

Participants

- Georgia Teacher Fellows (GTF) set a participant selection target of 135 teacher candidates for the 2012 cohort, which started teaching in SY 12-13. While more teacher candidates were selected, 126 Fellows enrolled in the 2012 cohort.¹
- Fellows reflected the desired population GTF intended to serve. For example, 100% of cohort members were new to formal teaching.
- During SY 12-13, GTF successfully placed 93 of the 2012 cohort members in teaching positions.² Most of the Fellows found teaching jobs in high-need schools (78%) and hard-to-staff subjects (91%). **Therefore, GTF contributed to the pipeline of effective teachers in high-need schools and hard-to-staff subjects.**

Program Design

- **Professional development and support adequately addressed the instructional needs of participants.** During SY 12-13, Fellows experienced three types of training and professional development.
 - *Teaching for Results* seminars. All Fellows were required to take part in these training and development sessions. Fellows met on a bi-weekly basis for these seminars. Topics varied by content area. The following list provides several examples of seminar topics:
 - Secondary Math: “Mathematical Connections,” “Technology for Mathematics,” and “Project-Based Learning”
 - Science: “Literacy in Science,” “Evidence, Models, and Explanations,” and “Science in Society”
 - ECE: “Early Childhood Mathematics Content Domain,” “Geometry and Measurement,” and “Bridging Cultures and Parent Involvement”
 - Special Education: “Maximizing Instructional Effectiveness,” “Science and Social Studies,” and “Foundational Mathematics”
 - Individual coaching sessions. Part-time effectiveness coaches visited Fellows on a regular basis (from 1-2 times per week to 1-2 times per month, depending on need). Coaches provided a range of support, such as real-time support, modeled instruction, and co-planned lessons.
 - Responsive coaching sessions. Coaches assigned these required group sessions to their Fellows based on needs identified during observations and individual coaching sessions.

¹ GTF experienced challenges related to the district demand for Fellows and supply of candidates qualified to teach math, science, or special education. GTF forged new partnerships with districts to secure more potential teacher placements; however, these new partnerships did not render enough available teaching positions for Fellows in need of jobs.

² 2012 cohort Fellows were selected and trained in 2012 and began teaching in the fall of 2012. In May/June of 2013, they completed the program and either remained in teaching, left teaching voluntarily, or were dismissed. 2013 cohort Fellows were recruited, selected, and trained in 2013 and began teaching during SY 13-14.

- **GTF used participant data to inform ongoing training and development.** GTF used information from its TeacherTrack2 data system to determine participant need. Regular data collection and analysis showed that some Fellows struggled with more advanced classroom management techniques. GTF coaches and instructors used this information to craft special training opportunities, like the responsive coaching seminars, to help Fellows strengthen their classroom management skills.
- In general, Fellows expressed satisfaction with the training and support they received during SY 12-13. For example,
 - 69 of 79 Fellows, or 87.3%, net agreed³ with this statement, “I felt supported in my work as a first year teacher.”
 - 49 of 72 Fellows, or 68.1%, net agreed with the statement, “Given the timeframe, pre-service training prepared me as well as possible to be successful in my first year of teaching.
 - 57 of 67 Fellows, or 85.1%, net agreed with the statement, “My coach knew how to help me improve my instruction.”
- Like most of the teacher induction and/or pipeline programs being supported through Race to the Top, GTF paired Fellows with experienced educators who served as coaches. However, during SY 12-13, GTF expanded its support network to include responsive coaching seminars and peer collaborative groups. GTF established the peer collaborative groups for the 2013 cohort to provide opportunities for fellows who teach the same content area or teach the same children at summer school to interact and support each other’s professional development.

Outcomes

- Over SY 12-13, the average attendance rate for *Teaching for Results* seminars was 88.2%.
- **Over 91% of Fellows in the 2012 cohort taught until the end of the school year.** GTF enrolled 102 Fellows in the 2012 cohort, and 93 remained in the program through the end of the school year.
 - The nine Fellows who left the program did so for the following reasons:
 - Teaching was not what they expected it to be (4),
 - They did not believe their schools were a good fit for them (2), or
 - Their school leaders did not think teaching was a good fit for them (3).
- GTF uses the Assessment of Classroom Effectiveness (ACE) to evaluate Fellows. Fellows receive at least three evaluative ACE observations, which along with student surveys and principal ratings are used to calculate their final ACE score. **Therefore, Fellows are observed and evaluated in a manner consistent with the GaDOE’s Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES).**

³ Seventy-nine cohort 2012 Fellows responded to GTF’s End-of-Year Survey. However, approximately 10 of those Fellows failed to respond to the majority of questions. Therefore, GTF considered those responses invalid and removed them from its analysis. The percentages provided to GOSA and reflected in this report include only responses from Fellows who actively responded to each question.

GTF uses the following rating scale.

Ineffective (1.0-1.9)	Proficient (4.0-4.9)
Minimally Effective (2.0-2.9)	Skillful (5.0)
Developing (3.0-3.9)	

- Of the 93 Fellows who taught until the end of SY 12-13, 84 (82%) received an ACE score. Eight of the nine Fellows who did not receive an ACE score did so because they either failed the portfolio (4) or did not turn in a portfolio (4). One of the Fellows did not turn in a portfolio because he/she was accepted to medical school and would not be teaching the following year. The ninth Fellow to not receive an ACE score was “non-renewed” by his/her principal in March; therefore, he/she was withdrawn from the program.
- Sixty-eight of the 84 Fellows who started teaching during SY 12-13 successfully completed all program requirements and passed the ACE. Twelve of these Fellows passed ACE with distinction. Of the 16 Fellows who did not successfully complete the program,
 - Seven were placed on an extension and allowed to remain in the program for an additional year.
 - Eight were “out-placed” from the program and not recommended for certification.
 - One participant deferred his decision to the 2013-14 school year.
- **In general, 2012 Fellows met GTF’s performance expectations.** For example,
 - Fellows’ average ACE observation score met GTF’s internal benchmark of 3.3.
 - GTF expected the majority of its teachers to be in the medium-high developing range, and 67% of its Fellows earned ACE scores of “developing” or higher.
 - Principals rated 57% of Fellows as “better than” or “much better than” other first-year teachers.
- Fellows earned a range of honors and accolades last school year. One Fellow was recognized by her district, earning Outstanding New Teacher of the Year. In addition, TNTP recognized 12 Fellows for passing ACE with distinction.
- **Of the 76 Fellows who successfully completed the program, received an extension, or deferred, 97% intend to continue teaching.**
- Overall, 57 of 70 Fellows, or 81.4% net agreed with the statement, “Overall, the Teaching Fellows Program was a significant factor in making me a more effective teacher.”
- Currently, GTF does not have access to reliable student achievement data. Although GTF is working with district partners to obtain student achievement data for their Fellows for future reports, the organization currently relies on anecdotal information as proxies for student outcomes. Anecdotal information revealed the following:
 - 75 of 78, or 96.2%, of Fellows net agreed to the question on the end-of-year survey, “I was effective at raising student achievement this year.”
 - 35 of 71, or 49%, of principals said that Fellows moved their students up one grade level or more during the school year.