the scale-up process resulted in a change in Teach For America teacher characteristics. Mathematica will also compare a sample of Teach For America teachers to a control group of non- Teach For America

teachers in the same grades and schools (together the “implementation sample”) to examine how new Teach For America teachers compare to the types of teachers students would have had in the absence of Teach For America.

- **Placements:** Where Teach For America teachers are placed (in terms of region and school characteristics) and what they teach (grade and subject) after scale-up, and how this compares to placements of previous cohorts of Teach For America teachers
- **Retention:** The percentage of Teach For America teachers returning to the classroom after one and two years and the number of students being served by these continuing teachers. They will also examine the characteristics of Teach For America teachers who left the profession, as well as retention outcomes in the third year for Teach For America teachers in the first cohort recruited as part of the scale-up.

Table 6: Implementation Study Component, Data, and Uses for Data

| Data | Data will inform understanding of: |
|---|--|
| Teach For America staff surveys/interviews | Recruitment, training, and support procedures, any changes to these as result of scale-up |
| Observations of pre-service training institutes | Pre-service training content |
| Teach For America-collected data | Number of teachers accepted, trained, placed; characteristics, placement, and retention of current and former Teach For America teachers; number of students served by current and former Teach For America teachers |
| Survey of Teach For America and non-Teach For America teachers in the implementation sample | Participation in professional development and support activities, background characteristics, education |

D(4) Information pertinent to replication and testing

Mathematica’s proposed analysis of the Teach For America i3 project will provide extensive data useful for LEAs or programs seeking to learn from or replicate components of this program. Implementation analyses will describe in detail the scaled-up model, the processes

involved in the scale-up, and the characteristics of Teach For America’s teachers, placements, and teachers who leave the program early. Objective and broad insights into Teach For America’s approach to teacher recruitment and selection, placement procedures, pre-service training, and ongoing support, as well as changes to these processes made as part of the scale-up effort, will be invaluable to others in the field seeking to learn from Teach For America’s experience, and possibly adopt or adapt any of our practices. Additionally, information gained through surveys, interviews, and observations will inform improvements to our model and facilitate even higher quality replication and expansion of Teach For America.

Most importantly, Mathematica’s study will analyze the outputs of Teach For America’s cohort in comparison to other teachers in the same school. By providing unbiased, experimental design data, the researchers will provide information that allows others to assess the effectiveness of Teach For America’s project in terms of student achievement. This will be a critical tool for others in assessing the viability of replication or testing of this model.

D(5) Sufficient resources for the study

If Teach For America is awarded this grant, Mathematica Policy Research – a leading expert in experimental studies in education – has committed to carry out the implementation and experimental design study described above for \$5 million, which is included in the project budget.

D(6) Independence of the evaluator

Mathematica Policy Research is a well-respected independent evaluator with extensive experience managing large-scale independent experiment studies. Mathematica will run the project evaluation as a “Purchased Services Contractor,” with results determined independently of Teach For America. The above descriptions of the proposed evaluation demonstrate the rigor

of the project design and the capacity for the evaluation to generate key data for both Teach For America, but also for a broader audience interested in replication or testing of the project.

Through innovative analysis of public programs and policies, Mathematica has established itself as a leader in the research and policymaking communities. For nearly 30 years, the company has directed major experiments and demonstrations that have tested existing and proposed social programs, and it has conducted quick-turnaround assessments of policy initiatives in response to client needs.

Mathematica pioneered the use of rigorous random assignment studies in the field of education. Its researchers have extensive expertise in all aspects of large experiments, including study design, execution, and management. As administrators of the federal What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), Mathematica is intimately familiar with the qualities of a well-implemented educational experiment and designs studies to meet WWC standards.

Dr. Melissa Clark will serve as the Project Director and will be assisted by Dr. Eric Isenberg as deputy Project Director and Ms. Kathryn Sonnenfeld as Survey Director. Dr. Clark is an economist with extensive experience designing and conducting experimental evaluations and serves as Principal Investigator of the HSAC study. Dr. Isenberg has served as researcher, principal investigator, and project director on a number of studies of educational interventions and specializes in estimation of value-added models. Ms. Sonnenfeld has directed or had a key role on survey operations for numerous large-scale education studies, including HSAC, the Impact Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Models, the 2004 Teach For America impact study, and the First 5 LA/Los Angeles Universal Preschool Child Outcomes Study.

E. Strategy and Capacity to Bring to Scale

In conjunction with our 148 LEA partners, Teach For America has the experience, capacity, and broad base of support to execute the proposed i3 project and ensure that over 13,000 exceptional teachers reach 850,000 children in low-income communities across America by the 2014-15 school year, while growing the pipeline of educational leaders. We will build upon the foundation developed in executing past growth plans, during which we ultimately grew more quickly than originally planned. At the end of our first plan (from 2000-2005), we exceeded our initial goal of teachers placed by 10%. Over the course of our 2006-2010 plan, we will have recruited, trained, and placed more than 17,500 new teachers, 1,150 more than originally envisioned. We have built and demonstrated the capacity to implement scale-up projects successfully, reaching and often exceeding our targets for numbers of teachers while increasing their impact on high-needs students nationwide.

E(1) Number of students reached

Teach For America will grow from an estimated 450,000 students reached in the 2009-10 school year to 850,000 in the 2014-15 school year. By the end of the grant period in fall 2014, 13,500 Teach For America teachers will begin the year teaching 850,000 students. If able to continue on our planned growth trajectory, we will directly reach over 1,000,000 students by the 2016-17 school year.⁴⁵

We will reach these students initially through partnering with 148 LEAs from all across the country, representing high-need urban and rural school districts and charters that qualify as LEAs. The full list of LEA partners can be found in Appendix D, along with the i3 agreements

⁴⁵ Calculated based on data from our annual “End-of-Year Survey,” which asks corps members to report how many students they have, on average, in each class.

they have signed expressing their intent to partner with us for the purpose of this grant proposal.

As we expand into new districts and regions of the country, we will increase our LEA partners to over 200. Following is a sampling of our current partner LEAs:

- **Major Urban Districts:** Atlanta Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, Charlotte-Mecklenberg Schools, Chicago Public Schools, Denver Public Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools, Hartford Public Schools, Houston Public Schools, Indianapolis Public Schools, Los Angeles Unified School District, Louisiana Recovery School District, Miami-Dade Public Schools, Memphis Public Schools, Milwaukee Public Schools, Minneapolis Public Schools, New York City Department of Education, Newark Public Schools, Providence Public Schools, School District of Philadelphia, and St. Louis Public Schools
- **Rural Districts:** American Horse School in South Dakota, Bertie and Warren County Schools in Eastern North Carolina, East Feliciana Parish Schools in South Louisiana, Hawai'i Department of Education School District, Gallup-McKinley Public Schools in New Mexico, and West Tallahatchie School District in the Mississippi Delta
- **Charter Schools:** Achievement First, IDEA Public Schools, KIPP Schools in seven communities, Uncommon Schools, Lighthouse Academies, Yes College Prep

To accomplish our growth goals, we will need to successfully execute our recruitment and placement strategies as previously described in sections A and C while growing the organizational capacity and resources needed to support our scale-up project.

E(2) Capacity to scale

With a 20-year track record of growth and success, Teach For America has the management and organizational capacity, and the scalable fundraising plan, necessary to reach the project's goals and to ensure that the project will continue beyond the term of the grant.

Staff and management capacity. Our chief executive officer and the project director of this Innovation Fund grant is Wendy Kopp, who founded the organization 20 years ago and has overseen its growth and management. Matt Kramer, our president, has managed all programmatic and financial operations during the most recent multi-year growth plan. They are surrounded by an operating committee of seven experienced executive vice presidents of program; regional operations; growth strategy and development; public affairs; marketing; finance, technology, and administration; and human assets. As the senior leadership team for the organization, which is responsible for Teach For America's performance, operations, effectiveness, and long-term strategy, the operating committee members will support the chief executive officer and president in managing the execution of the scale-up project, leading their teams in pursuing the project goals.

As we grow our staff capacity to recruit, train and support a larger teacher corps and alumni force, our management model is scalable. The primary constraint will be hiring new staff members and developing the necessary pipeline of talent within the organization. In this area, we benefit greatly from the recent growth of our alumni force, which provides over 50% of our full-time staff; the vast majority of program, seasonal and part-time staff; and a talented source of volunteers as we seek to leverage them more effectively in our program operations. We have 17,000 alumni across the country, and will have over 30,000 alumni by 2014. This group is sufficient to meet most of our anticipated hiring needs as we scale.

Additionally, over the course of the past five years, we have made deep investments in the human resources capacity necessary to fuel our growth. We have built a talent recruitment team to source candidates for our full-time staff and summer faculty roles; developed a competency model to serve as a foundation for staff evaluation, professional development and career path planning; and begun investing in providing staff with developmental opportunities necessary to move from one stage of leadership to the next.

Board capacity. Teach For America is governed by a national board of directors (see Appendix H for the full list). The board, chaired by Aspen Institute Chief Executive Officer Walter Isaacson, meets four times annually to perform its fiduciary functions, including reviewing the organization's performance against goals and ensuring proper fiscal controls, increasing the organization's access to resources and support, and advising on Teach For America's strategy.

Additionally, almost all regional sites have advisory boards (the only exceptions are some remote rural regions and some new regions where boards are still in formation). These boards help ensure that on a region-by-region basis, Teach For America builds strong relationships with LEA partners, raises sufficient financial resources to continue to grow and sustain its program, and reaches key performance goals. Moreover, the chairs of each regional advisory board sit on our National Council, which meets with the national board twice a year to report on regional needs and performance.

Financial resources. Teach For America has grown its annual operating revenue by more than 20% each year of the past decade, growing in all from \$10.5 million in revenue in fiscal year 2000 to \$149 million in fiscal year 2009. Because more than 75% of Teach For America's revenue is raised in our 35 regions and the vast majority is from private funders, the funding is

extremely diversified. Last year, more than 11,000 private donors (individuals, corporations and foundations) made contributions to Teach For America. Notably, over the last three years, despite the economic downturn, Teach For America's revenues have continued to grow from \$114 million in 2008 to a projected \$189 million in 2010. We have sufficient revenue to launch the i3 project plan, a track record of growing our funding base, and a comprehensive fundraising plan to reach our goals. This plan is explained in more detail in section F of this proposal.

E(3) Replicating the project

Teach For America is a national 501c3 organization with offices supporting teachers and alumni in 35 geographic regions in 28 states and Washington, D.C. Each region has an executive director and program staff, and most also have development staff and local advisory boards. Each region is responsible for setting and meeting its own program, placement, and fundraising goals within the framework of our national priorities and practices. National operations, program, and development teams provide coaching and support to help them achieve their goals, create efficiencies, and share best practices nationwide. This organizational model ensures that our program is implemented with fidelity across the country.

In addition to executing our program across multiple regions, Teach For America corps members teach across all subjects (more than 40, plus special education, bilingual education, and early childhood education) and grade levels (pre-Kindergarten through 12). Regions themselves place corps members in a mix of rural schools, as well as small, medium, and large urban districts. We place teachers not only in traditional public schools, but also in charters (22% of 2009 placements). Thus, our corps members operate in a wide range of settings serving students with a diversity of needs, supports, and expectations, but all of whom are high-needs students.

Rigorous studies evaluating the impact of corps members on student achievement across multiple settings – rural, urban, elementary, secondary – have consistently found statistically significant effects that are similar in magnitude (see Section B). Additionally, principal satisfaction is uniformly high across our regions – 97% express overall satisfaction with Teach For America teachers⁴⁶, and we will continue to have independent evaluators survey principals every other year to understand our partners’ satisfaction with the teachers we are providing. Our demonstrated results across multiple contexts, and high levels of principal satisfaction, have led to continued, increasing demand from new districts and charter schools, and we have shown we have the capacity and resources to meet that demand effectively.

E(4) Start-up and operating costs per student per year

Teach For America is requesting \$50 million from the Innovation Fund to support our growth plan. With significant growth experience and a strong infrastructure and foundation to build upon, we do not have any direct start-up costs for this project, though we will be making additional investments in program innovations and impact as we grow. Even so, our budget growth is roughly proportional to the growth in our teacher corps and alumni populations.

During the scale-up, we will continue to expand our infrastructure to support a growing corps and alumni base while investing in four priority program areas that will allow us to increase our productivity and the level of impact we generate through our corps members and alumni. We expect that Teach For America’s total budget will grow by around 18% annually between 2010-2015 (including 3% assumed annual inflation), driven primarily by the 12% annual growth in our corps and 18% annual growth in our alumni. Under this plan, our cost per

⁴⁶ Policy Studies Associates.

teacher will grow by approximately 1% plus inflation, with additional program investments being offset in part by some efficiencies and scale economies.

By 2015, our operating budget will be \$419 million, including \$303 million of costs directly funding corps member programming and \$37 million of costs related to alumni programming. In 2015, we will spend approximately 9.8% of our budget on development and 9.2% on operating infrastructure to ensure our corps members and program staff have access to a robust, efficient support system. National averages for fundraising and administrative costs are 9.6% and 11% respectively, so we will remain at or below national nonprofit averages. Teach For America has received a four-star rating for fiscal efficiency from Charity Navigator for eight years in a row⁴⁷, and Worth Magazine ranked Teach For America in the top five on its list of nonprofit organizations demonstrating excellence in financial stewardship⁴⁸.

Table 7: Budgeted Expenses

| Budgeted Expenses by Year (in millions) | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 | FY2015 |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Recruitment and Selection | \$26.90 | \$30.80 | \$36.10 | \$41.90 | \$48.00 | \$54.50 |
| Institute and New Teacher Training | \$32.90 | \$39.60 | \$46.90 | \$55.10 | \$63.80 | \$73.30 |
| Ongoing Teacher Support | \$62.90 | \$76.40 | \$91.80 | \$109.00 | \$127.90 | \$148.30 |
| Alumni Leadership and Engagement | \$15.50 | \$18.80 | \$22.50 | \$26.50 | \$31.30 | \$36.70 |
| Local Program Support | \$10.20 | \$12.80 | \$15.80 | \$19.20 | \$23.00 | \$27.10 |
| Development | \$17.70 | \$21.30 | \$25.40 | \$30.00 | \$35.40 | \$41.20 |
| National Management & General | \$18.70 | \$22.30 | \$25.10 | \$28.90 | \$33.40 | \$38.40 |
| Total | \$184.80 | \$222.00 | \$263.50 | \$310.50 | \$362.80 | \$419.60 |
| Cost per Student (Dollars) | \$356 | \$378 | \$389 | \$402 | \$418 | \$430 |

⁴⁷ Charity Navigator.

⁴⁸ Worth Magazine, “Elite List: 10 Most Fiscally Responsible Charities,” January 2010.

Serving 515,000 students next year, while recruiting selecting and training the next cohort of teachers, will cost an estimated \$378 per student. By the time we reach 750,000 students, we project costs of \$418 per student. Continuing on a similar growth trajectory with respect to costs, number of teachers, and number of students served, we estimate that serving over 1,000,000 students will cost approximately \$458 per student, or \$372 in 2010 dollars; projected inflation accounts for the majority of the increase.⁴⁹

Table 8: Cost per student

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Number of students | 500,000 | 750,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Estimated total corps member-related costs | \$189 million | \$313 million | \$458 million |
| Cost per student | \$378 | \$418 | \$458 |
| Inflation-adjusted cost per student | \$367 | \$371 | \$372 |

E(5) Disseminating knowledge and best practices

Teach For America has significant assets that position us well to broadly disseminate lessons learned through this project in order to support its replication. At the conclusion of the i3 project these assets will include:

- A footprint into more than 50 of the highest-need urban and rural communities across the country, including partnerships with over 3,000 schools and principals, and with over 200 LEAs and district leaders

⁴⁹ To calculate our cost per student, we subtract from our total budget all spending on alumni programming and associated operating costs, which will constitute 13% to 15% of our total budget over the next five years. We then divide that number by the number of unique students our corps members will reach per year (an average of 64 students per corps member, which we derived based on data from our End-of-Year survey).

- An alumni force that will consist of over 30,000. Of these, around 10,000 will be classroom teachers, 1,000 will be school leaders, 170 will be elected officials, and 125 will be education policy advisors to federal, state, or local elected officials
- Recent experience marketing the book *Teaching as Leadership: the Highly Effective Teacher's Guide to Closing the Achievement Gap*, which summarizes the lessons Teach For America learned about effective teaching over the last 20 years
- A public website (www.teachforamerica.org) that gets 2.6 million unique visitors each year; and a second public website (www.teachingasleadership.org) that focuses on conveying lessons about the methods and mindsets of effective teachers in a user-friendly, engaging and interactive way
- A recently launched partnership with the Arizona State University School of Education to pilot adoption of Teach For America's approach to teacher recruitment, selection, pre-service, and ongoing professional development within a campus-based teacher education program with potential for replication in other universities

We will use our assets to execute a robust dissemination strategy that ranges from one-on-one touchpoints to large-scale presentations to maximize awareness of the project and convey the key lessons that emerge from the project about recruiting, selecting, training, supporting, and retaining effective teachers at the project's inception; at critical junctures along the way; after the project evaluation is completed. Individual strands of the strategy will include:

- One-on-one annual meetings and appropriate follow-up with leaders from our 148 LEA partners around the country to discuss the project and its lessons

- One-on-one annual meetings and appropriate follow-up with the 71 schools of education with which we partner to share the lessons we have learned about preparing effective teachers and discuss how we could collaborate to impact more prospective teachers
- If awarded, e-mail notification of receipt of grant award, regular progress towards goals, and key findings of evaluation to our network of alumni and national supporters, including policy leaders, advocates, researchers, and elected officials, along with announcement on our public website
- Presentations about the project by senior staff members and Mathematica researchers at conferences and think tanks, such as the Center for American Progress, American Educational Research Association, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Education Trust, the New America Foundation, the National Council of Teacher Quality
- Participation in U.S. Department of Education communities of practice.

F. Sustainability

F(1) Sustaining growth through 2015 and beyond

Teach For America's i3 project will provide a critical launching pad for a comprehensive national growth plan we have developed with extensive input from our staff, national and regional boards, and major funders. The financial component of this growth plan is designed with the same underlying philosophy of our last plan: secure significant upfront, multi-year funding to launch the plan (the i3 grant); and leverage this to build highly diversified and renewable local funding bases that will sustain the organization at a much larger scale and continue to generate new prospects when the grant funding finishes.

Financial model and sustainability plan. To support the proposed i3 project, Teach For America will need to more than double annual operating revenues over the next five years. Our plan to ensure sustainability beyond the i3 scale-up grant includes four key strategies: 1) continue to deepen and diversify regional funding bases in line with growth of teacher corps in existing regions; 2) open at least 12 new regions with diversified funding bases that completely cover operating costs and the incremental reserve requirement; 3) build a robust national operating campaign through new partnerships with national foundations and corporations; and 4) continue to secure annual federal support from the Department of Education and NASA along with continued AmeriCorps support.

Table 9: Forecast Revenue

| Forecast Revenue by Year (\$million) | FY10 | FY11 | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Regional | 147 | 184 | 220 | 260 | 303 | 350 |
| Existing sites (launched by 2010) | 147 | 180 | 212 | 245 | 279 | 313 |
| Expansion sites (launched after 2010) | 0 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 24 | 36 |
| National Private | 18 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 29 |
| Federal Appropriation and AmeriCorps | 25 | 30 | 36 | 42 | 48 | 53 |
| Federal: Investing in Innovation | | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | |
| Total | \$189 | \$249 | \$292 | \$340 | \$391 | \$432 |

1. Regional revenue campaigns: Regional revenue currently accounts for 75% of Teach For America's annual operating revenues and forms the cornerstone of our plan for sustainability. Regional corps sizes, which drive our budgets, are closely connected to development progress and we require that any growing region increase its fundraising targets to support a larger corps. Our regional sites have clear fundraising goals, and milestones by which they must hit them, in order to secure their desired number of corps members for the coming year. Thus, when we grow in existing regions, we secure additional local private, district, or state funding to support that growth. Perhaps surprisingly, we have found that some of our most under-resourced sites have been able to use this approach to attract the necessary support; at the same time, we have national resources available for sustaining our presence in regions where sufficient philanthropic resources truly do not exist. Through our systematic approach to regional fundraising, Teach For America's regional revenues have grown from \$30 million in 2005 to over \$114 million in 2009, fueled primarily by the following local fundraising strategies:

- **A successful annual individual giving campaign, called Sponsor A Teacher.** Regions match individual donors who contribute \$5,000 to \$100,000 annually with a local corps member(s). Gifts from these campaigns have grown from less than \$3 million in 2004 to \$16 million in 2009 and are our most reliable and renewable source of funding; consistently 70% to 80% of gifts repeat each year. Perhaps most significantly, the Sponsor A Teacher campaign has built a community of civic leaders and philanthropists who are willing to help solicit new and increased funding and who themselves form a pool of major donor prospects. Individuals giving at least \$100,000 annually to Teach For America have grown from nine to 99 over the last five years.

- **Major gifts for regional growth plans.** These are gifts from well-known foundations and wealthy individuals, including over \$21 million to seven regions in the last three years from the Walton Foundation, Broad Foundation, and Arnold Family Foundation
- **Fees from our district partners.** These, generally around \$2,500 per corps member, help offset Teach For America's costs in recruiting, training and supporting the new teachers. These grow in line with corps growth and form the second-largest revenue source for most regions.
- **State appropriations.** State funding accounted for 9% of regional revenues in 2009 and grew at an annual rate of 47% between 2006 and 2009 and, due to groundwork laid in the last few years, we are positioned to continue to grow this source at a similar rate in the next plan.

Overall, we will grow regional revenues by approximately 20% annually over the next five years by executing our proven local fundraising model. While this growth rate will be challenging, it is significantly slower growth than we have attained annually over the past decade.

2. **New sites:** Teach For America will open 3 to 4 new sites each year over the next four years, ultimately opening around 15 new sites accounting for \$36 million in 2015. Prior to opening new regions, we secure enough funding to cover the operating costs of the region for three years as well as the required incremental reserves. We are purposeful in our fundraising, ensuring that we are highly diversified across funding streams and include investments from key civic and philanthropic leaders in the community whose championship is essential for long-term success.

In the last three years, we have opened 10 new sites with full local funding amounting to \$14 million that includes investments from some of the most prominent civic leaders and philanthropists in each community. Currently more than 20 cities and rural regions have expressed strong interest in supporting a new Teach For America site. Teach For America selects new regions each year through a process based on student academic needs, strength of district commitment and partnership, and local funding commitments. Teach For America's new site development team will ensure that we secure sufficient revenues each year to open sites that are fully funded and meet or exceed revenue targets in a way that is sustainable beyond the grant.

3. National operating campaign: National private revenue is a stabilizing component of Teach For America's growth strategy that allows Teach For America to test and invest in large-scale program innovations, to provide short- and long-term subsidy to regions that are not fully funded, and to readily seize unanticipated growth opportunities. Across all campaigns – annual operating, growth funding to provide working capital and grow operating reserves, and endowment funds – we raised over \$685 million in contributions and pledged multi-year commitments from national private donors between 2005 and 2009.

We will continue to pursue national support for our growth plan as well as targeted support for special initiatives, including those related to improving teacher effectiveness, early childhood and special education, STEM education, rural expansion, and alumni leadership. Finally, we will continue to deepen relationships with current and new corporate partners, who have provided a steady stream of \$7 to \$8 million in national revenues for the last several years.

4. Federal grants: Teach For America has secured annual federal grants from AmeriCorps (since 1994) and from the Department of Education (since 2002) that set ambitious targets for growth and performance, cover national and regional costs related to recruiting and

training a new corps of teachers each year, and help subsidize regional operations, especially those in rural areas without a strong base of philanthropic dollars. We have been an AmeriCorps partner since its inception and we dedicate the necessary resources to ensuring we are well-positioned to renew those grants every three years. Additionally, while the federal appropriations process can be unreliable, we have grown our support modestly over the last several years, and continue to expand our strong base of support in the U.S. Congress.

For the sustainability of this grant, we are projecting growth in federal funding (outside of i3 funding) that is slower than our federal funding growth rate over the last ten years. At the same time, if we are able to secure faster growth in annual federal funding, we will be able to grow at a faster rate and reach one million students more quickly.

Evidence of broad support from stakeholders. We are proud to have strong support for this project from all of the key stakeholders who make our work possible. Our most critical stakeholders as we embark on this effort to grow to scale are the LEAs that will contract with us to hire our teachers. This application includes agreements between Teach For America and 148 LEA partners spanning 29 states and Washington, D.C., expressing their commitment to hiring our teachers throughout the project period. These LEAs serve over four million children across the country and represent a large portion of the highest-need students in America's public schools.

Due to the longstanding partnerships we have shared with many of the districts we serve, the high levels of satisfaction with our corps members expressed by principals, and the magnitude of the challenge we are addressing, we fully expect these partnerships to continue well beyond the project period. In the last decade, Teach For America has opened 20 new

regional sites and built dozens of new LEA partnerships; over the same time, we have only been forced to pull out of one region, Detroit, which we are re-entering this coming school year.

Because of the changing nature of LEA needs, Teach For America meets with school district and charter school leaders annually to discuss hiring needs for the following year. In these meetings, we decide the number of new teachers and the subject areas and grade levels that districts need for the following year. This leads to annual professional services agreements (PSAs), which are contracts between Teach For America and LEAs detailing our placement plans and mutual obligations for the following school year. We have attached in Appendix H a sample annual PSA and a list of current LEAs with signed PSAs for the school year. Through this project period we expect to work with our LEA partners, in accordance with the Innovation Fund agreements, and reach annual agreements on the number and distribution of teacher placements for the following school year.

Beyond our LEA partners, Teach For America's success requires the support of a wide range of partner institutions. Schools of education provide alternative certification pathways for our corps members and help validate our model. College presidents will serve as critical champions for our campus recruitment efforts, encouraging our nation's most promising future leaders to apply to Teach For America. National education organizations will serve as key influencers, increasing awareness about our impact and supporting our efforts to place more teachers. And our early childhood champions will help grow our ECE teacher presence and provide leadership pathways for our alumni. Additionally, we will rely heavily on our national foundation investors who have all committed substantial funds to fueling our growth to scale. The list below is a sampling of the deep and broad support that Teach For America currently has, letters of support from every organization and individual listed here can be found in Appendix D:

- **School Districts:** 148 LEAs in 29 states
- **Organizations of State and Local Superintendents:** The Council of Chief State School Officers representing every state school officer nationwide, the Council of Great City Schools representing the nation's largest urban school districts
- **National Foundations and Funders:** The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, Don and Doris Fisher Fund, the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, Rainwater Charitable Foundation, the Robertson Foundation, the Walton Family Foundation
- **College Presidents:** Amherst College, Duke University, Louisiana State University, The University of California, Berkeley, The University of Maryland Baltimore County, The University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Spelman College, Tulane University
- **Deans of Colleges of Education:** Arizona State University, Boston University, Georgia State University, Johns Hopkins University, Loyola Marymount University, The University of Pennsylvania, and The University of Washington
- **Education and Civil Rights Organizations:** Breakthrough Collaborative, Golden Key International Honour Society, Phi Sigma Pi National Honor Fraternity, The Education Commission of the States, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, The National Society of Collegiate Scholars
- **Early Childhood Leaders:** The National Head Start Association, Libby Doggett

F(2) Impact beyond the scale-up grant

Beyond the term of this four-year project, Teach For America will maintain its larger-scale work with our district and school partners through continuing to build a broad base of public and private support, generating revenues based on the demonstrated impact of our corps members and alumni in the communities we serve. As we deepen and expand our presence, our teachers will become woven into the fabric of these communities, and we will have built a sustainable base of local philanthropic and district support such that we will no longer need the i3 scale-up funds after four years. In essence, we will have leveraged i3 funds each year to attract the necessary long-term supporters to sustain, and potentially continue to grow, Teach For America for many years.

For our district partners, we will have increased the steady supply of highly effective new teachers from around the country – providing them with access to exceptional talent that is a scarce resource and costly to attract. And our alumni will contribute to district pipelines not only of highly effective teachers, but also of administrators and leaders with the experience, skills, and conviction to create truly exceptional schools and schools systems for high-need students. Finally, we will have deepened our relationships with our myriad LEA partners, offering them not only our teachers, but also our experience base as we share our best practices and provide them with access to professional development and support materials that develop highly effective teachers for low-income schools.

At the conclusion of the scale-up grant, over 13,000 corps members will be reaching more than 850,000 of our nation's most disadvantaged students, on the path to reaching one million high-need students in the 2016-17 school year. These corps members will consistently advance their students' achievement at the level of our nation's most effective teachers. They

will account for approximately 20% of new teachers in the highest-need schools across more than 50 regions of the country, providing a steady supply of highly effective teachers to the schools and districts where they are needed most. Their efforts will change students' lives and produce a new pipeline of diverse students for college campuses and for our nation at large.

At the same time, an ever-expanding force of over 30,000 Teach For America alumni will provide critical leadership in classrooms, schools and districts, and in the broader non-profit, policy and business community. We anticipate that this group will include around 10,000 additional teachers, which means that corps members and alumni together will be teaching between one and two million of the 14 million children growing up in poverty⁵⁰ in America. Our alumni will lead over 5% of the 10,000 urban schools serving majority low-income students, including around 5% in the nation's three largest districts – Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York – and over 15% in Washington, D.C., and New Orleans. And still other alumni will drive innovations from inside and outside the education system – as superintendents, political leaders and policymakers, social entrepreneurs, journalists, advocates, and civic leaders in all sectors. As a group, our alumni will be moving the needle in closing the achievement gap, changing the conversation about what is possible and how to achieve it, and helping – with the other teachers and leaders in our 148 LEA partners and with the support of our many other partners – to move our nation toward the tipping point at which the movement to end educational inequity becomes unstoppable.

⁵⁰ U.S. Census Bureau.

G. Quality of the Management Plan and Personnel

G(1) Management plan

Teach For America's senior operating committee team, led by Wendy Kopp and Matthew Kramer and comprised of senior leaders of each functional area, meets every month to review progress to goals, discuss critical programmatic or operational needs, monitor organizational efficiency and effectiveness, prioritize and plan for the future.

Within each program area, Teach For America has a management plan and staffing structure that enables the team to monitor and make progress toward clearly defined goals (descriptions below). To monitor expenses, each team has at least one budget manager to set budgetary needs and monitor expenditures, and a budget tracker to track spending for each department.

Recruitment. All recruitment staff members use data "dashboards" to track progress in moving candidates through the pipeline and to monitor the relationship between recruitment activities and number of applications. Dashboards are customizable for management level, i.e., recruitment directors can see campus-by-campus activity; senior staff can monitor progress and activity across cohorts of recruitment directors, and so on.

Admissions. Given the multiple deadlines and thousands of interviews happening simultaneously, the admissions team must ensure flawless execution of a tight admissions calendar. We use an online application process, linked to our constituent database. This system enables the operations team to track the progress of each applicant through the stages of the interview, matriculation and placement process, and to obtain and manage data on applicants for analysis so that we can continuously improve our selection process.

Teacher training and support. During Teach For America’s summer training institute, staff monitor teacher development against the Teaching As Leadership proficiency rubric; student academic growth against standards-aligned learning objectives; and operational efficiency in order to maximize pre-service teachers’ time spent training. Throughout the year, Teach For America staff record performance information at not only the teacher level (using Teaching As Leadership), but also aggregated student results at the class level, to measure and maximize each teacher’s contribution towards student learning.

Growth strategy. Our growth strategy team utilizes a corps member placement system that relies on clear milestones and benchmarks throughout the year for securing placements and funding to make decisions on whether to grow, maintain, or contract regional corps size according to demand on the ground. This system allows us to manage toward overall national growth goals, and seize new opportunities for placements as they arise, while mitigating the risk associated with volatile district budgets.

Key Project Objectives:

Table 10: Project objectives, owners, and timelines

| Objective | Owner | Responsibilities | Milestones | Timeline* |
|--|----------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------|
| Ensure key milestones and project benchmarks are met and board is invested in the project | Wendy Kopp and Matt Kramer | Ensure project is conducted on time and within budget | Operating Team Meetings | Every month |
| | | Ensure key personnel report on their progress regularly and that problems are identified early and addressed immediately | Program Team Meetings | Every two months |
| | | Keep National Board informed of project progress and receive guidance and feedback | Report to National Board | Bi-annually |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | from them | | |
| Recruit exceptional incoming corps members | Elissa Clapp | Efficiently grow the number of applicants to Teach For America by 2014 | Recruitment data analysis of prior season and development of strategy for next season | Summer |
| | | Maintain applicant quality while increasing diversity | Execute new strategies, cultivate additional campus champions, and grow stakeholders | August to February |
| Select incoming corps members with greatest potential to increase student achievement | Joshua Griggs | Evaluate every application through a rigorous, data-driven process | 5 application deadlines, 3 steps to each deadline (initial screen, phone interview, day-long in-person interview) | August, September, October, January, February |
| | | Ensure selection bar is applied consistently as applicant pool grows in size | Matriculate at least 75% of accepted applicants | After each application deadline |
| | | Assign corps members to teaching placements that match their preferences and qualifications | Upgrade admissions model with fresh student achievement data | June-July annually |
| Train and support corps members | Jeff Wetzler and Aylon Samouha | Grow the training infrastructure and support system to accommodate increased corps size | Launch new training institutes in 2012 and 2014; renegotiate training institute contracts annually | December-January annually |
| | | Ensure successful execution of existing summer training institutes | Run effective training institutes | June - August |
| | | Develop new university partnerships to certify corps members in expansion sites | Partner with additional Schools of Education to provide pathways to certification | March prior to launch of new site |
| | | Ensure the continuous improvement of our training and support approach so that the overall effectiveness of the corps members | Examine student achievement results and corps member surveys and refine and improve program design | August – October (end of institute); Feb – Mar (mid-year); June-August (end of year) |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | | increases every year over the course of the grant | Provide ongoing support for corps members | August – May annually |
| Identify and launch 3 to 4 expansion sites each year | Eric Scroggins | Ensure alignment between Teach For America’s mission and geographic presence by identifying regions for expansion with significant need and a clear vision for how Teach For America fits in with their plan to address local educational inequity Cultivate key stakeholders and raise private and local support in prospective sites | Identify prospective sites that meet Teach For America’s expansion criteria | September through November |
| | | | Secure support from key stakeholders | February |
| | | | Host public new site launch event | Spring |
| Optimize growth in corps size across existing regions | Elisa Villanueva Beard and Eric Scroggins | Manage the intersection of applicant numbers and preferences with the local teacher hiring landscape Determine overall distribution of corps by region, grade level and subject | Meet with regional partners (LEAs) to discuss their demand for corps members | Spring |
| | | | Allocate corps member distribution by grade level, subject and region | Completed by April |
| Ensure project evaluation is implemented smoothly and provides the field with applicable, and replicable information about supporting effective teachers | Heather Harding | Liaison with Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. and partner regions to ensure the project evaluation is carried out on time, within budget and with full cooperation and assistance | Identify regions and schools | Fall of 2010 |
| | | | Assign teachers using random assignment | August of 2011, 2012, and 2013 |
| | | | Administer student assessments | September, April of each year |
| | | | Analyze results and finalize report | 2015 |
| | | | Share findings with education community | 2015/2016 |

**occurs throughout project period*

G(2) Qualifications of Teach For America staff

Teach For America's chief executive officer and founder, Wendy Kopp, and our president, Matthew Kramer, will oversee the management of this project. Wendy will serve as project director and Matt will oversee the senior vice president of recruitment, the vice president of admissions, the senior vice presidents of teacher preparation and support, chief operating officer, and executive vice president of growth strategy and development. Brief biographies of key staff include (see Appendix C for full resumes):

Wendy Kopp, Chief Executive Officer and Founder – Wendy proposed the creation of Teach For America in her undergraduate senior thesis in 1989 and has spent the last 20 years working to nurture and grow the organization – which has successfully grown from a 500-member corps to a 7,300-member corps, with an alumni base that is 17,000 strong. Under Wendy's leadership, Teach For America is in the midst of an effort to grow to scale while maximizing the impact of teachers and alumni as a force for immediate and long-term change.

Matthew Kramer, President – Matt serves as Teach For America's president. He formerly oversaw the program continuum, including recruitment, selection and placement, teacher preparation, teacher support, and alumni affairs throughout the last major growth effort. Matt joined Teach For America after working at the management consulting firm, McKinsey & Company, where he was a partner and consulted with insurers and asset managers, and also served nonprofit institutions focused on K-12 education.

Elisa Villanueva Beard, Chief Operating Officer – Elisa has served as senior vice president for regional operations and chief operating officer since 2005. In that capacity, she has overseen massive growth, from 130 staff regional staff members to approximately 700. Elisa joined the staff as executive director of the organization's Rio Grande Valley site. During her

four years as executive director, she grew the region's funding base 17 times over, created a functioning community advisory board, and oversaw a corps of teachers that more than doubled.

Elissa Clapp, Senior Vice President, Recruitment – Elissa has managed the recruitment team since 1999, and in the last seven years has produced 30% compound annual growth in the applicant pool – from 3,000 applicants in 1999 to 46,000 applicants in 2010. Through her stewardship, Teach For America increased the incoming teacher class from 770 teachers per year to over 4,000 teachers per year.

Dr. Heather Harding, Vice President, Research and Policy – Prior to joining Teach For America's staff, Heather served as a principal associate at the Annenberg Institute for School Reform and taught in the Harvard Graduate School of Education's Teacher Education Program. She earned her master's and doctoral degrees in education from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, where her thesis considered the intersection of race and pedagogy for four successful white urban middle school teachers. Heather also previously served as executive director of the Eastern North Carolina region.

Dr. Robert Lundin, Vice President, University Partnerships – In his capacity as vice president for university partnerships, Robert oversees Teach For America's network of over 70 higher education training partners across the nation. He is a graduate of Rice University who also holds a master's degree in bilingual education from the University of Saint Thomas and a doctorate in educational leadership from Vanderbilt University.

Eric Scroggins, Executive Vice President, Growth Strategy and Development – Eric is responsible for developing and executing our growth strategy and ensuring that we have the resources to achieve our goals. Eric has served on Teach For America's staff since 2003. He has created new models connecting growth and development that helped nearly double both overall

revenue and the percentage of regions supporting their work fully through local funding. Additionally, Eric has overseen the opening of ten new regions. Eric previously served as executive director of both the Bay Area region and the St. Louis region..

Jeff Wetzler and Aylon Samouha, Co-Senior Vice Presidents, Teacher Preparation Support and Development – Jeff and Aylon, along with their teams, led our efforts to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our training model since 2006. Since Jeff and Aylon assumed their current roles, the number of first year corps members attaining significant gains grew by 117%, the number of second year corps members attaining significant gains grew by 56% and the number of new training institutes grew by 60%, from five to eight institutes. Jeff previously served as a management consultant and product developer at Monitor Group and earned his M.A. in Adult Learning and Leadership at Teacher’s College at Columbia University. Aylon was previously vice president of East operations at Score! Educational Centers, where he helped lead the rapid expansion of the organization from 20 to 160-plus centers nationally.

Joshua Griggs, Vice President, Admissions – Joshua has worked on Teach For America’s admissions team since 2006. As vice president, he has led business process innovation, revision, and scaling in response to 90% growth in applications and Teach For America’s expansion into 10 new regions. He also implemented alumni interviewer recruitment and engagement plan that quadrupled the number of alumni conducting phone interviews.

The full resumes of the staff members listed above and the researchers listed below can be found in Appendix C.

G(3) Qualifications of Project Evaluation Staff: Mathematica Policy Research

Melissa Clark (Ph.D., Economics, Princeton University), a senior researcher at Mathematica, will be the project director of the Teach For America evaluation. Dr. Clark is one of Mathematica's strongest econometricians and design experts, and has demonstrated expertise in conducting rigorous evaluations and estimating impacts through her work on several major, multi-site impact evaluations of education programs. As principal investigator on the National Evaluation of Charter Schools, Dr. Clark helped develop the analysis plan and is leading the impact estimation. This large-scale random assignment study will estimate the impact of charter schools on middle school student achievement in math and reading using test score data from school records from over 30 school districts. Dr. Clark devised innovative solutions to several complex design challenges for this evaluation, including the pooling of scores from different tests across districts, high rates of missing test score data, and high rates of control group crossover.

Eric Isenberg (Ph.D., Economics, Washington University), a researcher at Mathematica, will be the deputy project director. Dr. Isenberg has worked on a number of education studies and is an expert in value-added analyses. As the co-principal investigator of the Impact Evaluation of Teacher Induction, a large-scale, multi-site, randomized controlled trial for the Institute of Education Sciences, Dr. Isenberg led the analysis of the impact of comprehensive induction on student achievement, using the same growth modeling techniques required in value-added estimation. He is the principal author of "Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Results from the Second Year of a Randomized Controlled Study."⁵¹ As the deputy project director of the District of Columbia Value Added project, Dr. Isenberg developed and

⁵¹ Isenberg, Glazerman, Bleeker, Johnson, Lugo-Gil, Grider, Dolfen and Britton.

implemented value-added measures for teachers and schools in the District of Columbia Public Schools.

Kathryn Sonnenfeld (B.A., Art Therapy and Psychology, The College of New Jersey), a senior survey researcher at Mathematica with 20 years of experience, will be the evaluation's survey director. Ms. Sonnenfeld has played a leadership role on several large-scale studies that called for student assessments and has extensive experience in designing data collection systems that involve random assignment. As deputy survey director for the Impact Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Models and the 2004 TFA impact study, Ms. Sonnenfeld was responsible for designing the school records data collection efforts, helping develop teacher surveys, and designing and maintaining databases for tracking student random assignment. For the First 5 LA/Los Angeles Universal Preschool Child Outcomes Study, Ms. Sonnenfeld developed instruments (child, teacher, and parent), obtained copyright permissions, and developed materials for and conducted field staff training.

Competitive Priorities

Competitive Preference Priority 5 – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes

Teach For America launched an early childhood education (ECE) initiative in 2006 to recruit more outstanding educators and future leaders into Head Start, pre-K, and early elementary school classrooms and provide them with tailored training and support.

An i3 award would enable us to significantly expand the number of ECE corps members from 1,700 teachers serving in 35 sites in the 2009-10 school year to 3,360 teachers – 24% of our total corps – in 54 sites in the 2014-15 school year. These efforts will provide tens of thousands of low-income children with highly enriching and engaging teachers who use a developmentally appropriate outcomes-based approach to teaching young children.

Table 11: Early childhood education corps members

| School year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| ECE Corps Members | 1,770 | 2,010 | 2,330 | 2,680 | 3,000 | 3,360 |
| ECE Placement Regions | 35 | 39 | 44 | 47 | 50 | 54 |

Evidence of Improved School Readiness

Teach For America’s early childhood cohort has a significant impact on low-income youth. A 2008 Westat study comparing Teach For America’s early childhood initiative with teachers teaching comparable populations of low-income students concluded:

- Where 4-year-old Head Start students knew an average of 10 letters at the end of the year, Teach For America corps members’ students knew an average of 24 letters;
- Head Start students were at the 34th percentile in letter word knowledge, Teach For America corps members’ students were at the 82nd percentile.⁵²

Improving Developmental Milestones and Aligning them with Outcome Measures

⁵² Zill.

To prepare ECE corps members to ensure that every child they teach meets developmental milestones and high standards of learning across all domains, Teach For America maintains a central, dedicated program design staff that examines resources from all areas of the country and devises training materials that are aligned with high standards. Throughout the project period, we will focus on further improving the following areas of training and ongoing support:

- Providing inquiry-based instruction that promotes critical thinking, sustained dialogue and meaningful connections
- Promoting mature play through intentional center development and implementation
- Teaching our youngest learners essential problem-solving skills; how to approach, navigate and solve social and academic challenges
- Implementing small-groups based on regular formal and informal assessment; and
- Building and utilizing important family relationships; equipping parents with tools and knowledge to promote learning at home and become involved in the classroom

Evidence of Improving Alignment, Collaboration, and Transitions

Teach For America is uniquely well positioned to improve alignment and support transitions among ECE grades and with the higher level grades. The program places corps members in a variety of ECE settings that serve children from low-income families, including pre-school community-based organizations, Head Start community-based organizations for three and four-year olds, Head Start school-based programs for three and four-year olds, pre-K programs in elementary schools, and the early elementary grades in all public schools.

Teach For America works with districts to cluster corps members in the same schools or feeder schools/programs in order to maximize the ability of our corps members to collaborate,

align their instruction and approach with each other. In addition, our corps members share a specific, outcomes-based orientation – rooted in the pre-service training and ongoing instructional support – that provides cohesion for students who are taught by multiple corps members. Finally, corps members are part of the broader Teach For America community and as a result, have the ability to share resources, such as curricula and lessons plans, and best practices, such as strategies for working with families and helping students transition to higher grade levels with their peers all across the country.

We also maintain a formal partnership with the National Head Start Association, have an Early Childhood Education Advisory Board composed of experts in the field (see Appendix H for a list), and are funded by some of the nation’s leading philanthropists with an interest in early childhood education. These strong relationships amplify our impact by providing us with avenues to channel what our corps members are learning on the ground into the broader policy conversation. This allows us to share learnings across the spectrum of ECE groups including those serving birth to age three, preschools and Head Start, and our LEA partners serving kindergarten through third grade.

Competitive Preference Priority 7 – Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students

Teach For America’s overarching approach and accountability system has led corps members across the country to become pioneers in implementing data-driven approaches to teaching special needs and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

Almost 900 Teach For America corps members teach in one of the three primary special education settings (self-contained, inclusion, and resource) and an additional 390 teach LEP students in four different types of settings (bilingual Spanish, ESL-pull out, ESL-push in, and ESL self-contained). An i3 award would allow us to place, in the 2014-15 school year, 1,640 special education teachers, who would impact more than 24,000 students, and 600 LEP teachers, who would impact 13,000 students. Throughout the project period, 10% of Teach For America’s total corps will teach special education. Both placement areas would fill a vital gap for the under-resourced school districts that we serve that struggle to find qualified teachers.

Table 12: Special education and LEP corps members

| School year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Corps Members teaching Special Education | 880 | 985 | 1,140 | 1,315 | 1,470 | 1,640 |
| Corps Members teaching LEP Students | 295 | 390 | 450 | 520 | 580 | 650 |

Evidence of Improved Academic Outcomes

In recent years we have improved our training and support systems for corps members teaching special education and LEP students. As a result, we have significantly grown the percentage of highly effective teachers in these areas:

- In the 2008-09 school year, 40% of first-year special education teachers and 49% of second-year teachers effected “significant gains” (i.e. were highly effective) with their students.
- 48% of first-year teachers working with LEP students and 62.5% of second-year teachers were highly effective. These numbers will continue to increase as we implement additional training and support help.

Specific Strategies and Practices designed to Improve Student Achievement

Throughout the grant project, Teach For America will implement a number of strategies, building off of our already strong foundation for, and commitment to, ensuring our teachers bring the same high expectations and level of preparedness and support to teaching special education students as they do students at all levels. These strategies include:

- Pre-service training enhancements in how to:
 - Set goals that are feasible and ambitious along with real-life applications of such goals
 - Use assessments appropriately and hold general education expectations for special education and LEP students
 - Choose and apply appropriate accommodations and modifications
 - Differentiate instruction, co-teach, and provide remediation
 - Invest parents, family members, and other key influencers in meeting educational goals
- Providing resources and ongoing support including:

- Sample IEP goals for students with the most common disabilities represented in special education placements (specific learning disabilities, behavioral/emotional disabilities, mental disabilities, and autism)
- Model assessments with modifications and accommodations for special education and LEP students
- Specialized tools for tracking individual student progress for each population
- Innovative online solutions, such as advice forums that connect special educators and LEP educators across the country and provide them with a community of support, best-practice and resource sharing, and a range of quality, tailored resources.

Competitive Preference Priority 8 – Innovations that Serve Schools in Rural LEAs

Teach For America has a proven record of attracting exceptional young people to teach in under-resourced rural communities going back to 1990 when we opened with three rural sites among our six initial launch sites (Eastern North Carolina, South Louisiana and rural Georgia). Today, approximately 590 Teach For America first- and second-year corps members teach in rural LEAs (as defined in the i3 notice), and an additional 180 serve Native American and Native Hawaiian populations in federal schools on reservations or in rural schools in Hawai'i that are part of the statewide LEA.⁵³ In the words of South Dakota Secretary of Education Dr. Rick Melmer, "In a rural state like South Dakota, finding high-quality teachers for all of our districts is a real challenge. Teach For America has been a terrific answer to that challenge. As a result, we have been able to fill over 50 positions this year in some of the most critical need areas in South Dakota. Furthermore, we are seeing excellent achievement results in their classrooms. Honestly, I am not sure what we would have done without Teach For America over the past three years."

Through this i3 project, we will grow to place approximately 1,000 corps members in rural LEAs, providing a critical source of teachers who will help address many of the unique challenges facing rural communities.

⁵³ Corps members in New Mexico and South Dakota teach in federal schools on reservations and are not included in the definition of rural schools here; Hawaii is a state-wide LEA, though all Teach For America placements are rural serving native Hawaiian students.

Table 13: Rural corps members

| School Year | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Corps Members teaching in Rural Sites | 590 | 681 | 782 | 880 | 922 | 966 |
| Rural sites | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Students served | 40,000 | 50,000 | 55,000 | 60,000 | 65,000 | 70,000 |

Our core practices and strategies are described in the grant narrative, but for rural communities, the following are of particular importance:

- **Attracting talented teachers.** Rural LEAs do not have a sufficient pool of candidates for teacher or administrator positions. Today, Teach For America places and supports more than 590 teachers in rural LEAs each year, teachers who have been recruited nationally from top colleges and universities that typically would not be reached by rural schools.
- **Hiring teachers in hard-to-staff subjects.** Rural LEAs have more challenges than other districts in hiring teachers for STEM, special education, and other hard to staff subject areas. By the 2014-15 school year, Teach For America will bring in 338 STEM and 116 special teachers to schools in rural LEAs.
- **Providing exceptional professional development to teachers in remote areas.** Rural LEAs have more challenges than urban and suburban districts in providing exceptional professional development because of the distances between schools. Teach For America will provide exceptional professional development through our program staff to the more than 950 first- and second-year teachers in rural LEAs by the 2014-15 school year.

Additionally, through our TALON website, we are able to provide access to highly rated

lesson plans, tools for improved teaching, and an annotated video library for professional development – all of particular importance to teachers in rural communities.

- **Building a leadership pipeline.** Teach For America currently has approximately 30 alumni serving as school leaders in rural communities. Alumni are also founding school leaders of Gaston College Prep and IDEA, two models of exemplary rural schools. We anticipate by the project’s conclusion almost 60 principals and assistant principals who are alumni of Teach For America will be working in rural areas.

Evidence of Improving Student Achievement in Rural Communities

Teach For America is committed to comprehensive external evaluations of our teachers’ impact. The two most rigorous external studies include data from rural regions.

- A 2008-09 study using data from North Carolina, including the rural Eastern part of the state where we place 170 corps members, found that impact on student achievement of having a Teach For America corps member was at least twice that of having a teacher with three or more years of experience relative to a new teacher.⁵⁴
- A 2004 randomized control study by Mathematica looked at Teach For America corps members across five regions, including the rural Mississippi Delta, and concluded that students taught by Teach For America corps members attained statistically significant greater gains compared to our teachers.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Xu, Hannaway, and Taylor.

⁵⁵ Decker, Mayer, and Glazerman.