



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Jenna Conway
Superintendent of Public Instruction

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
P.O. BOX 2120
RICHMOND, VA 23218-2120

Office: (804) 225-2057
Fax: (804) 371-2099

November 1, 2026

The Honorable L. Louise Lucas
Chair, Senate, Finance and Appropriations Committee
201 North 9th Street, Room 1404
Richmond, VA 23219

The Honorable Luke Torian
Chair, House Appropriations Committee
201 North 9th Street, Room 1223
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Chair Lucas and Chair Torian:

In accordance with [Item 124 Q.2. of Chapter 725, 2025 Acts of Assembly](#), the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) is directed to administer grant funding to support teacher residency partnerships between university teacher preparation programs and the Petersburg, Norfolk, and Richmond City school divisions, as well as other university teacher preparation programs in partnership with hard-to-staff school divisions. These grants are intended to enhance the preparation of new teachers and strengthen retention in schools experiencing persistent staffing challenges by providing extensive clinical experience alongside of intentional mentoring. Pursuant to the requirements of the Appropriation Act, the VDOE compiles and consolidates all reports submitted by participating university partners and school divisions and provides an annual report to the Chairs of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance and Appropriations Committees.

The enclosed report details the application and award process, summarizes the grants issued, provides program recommendations, and includes the final annual reports submitted by each awardee. Should you require any additional information or have questions regarding this report, please contact Jessica Proffitt, Deputy Superintendent of Instructional and Educator Excellence, at Jessica.Proffitt@doe.virginia.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jenna Conway".

Jenna Conway
Superintendent of Public Instruction

JC/JP/sl

CC: The Honorable Jeffrey O. Smith, Virginia Secretary of Education

REPORT ON TEACHER RESIDENCY PARTNERSHIP

November 1, 2026

Item 124 Q.2 (Chapter 725, 2025 Acts of Assembly)



PREFACE

Item 124 Q.2. (Chapter 725, 2025 Acts of Assembly) directs the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to issue grants for teacher residency partnerships between university teacher preparation programs and the Petersburg, Norfolk, and Richmond City school divisions, and any other university teacher preparation programs and hard-to-staff school divisions to help improve new teacher training and retention for hard-to-staff schools. The budget language also directs VDOE to consolidate all annual reports and submit to the Chairs of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance and Appropriations Committees no later than November 1 each year.

Teacher residency programs are intensive experiences in which residents complete a year-long clinical placement under the supervision of a mentor-teacher in a partner school division while completing the required coursework needed to become licensed teachers. Virginia Commonwealth University and the College of William and Mary partnered with 20 school divisions across the Commonwealth to prepare 26 teachers in identified critical shortage teaching endorsements who were subsequently hired in a hard-to-staff school division. Portsmouth City Public Schools also partnered with Norfolk State University to pilot a teacher residency program with 2 teacher residents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Executive Summary	v
Overview and Authority	1
Application for Teacher Residency	1
Summary of Awards	2
Budget Overview	2
Suggested Appropriation Modifications	3
Report Submissions	3
Conclusion	3
Appendix A: College of William and Mary Report	4
Appendix B: Portsmouth City Public Schools Report	7
Appendix C: Virginia Commonwealth University Report	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The General Assembly appropriated \$2.85 million in each year of the biennium to strengthen teacher preparation and retention in Virginia's hard-to-staff school divisions through targeted teacher residency partnerships. These funds support collaborative programs between university teacher preparation providers and school divisions such as Petersburg, Norfolk, and Richmond City, with eligibility extended to any public institution of higher education partnering with hard-to-staff divisions.

The initiative is designed to improve teacher readiness and long-term retention in high-need schools through site-specific residency models that include structured preparation, mentoring, and potential stipends to attract qualified candidates. As required in Item 124.Q of the Appropriation Act, partner school divisions contribute at least one-third of program costs and provide the data necessary to evaluate outcomes. University partners must submit annual reports to the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE).

For fiscal year 2026, VDOE received three applications from institutions of higher education. A review panel—representing a school division, and two public institutions—determined that all submissions met statutory and program requirements and recommended full funding for all three. These awards supported teacher residents across multiple divisions, and every resident completing the program accepted a teaching position in their host division, advancing the legislative goal of improving staffing stability in high-need schools. The awards supported 28 teacher residents across 21 school divisions.

VDOE is undertaking a comprehensive modernization of Virginia's teacher licensure system, with a new system planned for implementation in 2027. In addition to creating a more efficient and user-friendly licensure process for educators, school divisions, and educator preparation programs, this modernization provides an opportunity to strengthen the Commonwealth's educator workforce data infrastructure. The new system will be designed to capture more consistent information about how educators enter the profession, including their preparation pathway and participation in residency-based and other alternative preparation models, and to connect those data with information about where educators are employed and how long they remain in Virginia classrooms. Over time, these improvements will allow VDOE to better understand the outcomes of different preparation pathways, identify patterns in educator recruitment and retention, and provide policymakers, preparation programs, and school divisions with more actionable information about Virginia's educator workforce. This enhanced data capacity will also support the Commonwealth in evaluating the effectiveness of investments in teacher preparation and workforce initiatives and making more informed decisions about how best to strengthen the educator pipeline.

VDOE has consolidated all required reports from participating higher education partners for fiscal year 2026. Attachments include submissions from each awarded institution and partner school division.

OVERVIEW AND AUTHORITY

In FY26, the General Assembly continued appropriating state funding for a teacher residency partnership between university teacher preparation programs in Virginia and the Petersburg, Norfolk, and Richmond City school divisions, and any other university teacher preparation programs and hard-to-staff school divisions to help improve new teacher training and retention for hard-to-staff schools. Virginia public institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs may apply for the grant funds. A public institution of higher education may partner with a teacher preparation program in a private institution of higher education, following necessary grant-making or procurement process.

The language from the Appropriation Act is as follows:

Item 124.Q

Q. Out of this appropriation, \$2,850,000 the first year and \$2,850,000 the second year from the general fund is provided for grants for teacher residency partnerships between university teacher preparation programs and the Petersburg, Norfolk, and Richmond City school divisions and any other university teacher preparation programs and hard-to-staff school divisions to help improve new teacher training and retention for hard-to-staff schools. The grants will support a site-specific residency model program for preparation, planning, development and implementation, including possible stipends in the program to attract qualified candidates and mentors. Applications must be submitted to the Department of Education by August 1 each year.

1. Of this amount, \$1,100,000 the first year and \$1,100,000 the second year is provided for Virginia Commonwealth University to continue and expand a program to support residents in partnership with the Richmond Teacher Residency program. Virginia Commonwealth University shall include this program in its annual report to the Department of Education, pursuant to paragraph Q.2. of this Item.

2. Partner school divisions shall provide at least one-third of the cost of each program and shall provide data requested by the university partner in order to evaluate program effectiveness by the mutually agreed upon timelines. Each university partner shall report annually, no later than June 30, to the Department of Education on available outcome measures, including student performance indicators, as well as additional data needs requested by the Department of Education. The Department of Education shall provide, directly to the university partners, relevant longitudinal data that may be shared. The Department of Education shall consolidate all submissions from the participating university partners and school divisions and submit such consolidated annual report to the Chairs of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance and Appropriations Committees no later than November 1 each year.

APPLICATION FOR TEACHER RESIDENCY

The VDOE called for proposals via the Virginia Education Update Newsletter. Applications for the 2026 fiscal year were due on December 12, 2025.

The VDOE received three applications in response to the solicitation. Since this is a competitive grant opportunity, a panel was convened to review and score the applications. The panel

contained a representative from a school division, and two representatives from a public institution of higher education. The panel met virtually on January 26, 2026, to review applications and recommend awards. The panel meeting was facilitated by VDOE staff. The panelists determined that all submitted applications met the requirements outlined in grant requirements and recommended funding all applications.

SUMMARY OF AWARDS

Two institutions of higher education and one school division in partnership with an institution of higher education were awarded grants for fiscal year 2026. The awards were as follows:

- The College of William and Mary: \$54,946
- Portsmouth City Public Schools: \$28,953
- Virginia Commonwealth University: \$1,750,000
- TOTAL: \$1,833,899

The awards supported 28 teacher residents across 21 school divisions. All residents who completed the program in spring 2026 subsequently accepted teaching positions within the same school division in which they completed their residency, demonstrating strong alignment between the residency experience and workforce needs.

BUDGET OVERVIEW

Below is an overview of the budget broken down by the institutions of higher education who were awarded.

Awardee	Funding Requested	Funding Awarded	Amount Spent During Fiscal Year 2026	Amount Carried Over to Fiscal Year 2027
College of William and Mary	\$54,946	\$54,946	\$54,946	\$0
Portsmouth City Public Schools	\$28,953	\$28,953	\$15,195	\$13,758
Virginia Commonwealth University	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	\$0*	\$1,750,000

*Received a no-cost extension for fiscal year 2025 funding. All funds expended were from funding awarded in fiscal year 2025.

SUGGESTED APPROPRIATION MODIFICATIONS

In FY 2026, two awardees requested to carry-over awarded funding to FY 2027, citing an inability to spend down the funding due to the timing of the grant award. In planning for FY2027, the VDOE will be changing the timeline in order to ensure funds are distributed as quickly as possible. However, a change to the budget language allowing this funding to be spent over two fiscal years would help eliminate the need for no-cost extensions and would allow awardees to better plan and recruit for future cohorts ensuring the success of the programs.

REPORT SUBMISSIONS

The VDOE has consolidated the report submissions from the participating university partners and school divisions. The following attachments are reports from each of the three awardees awarded Teacher Residency Partnership Grants in Fiscal Year 2026.

CONCLUSION

The General Assembly's investment in the Teacher Residency Program is being utilized to support teacher candidates in earning their teaching licensure and becoming a well-prepared teacher-of-record in a high-needs school division within the Commonwealth. As VDOE modernizes Virginia's teacher licensure system, the Department will strengthen data collection to better understand educator preparation and workforce outcomes, including how candidates were prepared, whether they participated in residency-based preparation models, where they are employed following preparation, and how long they remain in the teaching profession.

APPENDIX A: COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY REPORT

Teacher Residency Partnership Grant Final Year Report
Academic Year: August 2025-May 2026

William & Mary
New Kent Public Schools
Newport News Public Schools

Narrative Summary

During the 2025-2026 academic year, the Teacher Residency Partnership Grant successfully supported the Teacher in residence programs in Newport News Public Schools and in New Kent County Public Schools, in partnership with William & Mary's School of Education.

The Teacher Residency Partnership Program was a year-long residency designed to prepare highly qualified educators for PreK-12 classrooms using a gradual release model. This program integrated structured classroom experiences with targeted coursework and provided residents with both practical teaching experience and academic preparation. Residents were paired with experienced mentor teachers who provided guidance, feedback, and modeled best practices. Stipends were provided to both residents and mentors.

The purpose of this Teacher Residency Partnership Program proposal was to strengthen and expand the established Teachers in Residence (TIR) model, enhance support for residents, broaden residency opportunities, and evaluate program effectiveness. The TIR program offered increased hours and clinical experiences in K-12 settings for preservice teachers, provided a living wage as a division employee, and provided tuition stipends to support degree completion. Through this model, preservice teachers completed a William & Mary master's degree in their endorsement area in three semesters (twelve months) while engaging in a full-year, immersive K-12 residency.

The residency program served as a critical alternative for W&M students for whom unpaid student teaching is not feasible. By combining master's-level coursework with paid clinical experiences, the TIR model reduced financial barriers for preservice teachers and recruited teacher candidates to hard to staff instructional positions in New Kent County and Newport News Public Schools.

The broad goals of the Teacher residency Partnership Grant were threefold:

1. Recruit and Retain William & Mary Teachers in Residence in Newport News and New Kent County Public Schools;
2. Employee Teachers in Residence as Division Staff and Design On-the-Job Learning (OJL); and
3. Conduct the Clinical Experience Internship per the State-approved Program Requirements.

Table 1 includes summative evidence of the outcomes achieved of each of the three goals.

Table 1. Project Goals and Outcomes

Project Goals	Measures	Achieved Outcomes
Goal 1: Recruit and Retain William & Mary Teachers in Residence in Newport News and New Kent County Public Schools.	1. Recruit TIRS 2. Retain TIRS	1. Four Teachers in Residence were recruited for the 2025-2026 year, two in NKCPS and two in NNPS. Their endorsement areas were Special Education, Secondary Math, Secondary Science, and Secondary Social Studies. 2. All four TIRS completed the year-long residency successfully and all four achieved glowing evaluations. All candidates had highly favorable feedback on their experience in the TIR program. One candidate made the difficult decision to move home to Massachusetts after graduation to care for a parent. Three of the four TIRS remain in employment with NCKPS and NNPS and will start the next academic year as first year teachers in those divisions.
Goal 2: Employee Teachers in Residence as Division Staff and Design On-the-job Learning (OJL).	1. Match TIRS with effective mentors 2. Provide mentoring and support to TIRS	1. All four TIRS completed favorable evaluations of their mentors. 2. NNPS provided year-long programming and check-ins at the division level for TIRs. TIRs in NKCPS met consistently with the Executive Director of HR for support, mentorship, and for check-in conversations. W&M provided mentorship and consistent check-in and support through a University Supervisor who visited each TIR in the field for a series of coaching cycles.
Goal 3: Conduct the Clinical Experience Internship per the State-approved Program Requirements	1. Conduct the state-approved internship 2. Prepare for employment 3. Evaluate the experience	1. All four TIRS successfully completed more clinical hours than are required in the state-approved program for teacher licensure. 2. Praxis preparation and testing fee stipends were provided to all TIRS. All four passed their required Praxis assessments. License application fees were provided to school divisions. 3. TIRS completed two exit surveys evaluating their overall experience in the program as well as their experience with their mentor teachers.

While the above table serves to describe achieved outcomes of the 2025-2026 Teacher Residency Partnership Grant, further supporting data regarding program activity and outcomes

are presented in the evaluation data section of this report that follows.

Final Evaluation Data

Each of the four Teachers in Residence received final evaluations from their University Supervisor, the instructor of record for the student teaching internship, that indicated they had either met or exceeded the expectations established through William & Mary's student teaching evaluation rubric.

Three of the four Teachers in Residence completed an exit survey responding to questions related to how well prepared the program made them feel and to questions regarding the support of the mentor (cooperating) teacher. All who responded had positive experiences and especially indicated that their mentor teachers were supportive and helpful to their learning and growth.

Budget Expenditures

The table below shows that all grant funds have been expended to support the Teacher Residency Partnership Grant in support of the 2025-2026 academic year.

Table 2. Overview of Budget and Expenditures for the 2025-2026 TIRS Partnership Grant

		Funds expended as of July 21st, 2026
Academic year tuition stipend (\$12,500 per resident)	\$50,000	\$50,000
VDOE license application fee (\$100 per resident)	\$400	\$400
W&M stipends to mentor teachers (\$1000 each)	\$4,000	\$4,000
Praxis vouchers (3 @\$130, 1 @\$156)	\$546	\$546
Total	\$54,946	\$54,946

Final Comments

The William & Mary School of Education, Newport News Public Schools, and New Kent County Public Schools remain fully committed to the William & Mary residency partnership and to providing financial supports for preservice teacher clinical experiences in order to recruit and retain teachers to both the academic program and to the employing school divisions. Together, we have made significant investments in William & Mary's teacher residents and are committed to a sustained partnership that reduces barriers for the next generation of teachers in our region.

APPENDIX B: PORTSMOUTH CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS REPORT

Portsmouth Public Schools & Norfolk State University Teacher Residency Partnership Grant 2026

Mid-term update: May 5, 2026	Final update: July 2, 2026
------------------------------	----------------------------

Submitted by: Dusti Johnson-Brinker, Director of School and Teacher Quality at Portsmouth Public Schools May 5 and July 2, 2026.

1. Program Overview, Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Overview

The Norfolk State University Portsmouth Public Schools Teacher Residency Program is a teacher preparation model built on a strong partnership between Norfolk State University and Portsmouth Public Schools that meets the high-needs staffing requirements of the school district and ensures new teachers are first day ready. The program provides opportunities for teacher preparation candidates at Norfolk State University and current employees in the school district to pursue their teacher licensure while providing meaningful on-site job experiences. Residents spend a full academic year in the classroom, which covers the arc of the school year from pre-service planning to final assessments. Each resident is paired with an experienced, highly effective mentor teacher who co-plans, co-teaches, and provides daily support in the form of coaching and feedback. The university supports each resident and mentor teacher by providing a university supervisor responsible for making sure the university coursework is tightly integrated and aligned with the clinical experience and academic theory directly informs instructional delivery, classroom management, and assessment practices.

Portsmouth Public Schools has six schools federally identified as needing Targeted Support and Improvement in the Students With Disabilities subgroup. According to the Virginia Language and Literacy Screening System (VALLSS) results, 46% of students in kindergarten through third grade have been identified as high-risk and require individual reading plans. All schools have an English Language Learner (ELL) population. As a result, intentional support needs to be provided to support the students' needs. It will be beneficial for residents to learn specific procedures and programs to implement in order to meet those needs and support the Virginia Literacy Act (VLA) guidelines.

Goals

The first goal of the program is to provide in-depth, realistic experiences with diverse learner needs and all phases of the school year for each resident, which will strengthen their competency and confidence upon program completion and significantly reduce first year teacher anxiety and burnout that leads to high turnover in the first three years of the profession.

The second goal of the program is to ensure residents build skills under the continuous guidance of a proven practitioner. Mentor teachers selected by the district have clearly demonstrated the ability to create supportive and engaging classroom environments by setting high expectations, building strong relationships with students, effectively managing the classroom through empathetic and respectful approaches, and employing creative, engaging instructional strategies that meet the needs of a diverse student population.

The third goal is strengthening the connection between theory and practice. The university strives to make learning relevant and immediate by focusing coursework on the specific context and needs of the district's student population, which requires an emphasis on culturally responsive teaching, fair and effective assessment approaches, and trauma-informed practices.

The fourth goal is to create a critical support network that eliminates isolation, which research has shown as a primary factor in attrition for new teachers in challenging environments.

The overall goal of the program is for 80% of program participants to become fully certified classroom teachers that will remain with the district for more than three years.

Objectives

The objectives of the Norfolk State University Portsmouth Public Schools Teacher Residency Program fall into three distinct categories: school division and university recruitment and retention, candidate skill development, and impact on P-12 students and schools.

a. Recruitment and Retention

	Mid- term update	Final update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1 is to achieve an annual placement rate of 80% of program graduates into teaching positions within Portsmouth Public Schools, specifically targeting high-need areas such as special education and early learning literacy. 	Three candidates were selected by the university and school division to participate in the teacher residency program. All 3 candidates were selected, but only two accepted the offers and served as instructional assistants and student teachers during the school year from August 2025-May 2026.	Both candidates (2/2=100%) were offered early contracts for full time teaching positions by the school division in February 2025. Both candidates accepted the teaching contracts, and serve as full-time special education teachers for the school division effective August 2026.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2 is to achieve a retention rate of 85% or more for program graduates within the school 	N/A	This will not be able to be measured until 2028.

division after three years of service.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 3 is to recruit at least 20% of the residents from local talent pools, such as current Portsmouth Public School instructional assistants, non-teaching school employees, graduates of local high schools, and residents that are graduates of community colleges. 	This first year supported the 2 NSU students who were special education teaching majors. Both teacher residents who applied for the program were accepted.	Three candidates have been selected and hired for the upcoming school year (2026-27). (2 general ed. majors and 1 special ed. major)

b. Skill Development

	Mid-term update	Final update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 4 is to ensure that 100% of program completers meet or exceed performance standards on the university and district performance evaluation assessment instruments. 	Both residents (2/2 = 100%) met expectations on university and district mid-year performance evaluation assessment instruments.	Both residents (2/2 = 100%) met expectations on university and district mid-year performance evaluation assessment instruments.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 5 is 100% of the residents will demonstrate mastery of culturally responsive teaching practices by scoring at meets expectations or exceeds expectations levels on university and 	Both residents (2/2 = 100%) met expectations of delivering culturally responsive teaching, according to the university and district performance evaluation assessment tools.	Both residents (2/2 = 100%) met expectations of delivering culturally responsive teaching, according to the university and district performance evaluation assessment tools.

district performance evaluation assessment instruments.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 6 is 100% of residents will consistently lead class discussions, interpret student data, and provide specific feedback as evidenced by the observation data provided by the mentor teachers and university supervisors. 	<p>During quarter 1, neither resident had consistently lead class discussions or interpreted student data to provide specific feedback. (0/2= 0%)</p> <p>By the end of Quarter 2 and throughout quarters 3 and 4 , both residents had. (2/2= 100%)</p>	<p>By the end of Quarter 2 and throughout quarters 3 and 4 , both residents had. (2/2= 100%)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 7 is 100% of the residents will demonstrate proficiency in the use of formative and summative student assessment data to modify lesson plans and differentiate instruction as evidenced by resident reflections, lesson plan modifications, mentor teacher and university supervisor observation data, and university and district performance evaluation assessment instruments. 	<p>During quarter 1, neither resident consistently demonstrated proficiency in the use of student assessment data to modify lesson plans and differentiate instruction. (0/2= 0%)</p> <p>By the end of Quarter 2 and throughout quarters 3 and 4, both residents had. (2/2= 100%)</p>	<p>By the end of Quarter 2 and throughout quarters 3 and 4, both residents had. (2/2= 100%)</p>

c. Impact

	Mid-term update	Final update
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 8 is program completers will demonstrate their students achieve comparable or superior academic growth relative to the students of veteran teachers in similar schools and grade levels. 	n/a	This will be evaluated next year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 9 is the leadership and coaching skills of mentor teachers will be enhanced, leading to increased job satisfaction, retention, and formal placement into district leadership roles. Thus, strengthening mentor teacher capacity. 	Each teacher mentor (100%) participated in the mentorship program and attended the training sessions on how to be a good mentor, how to support beginning teachers, and how to coach using student-centered coaching cycles. Each mentor is seen as a teacher leader and provides enhanced coaching techniques as trained.	Each teacher mentor (100%) participated in the mentorship program and attended the training sessions on how to be a good mentor, how to support beginning teachers, and how to coach using student-centered coaching cycles. Each mentor is seen as a teacher leader and provides enhanced coaching techniques as trained.

Outcomes

The overall outcome of a successful teacher residency program is to address the local, state, and national teacher shortages. The overall goal of this program is to address the chronic issues of high turnover and staffing shortages in hard-to-staff schools. Specifically, the Norfolk State University Portsmouth Public Schools Teacher Residency Program is a path to systemic improvement in retention, staffing, and turnover reduction. Graduates of teacher residency programs have a significantly higher rate of remaining in a partner school division than educators prepared through a more traditional route. Also, the residency program creates a consistent pipeline of highly qualified educators to fill positions in high-need areas such as special education and Title I schools. Additionally, there is a cost saving benefit to a residency program because of the savings associated with lower costs associated with recruitment and retention.

While there are ample benefits for the school division, the outcomes for the residents participating in and completing the program are significant as well. Typically, graduates of a residency program reach the level of highly effective on the district’s formal teacher evaluation system at a higher rate than non-residency teacher preparation program graduates. Due to the unique structure of a teacher residency program, graduates are more likely to demonstrate mastery of high-leverage teaching practices, such as culturally responsive pedagogy, differentiated instruction, and effective classroom management in diverse settings. Among graduates of a residency program, there is a higher sense of self-efficacy and preparedness to meet the needs of a diverse student population when compared to their peers. The induction and mentorship built into the program following the residency year is another benefit to the graduates, which enables them to continue their commitment to professional growth.

The outcomes for the school division and program graduates have a direct, positive impact on student learning. Teacher residency graduates enter the classroom with a level of competency and competence that has been built over an entire year, which enables students taught by residents to achieve comparable academic growth seen by students in effective veteran teachers’ classrooms. The mentor teachers involved with the residency program strengthen their coaching and leadership skills, which leads to a school and/or district-level leadership roles.

2. Teacher Resident Selection

Recruitment

The selection of residents to participate in the program is a collaborative effort between Portsmouth Public Schools and Norfolk State University that ensures the academic rigor of the university and the alignment of the mission of the school district. As partners in this endeavor, the first step is recruitment of candidates in the elementary and special education educator preparation programs. At the university, members of the teacher residency team visit the classrooms of teacher candidates in the undergraduate elementary and special education programs that are about to enter their senior year. Information about the teacher residency program is shared and interested students have an opportunity to ask questions during this time and schedule appointments with members of the team for a more in-depth discussion. Within the school district, current district employees such as instructional assistants and district employees with bachelor’s degrees performing non-teaching duties but have an interest in becoming teachers are invited to attend information sessions with district and university personnel present to answer questions, identify best pathways, provide timelines for completion, and assist with the application process.

Mid-term update:	Final update:
<p>The university and school division collaborated to create an information presentation in April 2025. The university shared the information with education majors preparing to embark on their student teaching experience.</p> <p>Three candidates were selected by the</p>	<p>Three candidates were selected for the 2026-27 school year and hired by the end of May, 2026.</p> <p>The division candidate that was being considered for the program did not have enough college credits yet to qualify as a senior, so will have to wait until the following</p>

<p>university and school division to participate in the teacher residency program. All 3 candidates were selected, but only 2 accepted the offers ($\frac{2}{3} = 75\%$) and served as instructional assistants and student teachers during the school year from August 2025-May 2026.</p> <p>The university and division wish to increase the number of candidates for the program to 6, but need to obtain funds to assist the candidates with tuition in order to do so. Due to this current limitation, the school division did not extend the opportunity to current district employees as originally planned.</p>	<p>year to participate.</p> <p>We hoped to have a total of 6 candidates but only 2 qualified for the program. We want to expand this program next school year.</p>
--	--

Requirements

The requirements for teacher preparation program candidates include a minimum overall 2.75 GPA with a preference for a 3.0 GPA or better in the core courses of the program. Candidates must have completed a minimum of 30 credits in the subject area in which they plan to teach, which must include the successful completion of the classroom and behavior management, teaching literacy, and educational technology courses. For interested school district employees there are a few pathways to consider. If the individual possesses a bachelor's degree with a minimum 3.0 GPA, they can be admitted to a Master of Arts in Teaching program. If the district employee does not possess a bachelor's degree, guidance is provided so that the employee can elect to complete an associate's degree in education through a community college and transfer into a bachelor's degree teacher preparation program at Norfolk State University. Like the university candidates, the district employees can only begin the teacher residency once they have successfully completed the classroom and behavior management, literacy, and technology courses. All candidates considered for the residency program must have strong recommendations reflecting they possess the dispositions necessary to be effective classroom educators. These references must be provided by former professors, supervisors, or advisors.

Mid-term update:	Final update:
Both candidates met the requirements listed above. ($2/2 = 100\%$)	Both candidates met the requirements listed above. ($2/2 = 100\%$)

Selection

Selection begins with the screening and reviewing process rubric used by the university and the school district. At the university, faculty in teacher preparation programs review the applications of interested candidates. This academic screening includes a review of transcripts, GPA, required standardized test scores, recommendations, and personal statement reflecting on why they are a good fit for participation in a teacher residency program. The university identifies a pool of applicants that meet the academic and program-specific requirements. personal statement, and recommendations that highlight eligibility and good fit for the program. These applicants are recommended to the school division for placement interviews.

At the school district, the Director of School & Teacher Quality and district human resource representatives conduct the professional and mission screening process. Resumes and applications reflecting the candidate's experiences with diverse populations and their commitment to the district's mission and hard-to-staff areas are considered. Applicants that have a score at or above the predetermined threshold on both academic and mission fit move forward to the principal interviews.

The principals interview applicants that have been approved by the university. These interviews are critical for matching the skills of the residents to the specific needs and culture of a school and the mentor teacher receiving the residents. The principals will be looking for applicants that demonstrate an understanding of commitment to the community and the student population of their school.

The Director of School & Teacher Quality and the human resources representative provide a job offer for a residency slot within a specific school based upon the selection requests of the principals. These residency spots are vacant instructional assistant positions within the school district. If an applicant is requested by more than one principal, the Director of School & Teacher Quality and human resources representative will collaborate with the principals to determine residency placement. Successful applicants will receive a placement offer from the Director of School & Teacher Quality and the principal for formal acceptance. To begin the residency, a binding agreement must be signed reflecting commitment to completing the remaining degree requirements while employed as an instructional assistant and teaching in the school division upon successful completion of the residency program.

The final phase in the selection process is the pairing of successful applicants with trained mentor teachers, which requires alignment based on grade level, subject area concentration, and professional compatibility. The formal offer to participate in the residency program includes a clear outline of the tuition incentive and the coursework to be completed for degree completion as well as the district's commitment to salary and benefits as well as a post-residency service agreement.

Mid-term update:	Final update:
The university utilized the Teacher residency selection criteria rubric and sent the list of approved candidates to the school division in April.	The university utilized the Teacher residency selection criteria rubric and sent the list of approved candidates to the school division in April.

<p>The district principals interviewed the candidates in May and notified the human resource department of their requests to hire. Upon hire in August, candidates were paired with a mentor teacher and provided information on the upcoming training schedule.</p>	<p>The district principals interviewed the candidates in May and notified the human resource department of their requests to hire. New candidates will be paired with a mentor teacher, invited to attend the New Teacher Institute Program (Aug 10-12) and provided information on the upcoming training schedule.</p>
--	---

3. Incentives and Supports

The Norfolk State University Portsmouth Public Schools Teacher Residency Program offers a variety of incentives and support that benefit residents and mentor teachers. These incentives and support ensure that residents can successfully complete all degree and licensure requirements and exit the program as first day ready classroom teachers.

Incentives

The tuition of teacher residents is covered during the residency. This incentive equates to \$8,000 to \$10,000 per resident. Since residents are employed by the school division as instructional assistants, a major barrier for degree completion is removed by providing a salary and benefits that enable residents to support themselves during the final field experience. Residents are provided with vouchers that cover any required Praxis examinations that must be completed prior to the spring semester of the academic year. The university provides teacher residents with access to 240 Tutoring to prepare for licensure examinations. Additionally, there are Praxis bootcamp sessions in the fall and spring semesters that increase the success of teacher preparation program candidates on required licensure exams. Mentor teachers receive a stipend for the vital role they play in the success of teacher residents. Finally, the registration fees and associated costs with conference attendance for the purpose of professional development are covered through collaboration between the school division and university.

Support

The support provided to the residents and the mentors is at the heart of what makes a teacher residency program effective. Residents receive support from the mentor teacher to whom they are assigned. The mentors collaborate with the university supervisor and resident to create a gradual release plan that is utilized throughout the 36-week experience. The mentor teacher provides daily feedback highlighting strengths and areas of growth regarding instructional delivery, learner assessment, and classroom management skills. Formal and informal feedback sessions occur throughout the residency experience that allow the mentor teacher to share this feedback with the university supervisor as well as the student. The university supervisor meets with the resident to provide feedback highlighting strengths and areas for growth based upon observations conducted. University supervisors ensure residents are registered for courses needed to complete coursework required for degree completion. It is the university supervisor that serves as the liaison between the university and the school

district in scheduling the residents in courses that align with their teaching obligations in their selected schools. The Director of School & Teacher Quality ensures every resident participates in the district's mentor program and its associated professional development offerings, which is a part of the retention initiatives supported by the district. Teacher mentors are provided with ongoing professional development through the collaborative efforts of the university and the school divisions. This professional development focuses on the art of coaching, effective mentorship, and building leadership capacity.

Mid-term update:	Final update:
<p>Upon hire in August, candidates were paired with a mentor teacher and provided information on the upcoming training schedule. Mentors worked daily with the candidates.</p> <p>Candidates were invited to attend the New Teacher Institute in August.</p> <p>Monthly professional learning sessions were provided by the teacher quality specialists (after school) specifically for new teachers to address challenges new teachers face.</p> <p>Monthly training was provided by the special education coordinator (during school hours during planning periods) specifically on topics pertaining to special education.</p> <p>The university provided ongoing training and coursework as well. If any scheduling conflicts arose the university and district contacts cooperated and made arrangements to accommodate the candidates.</p>	<p>Monthly professional learning sessions were provided by the teacher quality specialists (after school) specifically for new teachers to address challenges new teachers face.</p> <p>Monthly training was provided by the special education coordinator (during school hours during planning periods) specifically on topics pertaining to special education.</p> <p>The candidates attended an additional summer training on Kagan's student engagement strategies on June 30th.</p>

4. Partnerships and Employment Agreement

The preparation of highly effective new teachers through a well-structured teacher residency program requires a strong core team that is responsible for the planning and implementation of the program.

Description of Partner Roles and Responsibilities

Norfolk State University (IHE) will:

- Collect and manage data for programmatic evaluation from both the university and district. This data will be qualitative and quantitative in nature to include surveys, observation notes, audio/video recordings, focus groups, interviews, test scores, rubrics, etc.
- Make available appropriate personnel for residency responsibilities.

- Adhere to state and national teacher education reporting requirements, i.e. CAEP, VDOE, SCHEV.
- Provide tuition assistance.
- Provide and distribute mentor teacher stipends.
- Recruit residents according to the recruitment plan, using strategies to identify diverse candidates.
- Collaborate with the faculty to provide flexibility in completing required course offerings.

Portsmouth Public Schools District will:

- Provide and distribute resident salaries.
- Work to identify and recruit current employees that may be potential candidates to serve as mentors.
- Provide a new teacher institute over a period of 3 days before the residents begin to help them set up their areas, establish routines and procedures, as well as become familiar with the district curriculum.
- Hold monthly PD sessions to provide training in areas of need, requested by the residents or their mentors.
- Provide intentional training for mentors, using the researched based mentorship program, “Supporting Beginning Teachers” through in-person professional development sessions throughout the school year.
- Provide support to the mentors by conducting classroom visits and arranging professional learning opportunities according to identified needs.
- Provide support to the mentors and residents by training the mentors to hold intentional coaching conversations and peer coaching sessions to provide specific support to the residents.
- Mentors and Teacher Quality Specialists provide job embedded training to the residents as they work with them in the classroom, lead PLCs and connect them to resources, strategies, and practices.
- The Director of School & Teacher Quality in Portsmouth Public Schools serves as the contact person for Norfolk State University and communicates regularly with the Dean and University Supervisors, as well as PPS Teacher Quality Specialists, Mentors, and Residents to address any needs that arise and provide support.
- Collaborate with Norfolk State University to enable residents and mentors to participate in program requirements during scheduled work hours, i.e. coursework, professional development, etc.
- Assist in the collection and analysis of data for programmatic evaluation.

Both parties will:

- Maintain regular communication with all parties involved to bridge gaps, address concerns and build success.
- Engage with community partners who can provide input into residency decision-making processes. (SOE Advisory Board, Secondary Education Advisory Team (SEAT), and Council for Teacher Education (CTE).
- Provide working space for residency staff, as needed.
- Assume responsibility for residency overhead costs including staffing, space, materials, and digital presence.

- Provide and distribute salary/stipends to residency staff.

School principals who already have a strong mentorship program in their building volunteer to work with teacher residents. They support the Portsmouth Public Schools Bridge to Success Mentorship Program and collaborate each month with the Teacher Quality Specialists to hold intentional training at the new teacher meetings. They also provide ongoing feedback and support to the residents and mentors. Mentors are veteran teachers who volunteer to serve in such a capacity and are paired with residents according to their skills, similar subjects taught, strengths, and abilities. Personalities are taken into account to ensure pairings are comfortable and productive, and planning time is provided. Both parties are aware that if at any time a situation arises which may impede progress, the teacher quality specialists and/or principal may lend additional support, and if necessary, a change in mentorship can occur if needed, at which time the university supervisor and PPS Director of School & Teacher Quality would arrange and support a transition.

During this 36-week Teacher Residency Program residents are provided with intensive mentorship from experienced educators dedicated to their success and allow the resident to be immersed in a real-world classroom experience from day one. Residents will gain the practical expertise needed to be a phenomenal success in the classroom while earning their degree and teacher certification. Mentors have a direct impact on the next generation of classroom educators. Each mentor shares their expertise, which in turn reignites enthusiasm for teaching, provides motivation to explore new approaches, allows collaboration with a motivated resident, cultivates valuable leadership experience, and enables a substantial contribution to the future of education. For school leaders, the residency program allows them to identify and develop promising school educators within their own school setting and provides a first look at potential new hires. School leaders play an instrumental role in building a teacher pipeline of individuals familiar with a leader's student population, school culture, and school community. specially trained mentor teachers that utilize innovative coaching models to provide the support residents need. Therefore, the partnership between the school district and university needs to reflect a commitment to establishing a multi-tiered system of incentives and professional recognition that compensates the mentor teachers for their dedication and expertise. A financial stipend will be provided to each mentor teacher that is paid jointly by the university and the school district.

Gradual Release Approach

This teacher residency program provides a full year of clinical preparation for candidates in an elementary or special education program. A gradual release schedule will be utilized to optimize this experience over a 36-week period:

- Observe classroom management techniques, instructional delivery practices, assessment methods, and community relation approaches
- Analysis of lesson plans and assessment instruments followed by discussion with the mentor teacher
- Development of lesson plans to be implemented through a co-teaching approach with the mentor
- Provide instruction to a small group of students
- Implement resident developed lessons with limited guidance from the mentor

Co-Teaching Model

The NSU/PPS Teacher Residency Program utilizes a co-teaching model designed to provide residents with an immersive, scaffolded, and collaborative learning experience. Our co-teaching approach emphasizes shared planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection, promoting a true partnership in the classroom.

Core Principles of Our Co-Teaching Model:

- **Shared Ownership:** Both the mentor teacher and the resident are responsible for promoting a positive learning environment that fosters learning.
- **Collaborative Planning:** Joint planning sessions are central to aligning instruction, differentiating student needs, and integrating the resident's learning goals.
- **Varied Co-Teaching Approaches:** The mentor teacher and resident will strategically employ different co-teaching strategies (e.g., One Teach, One Observe; One Teach, One Assist; Station Teaching; Parallel Teaching; Alternative Teaching; Team Teaching) based on lesson objectives, student needs, and the resident's developmental stage.
- **Formative Feedback and Reflection:** Continuous constructive feedback and reflective dialogue are the cornerstone of the teacher residency model as they are critical to the resident's growth.
- **Gradual Release of Responsibility:** The resident's instructional responsibilities will progressively increase throughout the residency year. A detailed gradual release plan is provided.

Mid-term update:	Final update:
<p>Partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The university and district contacts maintain regular communication with all parties involved to bridge gaps, address concerns and build success. Collaborative meetings were held: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February& March- Residency development ○ April- Handbook development ○ May- Holistic support ○ June- Mentor training ○ July- Residency Launch plan ○ Aug- resident/mentor orientation meeting ● The university sought community partners to provide input into residency decision-making processes and held meetings (SOE Advisory Board, Secondary Education Advisory Team (SEAT), and Council for Teacher Education (CTE). The 	<p>No change since the Mid-term update.</p>

<p>district contact participated in those bi-monthly meetings by serving on the SOE Advisory Board.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The university sought community partners to provide tuition assistance to the residents. • The district assumed responsibility of paying the teacher residents a salary during their participation. The university assumed responsibility of paying for residency overhead costs including staffing, space, materials, and digital presence. • The district assumed the responsibility of training the mentors and new teachers. • The district provided and distributed a salary to each resident throughout the school year. (Once the GAN for this grant was awarded on April 29th, the stipends will be distributed by the end of May and reported on our Final update report.) <p>Gradual release & co-teaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During quarter 1 neither of these practices were evident. Training was provided and evidence increased during quarter 2. The candidates were willing to become more independent but when they switched assignments in quarter 3, the cooperating teachers treated the process as if the candidates were “Just starting” and took a little time to get back to where these practices were strong. During quarter 4 this was very evident again. 	
---	--

Expectations for Residents

This experience is guided by the standards of the **Interstate Teacher Assessment Support Consortium (InTASC)**, the **Virginia Department of Education Standards (VDOE)**, and the **Council for the Accreditation of Education Preparation (CAEP)**.

InTASC Standards

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) is a consortium of state education agencies and national educational organizations dedicated to the reform, preparation, licensing, and on-going professional development of teachers. The **InTASC Standards** are composed of 10 standards with multiple indicators that review the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected of teachers. Residents focus on these 10 InTASC standards throughout the entire student teaching experience.

VDOE Standards

The VDOE uniform performance standards include seven standards. Within each of the seven standards there are key elements that describe the knowledge that teachers should possess, and actions required to advance student learning. Together these seven standards represent the scope and complexity of teaching and note learners' outcomes within school divisions. The residency requires candidates to address these standards throughout the student teaching experience in conjunction with the InTASC standards.

Upon completing the Teacher Residency Experience, participants are expected to be able to effectively demonstrate competency with each InTASC and VDOE standard. Employment as a classroom educator within the school division is contingent upon the successful completion of the program as evidenced by meeting or exceeding performance standards on the university and district performance evaluation assessment instruments, which are aligned with InTASC, VDOE, and CAEP standards. With a satisfactory performance evaluation, the candidate may be offered an early contract for a teaching position, and the year served in the residency program will be factored in when considering the experience and determining the salary. The school system would like a commitment from the teachers to remain in the school division for a minimum of three years.

Mid-term update:	Final update:
<p>Both students met the expectations as evident in the university supervisor's visits, reports from Cooperating Teachers, video submissions, other assignment submissions, and participation in the university supervisor's meetings and seminars. (2/2 = 100%)</p> <p>The district utilizes the VDOE performance standards when evaluating teacher performance. By quarter 3, both candidates met expectations. (2/2 = 100%)</p>	<p>Both met the criteria with satisfactory performance.</p>

5. Evaluation and Accountability

The collaboration between Portsmouth Public Schools and Norfolk State University is vital to the evaluation of the residency program. The program evaluation committee will consider university teacher residency team, the Director of School & Teacher Quality, and a district human resource representative. Quarterly meetings to review process data will be held. These meetings will focus on recruitment, course completion, and mentor feedback. The program evaluation committee will also compile an annual report that details the results against the stated goals. This report is shared with the district superintendent, the university dean, and the School of Education Advisory Board.

Program Goal	Key Evaluation Metric	Data Source	Frequency	Responsible Party	Final update:
80% of program graduates placed in teaching positions	Percentage of program completers hired by the district	HR Records	Annually	School District	2/2 100% were placed in teaching positions
85% of program graduates will be retained in the division for a minimum of 3 years	Percentage of graduates still employed by the division since the start of their 4 th year post-residency	HR Records	Annually (tracking 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year milestones)	School District	n/a this year
20% of program participants will be from local talent pools	Percentage of residents from identified talent pools	Program application records, employment data, and self-identification data	Annually (by cohort enrollment)	University School District	2/2 0 too small of a group size this year
100% program completers meet or exceed performance standards	Percentage of residents scoring meets or exceeds expectations on university and district assessment tools	university and district performance evaluation assessment instruments	Annually	University Supervisors Mentor Teachers	2/2 100%

				District Administrators	
100% of the residents will demonstrate mastery of culturally responsive teaching practices	Percentage of residents scoring meets or exceeds expectations on university and district assessment tools	university and district performance evaluation assessment instruments	Annually	University Supervisors Mentor Teachers District Administrators	2/2 100%
100% of residents will consistently lead class discussions, interpret student data, and provide specific feedback	Percentage of residents observed engaged in leading discussions, data interpretation, and feedback	observation data	Monthly	University Supervisors	2/2 100% when given the opportunity
100% of the residents will demonstrate proficiency in the use of formative and summative student assessment data to modify lesson plans and differentiate instruction	Percentage of residents scoring meets or exceeds expectations on university and district assessment tools	University Teacher Preparation Rubrics District Performance Evaluation Rubrics	Annually	University Supervisors Mentor Teachers District Administrators	2/2 100%
Students of program completers will achieve	Student growth measures	District student data	Annually (beginning with	School District	n/a this year

comparable or superior academic growth	Virginia SOL Scores		completion of first year)		
Mentor teacher leadership and coaching skills will be enhanced.	Satisfaction surveys	Mentor Teacher Survey Data	Annually	University	4/4 indicated so on the survey 100%
	Leadership Placement	District HR records	Biennially	School District	

Budget Narrative

Period of Award: July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026

Applying School Division / Partner EPP: Portsmouth Public Schools / Norfolk State University

Personal Services (1000)

This project included stipends and compensation for mentor teachers and professional staff who support the six teacher residents.

Six mentor teachers will receive a **\$1,000 stipend**, totaling **\$6,000**, for providing instructional coaching, classroom modeling, and ongoing support throughout the residency year. Teacher Quality Specialists (TQS) will deliver professional development on mentoring and supporting beginning teachers. Their compensation totals **\$240** (calculated at \$30/hour for two specialists over four hours). Mentor teachers will also receive **\$720** in stipends for attending the required mentor training (6 mentors × 4 hours × \$30/hour). Teacher residents will receive pay from Portsmouth Public Schools for **\$17,680**, fulfilling the ⅓ match requirement. The total cost for Personal Services is **\$6,960**, all requested as grant funding.

Employee Benefits (2000)

Employee benefits consist of FICA charges associated with the mentor and TQS stipends. FICA for mentor teachers totals **\$459**, for TQS stipends **\$18.26**, and for mentor training stipends **\$55.08**, bringing total benefits to **\$532.34**, all covered by grant funds.

Purchased/Contractual Services (3000)

To support teacher candidate preparation, Praxis assistance and professional development costs are included. Residents will receive Praxis support through the NSU Praxis Lab (**\$900**), and the grant will cover Praxis test fees for six candidates (**\$600**). Additionally, residents will participate in a web-based Kagan Structures workshop to strengthen student engagement practices, totaling

\$1,494. The total cost for Purchased/Contractual Services is **\$2,994**, all supported by grant funding.

Internal Services (4000)

No internal services are requested for this grant cycle. Total cost: **\$0**.

Other Charges (5000)

Other charges include tuition-related stipends, conference-related mileage, and travel necessary for supervision and support.

Residents will receive tuition stipends calculated as follows: a \$500 stipend reduced by a 35% grant-applied portion (\$175), resulting in **\$325 per credit hour**. For 9 credit hours for 6 residents, the tuition cost totals **\$17,550**.

Residents will receive **\$193.20** in mileage reimbursements to attend the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) conference. The CEC conference is held locally, so mileage will be needed, but lodging will not. Also, Paraeducators get to attend for free, so there will not be a registration fee. Teacher Quality Specialists will receive **\$294** for travel to visit residents across six schools over ten months. The University Supervisor will receive **\$588** for required visits to residents during their placements. The total Other Charges cost is **\$17,743.20** (grant funded), with the school division and EPP providing in-kind travel support as noted.

Materials and Supplies (6000)

Residents and mentors will receive instructional materials to support professional development and classroom implementation. This includes the Kagan Structures book (**\$234**) and various classroom and PD supplies (dry erase boards, clipboards, timers, paper, and binders) totaling **\$490**. The total cost for Materials and Supplies is **\$724**, requested through grant funds.

Overall Summary

This budget supports a comprehensive teacher residency model through mentor stipends, training, resident coursework support, Praxis preparation, professional learning, supervision travel, and essential instructional materials. Grant funds primarily cover personnel stipends, tuition support, training, testing fees, and materials, while the school division and university provide in-kind support through travel and supervision.

APPENDIX C: VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY REPORT

VDOE Teacher Residency Grant Program Year: July 1, 2025 - June 30, 2026 (FY2026)

Name of Public Virginia Higher Education Institution: Virginia Commonwealth University

Partners: Robins Foundation, Cameron Foundation, The Community Foundation, R.E.B. Foundation, National Center for Teacher Residencies

Participating School Divisions: Richmond Public Schools, Petersburg City Public Schools , Henrico County Public Schools, Chesterfield County Public Schools, Prince William County Public Schools, Caroline County Public Schools, Charles City County Public Schools, Culpeper County Public Schools, Fairfax County Public Schools, Hanover County Public Schools, Madison County Public Schools, Surry County Public Schools, Sussex County Public Schools, Washington County Public Schools, and Waynesboro Public Schools

Name of Grant Director: Kim McKnight, PhD

Title: Director, Center for Teacher Leadership at the VCU School of Education & RTR Executive Director

Mailing Address: VCU Center for Teacher Leadership, School of Education, Box 842020, Richmond, VA 23284-2020

City, State, Zip Code: Richmond, VA 23284

Telephone Number: 804-512-6298 (c)

Email Address: mcknightkw@vcu.edu

DETAILED PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

RTR Teacher Residency is an intensive, school-based teacher preparation model guided by the National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR) Seven Principles of Teaching Residencies. These principles were derived from the literature on developing and retaining effective teachers in high-needs schools and form the basis of the theoretical model that guides the RTR program (Berry, Montgomery, & Snyder, 2008). The seven principles are: (1) Tightly weave education theory and classroom practice together; (2) Focus on learning alongside an experienced, effective mentor; (3) Group teacher candidates in cohorts; (4) Build constructive partnerships with districts, schools, communities, universities, and unions; (5) Serve school districts; (6) Support residents once they are hired as teachers of record; and (7) Establish and support differentiated career roles for veteran teachers.

RTR combines the best of traditional and alternative route teacher preparation programs, ensuring that outstanding candidates are well-prepared to make a positive impact on student learning on their very first day as teachers of record. The RTR teacher preparation model combines the NCTR residency principles with New Teacher Center (NTC) mentoring support for both residents and graduates. The NTC mentoring model was originally designed as induction support for beginning teachers. RTR has adapted it for pre-service teachers, providing an exceptional approach to preparing and supporting effective teachers. The NTC support throughout the residents' preparation and early teaching careers is central to the RTR model. Specifically, the **RTR/NTC program components include:**

- **Targeted recruitment and selection of residents aligned with school division needs:** Candidates are accepted into RTR based on a rigorous selection process that includes:
 - (1) a review of academic transcripts to ensure an appropriate academic major/prerequisite courses and a 3.0 GPA;
 - (2) submission of an application with open-ended reflection questions;
 - (3) three recommendations, including a supervisor/building administrator and colleagues;
 - (4) a statement of intent detailing how the RTR Teacher Residency program will help the applicant achieve their personal and career aspirations;
 - (5) an interview conducted by VCU / RTR members and school division professionals; and
 - (6) teaching a 5-minute lesson during the interview.
- **An intensive medical-style residency in which residents co-teach alongside a mentor teacher for an entire year.** The residency year begins on the first day that teachers report to work and ends on the last day of school, allowing residents to scaffold their learning through an extended period of well-supervised clinical practice guided by both university faculty and master mentor teachers. This year-long integration of theory and practice is distinct from traditional programs in which classroom-based practicums typically start halfway into the program.

- **A rigorous selection process and training for mentor teachers** that includes submission of an application containing multiple reflection questions, submission of a teaching video, participation in an interview, four full days of NTC mentor teacher training, and monthly mentor forums to enhance their coaching skills.
- **A degree from VCU's School of Education (master's degree, graduate certificate, or bachelor's degree) and monthly seminars** that integrate the theory and instructional strategies learned in coursework with the reality of high-needs classrooms. VCU faculty provide three semesters of graduate-level or six semesters of undergraduate-level coursework designed to address challenges specific to high-needs schools, using evidence-based practices as part of our teacher preparation program.
- **Post-residency support from an NTC-trained content-specific beginning teacher coach** who works with residents at least one hour per week for the first two years of their teaching career.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES:

The overarching goal of RTR is to improve student achievement in low-performing schools by recruiting, preparing, and supporting the retention of extraordinary, inspiring teachers and teacher leaders. Our expected outcomes are well-prepared and highly effective teachers who remain in high-needs schools and contribute positively to student achievement. In order to achieve our goals and objectives, RTR:

- Recruits talented, passionate teacher candidates who are committed to becoming career teachers in high-needs settings to address the most critical staffing needs of our most challenged schools and school divisions.
- Prepare teacher candidates in a research-based preparation program based on the NCTR Seven Principles of Teacher Residencies.
- Supports teacher candidates and graduates in the research-based NTC mentoring model that has been proven effective in improving student achievement for those teachers supported through this data-driven approach to mentoring.
- Retains highly effective teachers and teacher leaders through providing high-quality preparation, professional development, and differentiated career roles.

PARTNERSHIP(S):

RTR began as a partnership between Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) and Richmond Public Schools (RPS) to recruit, prepare, support, and retain highly effective teachers and teacher leaders who are committed to the students of RPS for the long-term.

Originally funded in 2010 through a \$5.8 million Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant from the U.S. Department of Education, RTR has since expanded to other divisions across the state. In 2017-18, RTR expanded beyond RPS, conducting a small foundation-funded pilot at Ettrick Elementary School in Chesterfield County Public Schools, which then expanded to include other high-needs schools in Chesterfield. From there, the program expanded to Petersburg City Public Schools and high-needs schools in Henrico County Public Schools. During the 2022-23 school year, we piloted a partnership with Prince William County Public Schools. This allowed us to see how the model could be implemented through a primarily virtual environment. The success of the pilot year led to further expansion of the Prince William partnership for the 2023-24 school year as well as the development of new partnerships with additional school divisions across the state. As we look toward the upcoming 2026-27 school year, we are continuing our partnership with numerous school divisions: Richmond City, Chesterfield County, Henrico County, Petersburg City, Prince William County, Brunswick County, Caroline County, Charles City County, Culpeper County, Dinwiddie County, Essex

County, Fairfax County, Hanover County, Hopewell City, King George County, Madison County, Norfolk City, Orange County, Prince George County, Roanoke City, Southampton County, Stafford County, Surry County, Sussex County, Waynesboro City, and Washington County.

One important component of our partnerships is the regular meetings we hold. Two such partnership meetings are the Advisory Board and Working Subgroup meetings. RTR Advisory Board meetings occur once per semester and include representatives from each partner school division as well as VCU. Representatives are individuals who hold decision-making power (e.g., school division superintendents, the School of Education dean); the purpose of the meetings varies, but often includes activities such as:

- Reviewing and revising the mission and purpose of RTR;
- Reviewing and revising RTR goals and objectives;
- Ensuring effective planning, monitoring, and strengthening of RTR;
- Setting program priorities;
- Providing K-12 educator and community input;
- Assisting in securing funding;
- Contributing to improvement plans; and
- Disseminating information to various stakeholder groups after the meetings.

The RTR Working Subgroup, composed of RTR staff members and school division representatives (e.g., human resources and professional learning representatives), meets bi-monthly. These meetings are to follow through on the plans set forth by the Advisory Council as well as maintain an ongoing discussion of current events in the residency program. Through these bi-monthly meetings, decisions impacting the experience of the current cohort of residents are made. Every other month,

individual meetings are held with school divisions to address topics specific to the division and provide updates on residents and graduates in the division.

In addition to meeting regularly to plan and implement RTR programmatic changes, partner divisions have agreed to provide RTR access to data for research and evaluation activities and have committed significant funding to sustain the program.

Each partner division has agreed to pay the costs of:

- Mentor stipends
- NTC training and the monthly mentor forums
- Beginning Teacher Coaches

In addition to the strong partnerships with the local school divisions, RTR benefits from the support of various community stakeholders. Support from these community partners includes:

- The Greater Richmond Chamber Foundation funding to increase social media presence;
- Venture Richmond funding free hotel rooms for out-of-town candidates who attend in-person events;
- Main Street Realty funding a fully-equipped seminar room for classes and events; and
- The Valentine Museum hosts a yearly RTR reception.

Additionally, since 2016, RTR has received funding from the Robins Foundation, Altria, and The Community Foundation. The Cameron Foundation provided funding for the 2017-2018 RTR pilot at Ettrick Elementary School in Chesterfield County Public Schools. Cameron, Robins, and The Community Foundation have committed to additional support for RTR in Petersburg City, contingent on continued state and Petersburg investments.

These strong partnerships have allowed RTR to grow over the years, enabling us to prepare more teachers to work in high-needs schools. Starting with 9 residents preparing to be English, math, science, and social studies teachers, we expanded to special education in 2014 and elementary education in 2017. In 2019, we piloted a Graduate Certificate in elementary education for those who did not qualify for the Master of Teaching (M.T.) program in elementary education but did have enough content courses to be licensed to teach elementary education. In 2020-2021 RTR successfully worked with our division partners to create an RTR track just for Instructional Assistants (IAs) that allows them to remain on the payroll in their school division and still complete the program within four semesters. This pilot has evolved to divisions creating paid Teacher Resident positions; whereas IAs had to complete their job duties half of each day and residency tasks the other half, those employed as Teacher Residents are able to spend the full day with their mentor, gradually taking on more

teaching responsibility while continuing to earn a salary. By August 2026 the Cohort 15 program graduates will be successfully hired by their school divisions, bringing **the total number of residents RTR has prepared to work in high-needs schools to 457**. To support these residents as they learn to teach, **RTR has also provided professional development to more than 400 in-service teachers serving as mentors**.

INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS:

Structure of the Program

RTR graduate-level residents co-teach full-time in our partner school divisions Monday through Thursday for an entire school year and are enrolled as full time students in VCU graduate coursework. Undergraduate-level residents co-teach full-time in our partner school divisions Tuesday through Thursday throughout the first year and Monday through Thursday throughout the second year and are enrolled as full time students in VCU's undergraduate coursework. Given the intensity of their ongoing teaching responsibilities, ongoing instructional planning and preparation, and full-time VCU coursework, RTR residents are unable to work part-time. For this reason, we requested in our FY26 residency proposal a \$23,000 stipend per resident to help offset the cost of living while they participate in the program. Additionally, the VCU School of Education offers a special RTR tuition rate that is 80% of in-state tuition for all residents.

In addition to these financial incentives, a critical component of RTR support is the approach we use in providing wrap-around services for our residents. The RTR Recruitment Coordinator and Admissions Specialist serve as ombudsmen helping residents navigate the complicated application process with both RTR and VCU and any issues that arise with the Office of Financial Aid and Student Accounting once residents are accepted into the program.

Each RTR resident receives the support of an academic advisor. The academic advisor meets with residents, SOE faculty, and RTR staff regularly to ensure that everyone is kept informed of residents' academic progress. The academic advisor:

- Ensures residents meet all VCU graduation requirements;
- Monitors the residents' attendance and performance in VCU coursework; and
- Addresses any concerns raised by residents regarding VCU coursework or expectations.

The most critical support RTR provides residents is the mentors who support them throughout the residency year. Mentors are selected through a careful screening process that includes: (1) a written application with recommendations from administrators; (2) evidence of student learning gains and collaboration with colleagues to improve instruction; (3) strong

content knowledge and pedagogical skills; (4) submission of a 30-minute teaching video; and (5) an interview to determine the extent to which the teacher is a reflective practitioner.

In addition to the mentors, RTR residency coordinators support the mentor/resident partnership in the schools. The residency coordinators:

- Serve as a liaison between school sites and the Center for Teacher Leadership to monitor the implementation of the RTR Program;
- Conduct monthly coaching sessions with the mentor to:
 - support the use of the NTC formative assessment tools;
 - assist the mentor in meeting the developmental needs of the resident; and
 - address challenges that may arise between the mentor/resident partnership.
- Conduct regular observations and/or formal/informal site visits at least once a month (more if needed),
 - to monitor the implementation of the RTR model (Gradual Release Calendar and NTC coaching tools);
 - growth of the resident; and
 - effectiveness of the resident/mentor partnership.
- Conduct monthly mentor forums to enhance the coaching skills of the mentors;
- Address any concerns raised by residents, mentors, or the principal at the school site; and
- Troubleshoot problems as they arise in the schools.

This careful monitoring of a resident's performance and the program's effectiveness enables RTR to be responsive to the needs of both the residents and our school division partners in a timely and ongoing manner. Lead residency coordinators also collaborate with SOE faculty to develop coursework and assignments that address the unique challenges of teaching in high-needs schools and align with the residency experience.

Once hired as teachers of record, RTR graduates also receive one-on-one coaching for at least one hour a week from a highly-skilled, content-specific new teacher coach who has been carefully selected and trained to observe instruction and student learning, to collect observation data, and to assist in the delivery of instruction. This strong induction support is a critical component of RTR because research shows that the most effective teachers leave urban school systems within the first two years (Barnes, Crowe & Schaefer, 2007; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 2003; National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 2007). The beginning teacher coach focuses on formative assessment using the same NTC mentoring model and tools that are used by the mentors, providing strong, consistent continuity of support from the residency year through the first two critical years of teaching. This ongoing process of data collection and analysis informs both the

mentor's and the beginning teacher's next steps. Issues of content pedagogy, subject matter knowledge, the alignment of instruction with student content and grade level standards, student assessments, and school division curriculum initiatives drive the coach's work in response to the beginning teacher's developmental needs and instructional context. Virginia Professional Teaching Standards are used to provide a clearly articulated, well-validated vision of best practice and a framework within which coaches can focus their work with beginning teachers. The language of the standards helps coaches and beginning teachers carry on instruction- and learning-focused conversations and assists beginning teachers in setting professional goals.

The cost of the staff described above that support RTR residents and graduates is shared. The academic advisor splits his time between supporting RTR residents and supporting students enrolled in traditional programs through the School of Education. NTC training for mentors and career coaches is conducted by the VCU Center for Teacher Leadership, one of only two organizations in the country licensed by NTC to conduct their training. In addition, the monthly mentor forums that both mentors and career coaches attend are conducted by the residency coordinators who are employed by VCU. The salary and fringe for RTR staff have been supported primarily by federal grants; recent cost share agreements between RTR and School of Education have supplemented staffing costs. While CTL conducts the training, the cost of the training and monthly mentor forums is covered by the school divisions for their teacher leaders. In addition, the school divisions pay the mentor stipends and the cost of new teacher coaches.

Additional Wrap-Around Supports

VCU RTR was awarded the Hawkins F. Hawkins Centers of Excellence grant, which was implemented in fiscal year 2023. This grant allows RTR to provide additional support to residents and program graduates. The creation of the Hawkins Center for Excellence enables us to have a resource hub and connector to services and opportunities throughout the university. The center is a one-stop-shop for residents when they need information on health services, financial aid, mental health care, and more. Through the center, we have begun offering affinity groups and professional networking experiences to help residents and graduates increase their collegial relationships with fellow teachers. The center also provides all residents with the opportunity to receive their ESOL endorsement to further meet the needs of the diverse student population in the schools they serve.

RTR has historically spent the majority of resources on recruitment and preparation, apart from our two-years of instructional support by new teacher coaches for all RTR grads. Based on feedback from program graduates regarding the challenges they faced as they began their teaching career, we now provide targeted support to address the challenges our program graduates face. Graduating residents attend a professional development day titled *Navigating the Life of a Real Teacher*. During this event, RTR alumni ambassadors, mentors, and other education professionals provide panel discussions and professional learning opportunities to the residents that will help them as they transition to having their own classroom. Program graduates are also paired with an alum who will help them navigate their first year through weekly 30-minute

check-in meetings, moral support, and guidance. This additional non-evaluative provides an extra resource for graduates to find answers to questions, seek guidance when challenges arise, and share things they are learning in their new role as the teacher of record.

PARTICIPANTS:

Chart A: The chart below represents Cohort 15 residents who enrolled in RTR in the 2025-2026 school year. We have listed the school division in which the resident will teach and if known, the name of the school. TBD indicates that these individuals have not yet been hired.

RTR/VCU degree programs are:

- Elementary Graduate Certificate (E.G.C.) - 27 credit hours
- Secondary Master of Teaching (M.T.) in English, Science, Math, or Social Studies - 41 credit hours
- Secondary Master of Education in Curriculum & Instruction (M.Ed.C&I) - 43 credit hours
- Special Education Graduate Certificate (S.G.C.) (also referred to as the RTR Instructional Assistant Pathway) - 31 credit hours
- Special Education Master of Education (M.Ed.) - 40 credit hours
- Elementary Bachelor of Science (E. B.S. Ed.) - 90 credit hours
- Special Education Bachelor of Science (SPED B.S. Ed.) - 75 credit hours

Name of the Resident	Area(s) of Teaching Endorsement Sought	Residency School Division	Degree Program Completed	Did the individual complete the first year of the TRP Program?	If the resident has accepted employment, please indicate the employer.	Area of Teaching Assigned
Cassia Block	Secondary Biology	Richmond	M.T.	Yes	TBD	
Linda Brown	Secondary Social Studies	Prince William	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	Prince William	Secondary Social Studies

Lindsey Counts	Secondary English	Washington	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	Washington	Secondary English
Cassandra Dallas	Secondary English	Prince William	M.T.	Yes	Prince William	Secondary English
Laurel Dent	Secondary English	Richmond	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	Richmond	Secondary English
Taylor Ford	Secondary Social Studies	Petersburg	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	TBD	Secondary Social Studies
Diana Gomez-Lopez	Elementary	Prince William	E.G.C.	Yes	Prince William	Elementary
Tyne Hudson	Special Education	Fairfax	M.Ed.	Yes	Fairfax	Special Education
Hajir Jameel	Secondary Math	Prince William	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	Prince William	Secondary Math
Maya Joyner	Elementary	Richmond	E. B.S. Ed.	Yes	Richmond	Elementary
Amanda King	Special Education	Washington	M.Ed.	Yes	Washington	Special Education

Jason Klopp	Secondary Social Studies	Fairfax	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	Fairfax	Secondary Social Studies
Caroline Lancaster	Elementary	Waynesboro	E.G.C.	Yes	Waynesboro	Elementary
Yeleni Lopez	Special Education	Fairfax	M.Ed.	Yes	Fairfax	Special Education
Jasmine Marshall	Elementary	Prince William	E.G.C.	Yes	Prince William	Elementary
Ingrid Palma	Special Education	Fairfax	M.Ed.	Yes	Fairfax	Special Education
Jessica Pierce	Secondary Science	Surry	M.Ed.C&I	Yes	Surry	Secondary Science
Samantha Ramirez	Secondary Biology	Henrico	M.T.	Yes	Henrico	Secondary Biology
Sarah Rengifo	Elementary	Prince William	E.G.C.	Yes	Prince William	Elementary
Emily Thomas	Elementary	Petersburg	E.G.C.	Yes	Petersburg	Elementary
Jamea Thompson	Elementary	Richmond	E.G.C.	Yes	Richmond	Elementary
Ray Williams	Special Education	Petersburg	M.Ed.	Yes	Petersburg	Special Education

NOTE: Seven additional residents enrolled in the program in May 2025 but did not graduate. One will rejoin the program for the spring semester and will graduate in May 2027. Two residents left the program last summer for personal reasons. Four residents were dismissed from the program due to attendance issues and/or academic underperformance. Support was provided in each of these instances, however the residents did not show improvement.

Chart B: The chart below represents Cohort16 residents. New residents were recruited during the 2025-2026 school year and began their VCU coursework in May 2026. Residents with an asterisk (*) after their name will complete the program in May 2028; all others will complete the program in May 2027.

Name of the Resident	Area(s) of Teaching Endorsement Sought	Residency School Division	School Placement for the Residency Year
Idgie Abad*	Elementary	Prince William	Dale City Elementary School
Javia Anderson	Elementary	Petersburg	TBD
Cameron Aragon	Special Education	Prince William	Lake Ridge Middle School
Yazmin Ardilla Nino	Secondary Math	Fairfax	Justice High School
Rebecca Barnabi	Secondary English	Waynesboro	Waynesboro High School
Andrew Bartley*	Elementary	Richmond	Broad Rock Elementary School
Irma Bonilla-Funes*	Elementary	Prince William	Dumfries Elementary School
Zuri Butler Cooke*	Elementary	Prince William	Occoquan Elementary School

Lucy Coogan	Elementary	Richmond	Westover Hills Elementary School
Megan Cross*	Elementary	Madison	Madison Primary School
Hannah Falls	Secondary Math	Chesterfield	Salem Church Middle School
Kiearie Fitzgerald	Secondary English	Richmond	John Marshall High School
Kylee Foreman	Secondary English	Prince William	Unity Braxton Middle School
Ainsley French*	Elementary	Chesterfield	Hening Elementary School
Emma Gray	Elementary	Petersburg	TBD
Esther Harrison	Special Education	Chesterfield	Hening Elementary School
Amber Hartman*	Special Education	Prince William	Leesylvania Elementary School
Ian Helm	Secondary Science	Richmond	Franklin Military Academy
Taylor Hinzman*	Special Education	Prince William	Mary Williams Elementary School
Anna Hucks*	Elementary	Washington	Abingdon Elementary School
Keagan James*	Elementary	Culpeper	Sycamore Park Elementary School
Marsha Joyner	Special Education	Sussex	TBD
Cansu Kaptan	Elementary	Prince William	Sinclair Elementary School

Massouda Kohistani*	Special Education	Fairfax	Poe Middle School
Nicole Kurtz*	Special Education	Henrico	Lakeside Elementary School
Emily Lima	Secondary Science	Prince William	Gar-Field High School
Katelynn McFarland*	Elementary	Culpeper	Yowell Elementary School
Asia Noor	Secondary Science	Prince William	Gar-Field High School
Marisa Phillips	Secondary Science	Hanover	Patrick Henry High School
Michaela Pines	Elementary	Richmond	J.L. Francis Elementary School
Alexandra Pino Chavez*	Special Education	Prince William	Pace West
Deanna Richards*	Special Education	Henrico	Jackson Davis Elementary School
Chris Rodriguez*	Elementary	Prince William	Bennett Elementary School
Jada Smith	Elementary	Chesterfield	Ettrick Elementary School
Amelia Steele	Elementary	Charles City	Charles City Elementary School
Seita Takanashi	Special Education	Fairfax	TBD
Jacqueline Viera-Reyes*	Elementary	Richmond	Broad Rock Elementary School
Shabnam Wahedi	Secondary Science	Henrico	Tucker High School
Emily Ward*	Elementary	Chesterfield	Ettrick Elementary School
Ciera Weathersby*	Special Education	Prince William	Vaughn Elementary School

Kelli Whited	Secondary Math	Washington	Glade Spring Middle School
Shalik Williams*	Elementary	Prince William	Leesylvania Elementary School

As of June 2026, the current cohort has a total of 43 individuals; resident demographics are:

34 Females (79%)

5 Males (11%)

2 Asian (4%)

7 Black/African American (16%)

7 Hispanic (16%)

3 Two or More Races (6%)

19 White (44%)

1 Did not disclose race (2%)

PROGRAM EVALUATION:

As part of the National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR), evaluation data is collected from program participants, and an evaluation report is presented to RTR staff. Current residents and mentors as well as program graduates and building principals (both hosts of residents and those who have hired program graduates) are surveyed. RTR utilizes this information to inform program design and practice. As a team, RTR staff members meet with the NCTR data representative to learn of the evaluation findings. RTR team members then work with the data to determine areas in which program improvements can be made. Additionally, we share the program feedback with representatives from our partner school divisions in order to maintain program transparency and as a means to solicit feedback to help us make meaningful improvements. The data collected by NCTR includes quantitative responses to Likert-type items on various program components as well as qualitative feedback through which respondents can share any information they choose. Student outcome measures are not part of this evaluation data collection.

The data show areas in which the RTR Teacher Residency program is performing well and areas in which we can make improvements. The data indicate that residents and program graduates felt prepared to be the teacher of record, and program graduates are seen as being more effective than traditionally prepared teachers. The mentor recruitment and

selection process is also viewed favorably by survey participants. The NCTR End-of-Year RTR program evaluation data is attached.

Additionally, RTR collects formative data throughout the year as well as information on program graduate retention and career accomplishments. Feedback on our partnerships was provided by school division representatives, particularly regarding our selection process. Division representatives expressed that they like how thorough the selection process is; the teaching demonstration during the interview was well received, and human resources personnel from partner divisions have asked if they can utilize some of our interview questions for their interviews of teacher candidates. Likewise, School of Education faculty and staff, as well as other university and school division partners, were asked to provide feedback on various aspects of the program from recruitment of residents through post-graduation support. The feedback we have received from partner divisions, faculty, staff, and program participants through the NCTR survey will be discussed over the summer as the RTR team engages in conversations regarding refinement of the program. Concerns and suggestions will be addressed, and stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide additional feedback on the changes we plan to implement.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS:

RTR was created to recruit and prepare teachers in high-needs schools in Richmond Public Schools. Anecdotally over the years, the program was seen as valuable to RPS and other partner school divisions. In 2020, the Center for Regional and Urban Analysis (CURA) in the L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs conducted a Benefit-Cost Analysis of Richmond Teacher Residency (RTR) Program. This report verifies what was discussed anecdotally for years and confirms the effectiveness of RTR. CURA findings include:

- **RTR-trained teachers more closely reflect the student demographics** of RPS than their non-RTR colleagues.
- **Student performance on standardized tests is generally better** in classes taught by RTR teachers compared to classes taught by non-RTR teachers in schools with similar student characteristics.
- **RTR teachers are deemed more prepared** to teach in high-needs RPS schools when they begin teaching than their traditionally prepared peers.
- **RTR teachers are less expensive to hire and cost less to replace than non-RTR teachers.** The hiring cost of an RTR teacher is \$8,020, which is less than half of a non-RTR teacher (\$17,574).
- **RTR retention rates are substantially higher in the first three years.** The ratio in the first two years is above 90%. Non-RTR first two years average retention ratio is about 70%. RTR third year retention is 82%, Non-RTR is about 52%.

The effectiveness of the RTR Teacher Residency program will benefit school divisions across Virginia as we increase our partnerships.

RTR has been fortunate to receive additional funding to support the development of a school leader residency program. With funding from the R.E.B. Foundation, we launched the school leader residency program during the 2022-23 school year. We have prepared 16 school leader residents to date, four of whom are RTR Teacher Residency graduates. School leader residency participants earn their post-master's certificate in educational leadership through VCU, attend monthly seminars to delve into topics from the Guidelines for Uniform Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria for Principals, and complete a full year in a residency experience during which they received mentoring from the school leader in their building. Throughout the residency year, they gradually take on more leadership responsibilities, satisfying the required clinical experience and developing skills and knowledge that they will be able to put into practice when they take on leadership roles. Our fourth cohort began the program in May.

Additionally, we received a congressional earmarks grant through the late Congressman Donald McEachin's office to begin an early childhood residency program. We prepared nine undergraduate residents in Richmond and Chesterfield using these funds between January 2022 and June 2024. The success of this program allowed us to move forward with the two-year undergraduate pathway for elementary and special education residents. Because those degree programs are able to be offered online, our school division partners across the state can now benefit from having residents enrolled in RTR's undergraduate pathway.

We have also received a Boundless Educator Initiative (BEI) grant from the National Center for Teacher Residencies. This grant provides additional support for residents in our program. Our residents have been able to utilize these funds to take additional courses required for teacher licensure, pay for their licensure exams, and receive emergency funding.

Over the last year, we have developed strong relationships with our new partner school divisions and have worked to strengthen our existing partner relationships. As we work with our partners to learn more about their specific division needs and the context in which the residents will be placed, we are able to develop recruitment strategies to target members of the community. We know that finding people with a vested interest in the community is key to finding individuals who will remain in the teaching profession. As we look toward the 2026-2027 school year, we have already begun conversations with our partner divisions to devise strategies to recruit a strong pool of candidates for the 2027-2028 school year.

Budget Report

The following is a breakdown of the RTR budget by state grant funds, school division cash match as well as in-kind contributions by Virginia Commonwealth University. The breakdown is aligned the VDOE preferred OMEGA code breakdown corresponding to Personal Services (1000), Employee Benefits (2000), Purchased/Contracted Services (3000), Internal Services (4000), Other Charges (5000) and Materials/Supplies (6000).

Period of Award: July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026								
Public Institution of Higher Education: VDOE 2025 RTR								
Personal Services 1000					Source of Funds			
	Description				State Grant Funds	School Division Cash Funds (At least 1/3 of the dollar cost of the	In-Kind	
Job titles of individuals whose salaries were charged to this program	Program Role	% FTE	Salary	Total charged to grant for this individual				Totals
RTR Executive Director	Oversees all aspects of RTR	90%	\$159,642	\$143,678	\$0.00		\$143,678	\$143,678
Finance Manager	Oversees all the financial	30%	\$101,193	\$30,358	\$0.00		\$30,358	\$30,358
Sr Financial Analyst)	Processes all fiscal documents; manages budget, and help with	100%	\$77,300	\$77,300	\$0.00		\$77,300	\$77,300
Education Specialist	Support the connection between research and practice for our K-	100%	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$0.00		\$75,000	\$75,000
Executive Assistant	Assisting with scheduling, organizing, prioritizing,	100%	\$55,000	\$55,000	\$0.00		\$55,000	\$55,000
RTR Recruitment Coordinator	The Recruitment Coordinator will design and implement	100%	\$60,962	\$60,962	\$0.00		\$60,962	\$60,962
RTR Admissions and Data Spec	Admission Specialist will design and implement admissions	100%	\$90,887	\$90,887	\$0.00		\$90,887	\$90,887
Program Coordinator	Support special projects and events	100%	76,296	\$76,296	\$0.00		\$76,296	\$76,296
Academic Advisor	Advising and supporting students.	50%	52,500	\$26,250	\$0.00		\$26,250	\$26,250
Assistant Director	Serve as the liaison for RTR to build and maintain collaborative	50%	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$0.00		\$50,000	\$50,000
Lead Professional Learning Coordinator	Responsible for all training related to the New Teacher Center.	100%	\$83,129	\$83,129	\$0.00		\$83,129	\$83,129
Lead Elementary & Secondary Residency Coordinator	Supports secondary resident/CRC partnerships	100%	\$83,212	\$83,212	\$0.00		\$83,212	\$83,212
RTR Lead Special Ed. & School Leader Coordinator	Supports SPED resident/CRC partnerships	100%	\$83,212	\$83,212	\$0.00		\$83,212	\$83,212
Special Ed. Residency Exp. Coordinator	Support the special education mentor-resident pairs.	100%	75,000	\$75,000	\$0.00		\$75,000	\$75,000
Financial Specialist	Responsible for all purchasing, travel arrangements and	90%	\$51,500	\$46,350	\$0.00		\$46,350	\$46,350
Total Personal Services 1000							\$1,056,634	\$1,056,634

Employee Benefits 2000				Source of Fund					
Job titles of individuals whose benefits were charged to this program	% Benefits	Salary	Total	State Grant Funds	School Division Cash Funds (At least 1/3 of the total)	In-Kind	Total		
RTR Executive Director	38.80%	\$143,678	\$55,747	\$0.00		\$55,747	\$55,747		
Finance Manager	38.80%	\$30,358	\$11,779	\$0.00		\$11,779	\$11,779		
Sr Financial Analyst)	38.80%	\$77,300	\$29,992	\$0.00		\$29,992	\$29,992		
Education Specialist	38.80%	\$75,000	\$29,100	\$0.00		\$29,100	\$29,100		
Executive Assistant	38.80%	\$55,000	\$21,340	\$0.00		\$21,340	\$21,340		
RTR Recruitment Coordinator	38.80%	\$60,962	\$23,653	\$0.00		\$23,653	\$23,653		
RTR Admissions and Data	38.80%	\$90,887	\$35,264	\$0.00		\$35,264	\$35,264		
Program Coordinator	38.80%	\$76,296	\$29,603	\$0.00		\$29,603	\$29,603		
Academic Advisor	38.80%	\$26,250	\$10,185	\$0.00		\$10,185	\$10,185		
Assistant Director	38.80%	\$50,000	\$19,400	\$0.00		\$19,400	\$19,400		
Lead Professional Learning	38.80%	\$83,129	\$32,254	\$0.00		\$32,254	\$32,254		
Lead Elementary &	38.80%	\$83,212	\$32,286	\$0.00		\$32,286	\$32,286		
RTR Lead Special Ed. &	38.80%	\$83,212	\$32,286	\$0.00		\$32,286	\$32,286		
Special Ed. Residency Exp.	38.80%	\$75,000	\$29,100	\$0.00		\$29,100	\$29,100		
Financial Specialist	38.80%	\$46,350	\$17,984	\$0.00		\$17,984	\$17,984		
				0					
Total Employee Benefits 2000						\$409,974	\$409,974		

Purchased/Contractual Services 3000	Source of Funds			
Description (Please provide detailed cost calculations.)	State Grant Funds	School Division Cash Funds (At least 1/3 of the dollar cost of the program)		
		In-Kind	Totals	
National Center for Teacher Residencies Membership Fees	\$0	\$0	\$22,000	\$22,000
New Teacher Center	\$0	\$0	\$20,100	\$20,100
		\$0		\$0
Total Purchased Contractual Services 3000	\$0	\$0	\$42,100	\$42,100
Internal Services 4000	Source of Funds			
Description (Please provide detailed cost calculations.)	State Grant	School Division Cash	In-Kind	
Totals				
RTR Evaluation	\$0	\$0	\$13,000	\$13,000
				\$0
				\$0
Total Internal Services 4000	\$0	\$0	\$13,000	\$13,000
Other Charges 5000	Source of Funds			
Description (Please provide detailed cost calculations.)	State Grant	School Division Cash	In-Kind	
Totals				
Stipends for RPS, PCPS, CCPS, HCPS,PWPS	\$1,739,000.00	\$0	\$0	\$1,739,000
Cash Match from divisions that includes mentor stipends, training, and the	\$0	\$573,870	\$0	\$573,870
Recruitment, Assessment, and Selection Costs	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Travel to NCTR and NTC conference/trainings	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$7,000
Special RTR Tuition Rate Savings for Residents (at least \$2,059*78	\$0	\$0	\$160,602	\$160,602
Total Other Charges 5000	\$1,739,000	\$573,870	\$172,602	\$2,485,472
Materials and Supplies 6000	Source of Funds			
Description (Please provide detailed cost calculations.)	Funds	School Division Cash	In-Kind	
Totals				
Project Supplies	\$0	\$0	\$8,140	\$8,140
Media Services	\$0	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000
Printing/Publication Costs	\$0	\$0	\$2,000	\$2,000
Total Materials and Supplies 6000	\$0	\$0	\$15,140	\$15,140

Budget Summary				
	State Grant Funds	School Division Cash Funds	In-Kind Funds	Total Expenditures
Personal Services (1000)	\$0.00	\$0	\$1,056,634	\$1,056,634
Employee Benefits (2000)	\$0	\$0	\$409,974	\$409,974
Purchased/Contractual Services (3000)	\$0	\$0	\$42,100	\$42,100
Internal Services (4000)	\$0	\$0	\$13,000	\$13,000
Other Charges (5000)	\$1,739,000	\$573,870	\$172,602	\$2,485,472
Material and Supplies (6000)	\$0	\$0	\$15,140	\$15,140
Totals	\$1,739,000	\$573,870	\$1,709,450	\$4,022,320

National Center for Teacher Residencies (NCTR) 2025-2026 End-of-Year Program Data For the RTR Teacher Residency Program {External Evaluation}

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Agree		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
Preparation							
At this point in the year, how prepared are you to teach next year as a teacher of record?	65	88%	12%		3.3	3.3	

How prepared do you feel to adapt a curriculum to explore opportunities for students beyond their school community?	65	88%	12%		3.3	3.2
How prepared do you feel to adapt a curriculum to reflect the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	64	88%	12%		3.3	3.3
How prepared do you feel to build, nurture, and facilitate caring, humanizing relationships with students and families?	65	94%	6%		3.6	3.6
How prepared do you feel to create a welcoming and affirming classroom environment for all students?	65	95%	5%		3.6	3.6
How prepared do you feel to demonstrate professionalism and collaborate with other teachers?	65	94%	6%		3.6	3.6
How prepared do you feel to demonstrate the content knowledge to teach subject matter?	65	89%	11%		3.2	3.3
How prepared do you feel to develop and implement consistent behavioral and academic expectations for students?	65	88%	12%		3.4	3.3

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------------	---

		Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly Agree				
How prepared do you feel to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of different kinds of learners?	65	89%	11%		3.4	3.4	
How prepared do you feel to engage in ongoing self-critical reflection to understand your personal impact on students and families?	64	94%	6%		3.5	3.5	
How prepared do you feel to establish clear classroom routines, procedures, and systems?	64	91%	9%		3.5	3.5	
How prepared do you feel to plan and teach a curriculum that explores opportunities for students beyond their school community?	64	91%	9%		3.4	3.3	
How prepared do you feel to plan and teach a curriculum that reflects the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	65	89%	11%		3.4	3.3	
How prepared do you feel to use student data in planning and instruction?	65	89%	11%		3.3	3.2	
Agreement							
Before I started my clinical placement with my mentor teacher, my program gave me a clear understanding of my mentor's roles and responsibilities.	65	78%	22%		3.1	3.3	
Before I started my clinical placement with my mentor teacher, my program gave me a clear understanding of my roles and responsibilities as a resident.	65	77%	23%		3.1	3.3	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Agree		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
During the process of applying and/or being selected into my program, the program made me feel valued and affirmed as an individual.	65	92%	8%		3.3	3.5	
I feel supported. by program overall to succeed as a resident.	65	91%	9%		3.2	3.4	
I was attracted to apply to my program by the clinical experience of the residency model.	65	91%	9%		3.4	3.4	
I was attracted to apply to my program by the program's mission.	65	91%	9%		3.3	3.3	
I've been able to engage in an array of professional responsibilities beyond classroom instruction at the school where I'm completing my residency.	65	97%	3%		3.6	3.4	
I'm satisfied with the financial package my program provides me.	65	83%	17%		3.3	3.2	
My clinical experience includes sufficient opportunities to practice and apply what I learn in my coursework.	65	94%	6%		3.4	3.5	
My course instructors make me feel valued and affirmed as an individual.	65	97%	3%		3.3	3.5	
My course instructors provide me feedback that improves my practice.	65	100%	0%		3.4	3.5	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Agree		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
My coursework includes learning experiences that improve my practice.	65	95%	5%		3.4	3.4
My coursework includes opportunities to prepare and/or rehearse key practices before I apply them in my classroom.	65	95%	5%		3.4	3.3
My coursework includes opportunities to reflect on how I have enacted key practices in the classroom.	65	97%	3%		3.4	3.5
My coursework is aligned to key instructional practices identified by my program.	65	91%	9%		3.3	3.4
My coursework is relevant to my school context and classroom.	65	94%	6%		3.3	3.3
My current or most recent classroom mentor is committed to providing an environment where students from historically marginalized communities can thrive and succeed.	65	95%	5%		3.6	3.5
My current or most recent classroom mentor is a good match for me.	64	94%	6%		3.5	3.5
My current or most recent classroom mentor makes me feel valued and affirmed as an individual.	65	92%	8%		3.6	3.5

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Agree		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
My current or most recent classroom mentor models and explains their teaching practices in a way that gives me a clear understanding of how I can enact those practices.	65	85%	15%		3.4	3.4
My current or most recent classroom mentor paces the release of teaching responsibilities in a way that improves my practice.	65	85%	15%		3.4	3.4
My current or most recent classroom mentor provides me feedback that improves my practice.	65	88%	12%		3.5	3.5
My experience at the school where I'm completing my clinical placement matches what my program told me I could expect.	65	83%	17%		3.2	3.3
My experience in my program matches what my program told me I could expect.	65	80%	20%		3	3.2
My program accurately assesses my performance.	64	88%	12%		3.3	3.4
My program and the school where I'm completing my clinical placement share the same vision and expectations of effective teaching.	65	88%	12%		3.3	3.3
My program is clear about what I need to do in order to be successful in the program.	65	88%	12%		3.3	3.4

My program is clear about when and how it assesses my performance.	65	85%	15%		3.2	3.4	
--	----	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	--

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Agree		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
My program overall is committed to ensuring residents of all backgrounds and identities can thrive and succeed as educators.	64	97%	3%		3.5	3.5	
My program overall is committed to preparing teachers who can support students of all backgrounds and identities to thrive and succeed.	65	97%	3%		3.5	3.5	
My program's assessments of my performance help me to improve my practice.	65	88%	12%		3.3	3.4	
Program staff associated with my residency make me feel valued and affirmed as an individual.	65	89%	11%		3.2	3.5	
Program staff associated with my residency program provide me feedback that improves my practice.	65	89%	11%		3.2	3.4	
The feedback I receive from my current or most recent classroom mentor, course instructors, and program staff is aligned.	65	92%	8%		3.4	3.4	
The school community where I am completing my clinical placement has had a positive influence on my learning and growth as a teacher.	65	89%	11%		3.4	3.4	

The school community where I am completing my clinical placement has provided me with sufficient opportunities to collaborate with other teachers and staff.	65	91%	9%		3.4	3.3	
--	----	-----	----	--	-----	-----	--

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Agree		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
The school community where I am completing my clinical placement is committed to providing an environment where students of all backgrounds and identities can thrive and succeed.	65	92%	8%		3.4	3.4	
The school community where I am completing my clinical placement makes me feel valued and affirmed as an individual.	64	89%	11%		3.3	3.3	
The school community where I am completing my clinical placement supports me to implement practices that value and affirm students of all backgrounds and identities.	65	94%	6%		3.4	3.4	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective/ Familiar or Effective / Familiar	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective/ Familiar or Not Effective / Familiar		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
Preparation							
At this point in the year, how prepared is your resident to teach next year as the teacher of record?	59	88%	12%		3.3	3.2	
How prepared is your resident to adapt a curriculum to explore opportunities for students beyond their school community?	58	76%	24%		3	3	
How prepared is your resident to adapt a curriculum to reflect the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	58	84%	16%		3.1	3.1	
How prepared is your resident to build, nurture, and facilitate caring, humanizing relationships with students and families?	58	95%	5%		3.6	3.5	

How prepared is your resident to create a welcoming and affirming classroom environment for all students?	57	98%	2%		3.6	3.5	
How prepared is your resident to demonstrate professionalism and collaborate with other teachers?	58	91%	9%		3.4	3.5	
How prepared is your resident to demonstrate the content knowledge to teach subject matter?	58	86%	14%		3.2	3.2	
How prepared is your resident to develop and implement consistent behavioral and academic expectations for students?	58	91%	9%		3.3	3.1	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective/ Familiar or Effective / Familiar	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective/ Familiar or Not Effective / Familiar		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
How prepared is your resident to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of different kinds of learners?	58	78%	22%		3.1	3.1	

How prepared is your resident to engage in ongoing self-critical reflection to understand their personal impact on students and families?	58	88%	12%		3.3	3.3	
How prepared is your resident to establish clear classroom routines, procedures, and systems?	58	93%	7%		3.4	3.3	
How prepared is your resident to plan and teach a curriculum that explores opportunities for students beyond their school community?	58	79%	21%		3.1	3.1	
How prepared is your resident to plan and teach a curriculum that reflects the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	58	81%	19%		3.1	3.1	
How prepared is your resident to use student data in planning and instruction?	58	81%	19%		3.1	3.1	
Agreement							
Before I started hosting a resident in my classroom, the program gave me a clear understanding of my resident's roles and responsibilities.	59	90%	10%		3.3	3.4	
Before I started hosting a resident in my classroom, the program gave me a clear understanding of my roles and responsibilities as a mentor.	59	88%	12%		3.3	3.4	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective/ Familiar or Effective / Familiar	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective/ Familiar or Not Effective / Familiar		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
Before I started hosting a resident in my classroom, the program gave me and my resident sufficient opportunities to build a relationship with one another.	59	95%	5%		3.4	3.4	
Being a residency program mentor has positioned me as a teacher leader in my school and/or district.	59	90%	10%		3.2	3.3	
Being a residency program mentor makes me a more effective teacher.	59	93%	7%		3.4	3.5	
During the process of being recruited, applying, and/or being selected as a mentor, the program gave me a clear understanding of how I would be compensated and supported.	59	92%	8%		3.3	3.4	
During the process of being recruited, applying, and/or being selected as a mentor, the program gave me a clear understanding of the program's mission.	59	98%	2%		3.5	3.5	

During the process of being recruited, applying, and/or being selected as a mentor, the program gave me a clear understanding of the value or benefits of being a mentor.	59	98%	2%		3.6	3.6	
During the process of being recruited, applying, and/or being selected as a mentor, the program made me feel valued and affirmed as an individual.	59	95%	5%		3.5	3.6	
I feel supported by my program overall to succeed as a mentor.	59	98%	2%		3.4	3.5	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective/ Familiar or Effective / Familiar	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective/ Familiar or Not Effective / Familiar		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
I'm provided sufficient time to serve in my role as a mentor.	59	80%	20%		3.1	3.2	
My experience as a mentor matches what the program told me I could expect.	59	93%	7%		3.3	3.4	
My experiences as a mentor have improved my abilities as a teacher leader.	59	97%	3%		3.5	3.6	

My resident is a good match for me.	59	97%	3%		3.6	3.5
My school leader supports me in my role as a mentor.	59	95%	5%		3.4	3.4
The coursework that the program provides to my resident is relevant to my school context and classroom.	26	81%	19%		2.8	3.2
The program provides me feedback that improves my practices as a mentor.	59	86%	14%		3.3	3.2
The stipend and/or benefits package I receive for being a mentor is appropriate for my time and effort as a mentor.	59	76%	24%		3	2.9
Effectiveness						

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective/ Familiar or Effective / Familiar	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective/ Familiar or Not Effective / Familiar		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
How effective has the program been at supporting you to model and explain your teaching practices to your resident so that	59	92%	8%		3.2	3.2

they have a clear understanding of how they can enact those practices?						
How effective has the program been at supporting you to pace the release of teaching responsibilities in a way that improves your resident's practice?	59	85%	15%		3.1	3.2
How effective has the program been at supporting you to provide your resident feedback that improves their practice?	59	92%	8%		3.2	3.3
Overall, how effective has the program been at supporting you to mentor your resident?	59	86%	14%		3.2	3.3
Familiarity						
How familiar are you with the coursework that the program provides to your resident?	59	44%	56%		2.4	2.5

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
-------------	-----------------------	---	---	--	--------------------------------	---	--

Agreement							
Graduates of the residency program demonstrate proficiency on the teacher effectiveness framework used at my school.	18	100%	0%		3.5	3.4	
Graduates share innovative practices and strategies with other school staff as a result of continued participation with their residency program.	18	100%	0%		3.5	3.3	
I access residency program staff to support graduates when necessary.	12	92%	8%		3.2	3.1	
I formally assess graduate practices with residency program staff.	11	73%	27%		2.7	2.9	
I have a manageable number of responsibilities as a training site principal for the residency program.	22	100%	0%		3.6	3.5	
I informally assess graduate practices with residency program staff.	11	73%	27%		2.7	3.1	
I would hire residency program graduates again next year.	17	100%	0%		3.6	3.5	
I would hire resident(s) as full time teacher(s).	23	100%	0%		3.8	3.5	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
I would host residents in my school again next year.	23	100%	0%		3.8	3.6	
Induction support provided by the residency program provides a level of support to graduates that other new teachers in my building do not receive.	15	100%	0%		3.4	3.4	
Mentors for the residency program use data to improve resident practice.	22	100%	0%		3.5	3.4	
My roles and responsibilities as a training site principal were clearly defined by the residency program.	22	95%	5%		3.6	3.4	
My school's expectations for instructional practice align with the residency program's vision and expectations for effective teaching.	22	100%	0%		3.7	3.5	
Participation in the residency program has positively impacted the culture of our school.	22	100%	0%		3.6	3.5	

Participation in the residency program improves student learning and achievement at our school.	23	100%	0%		3.4	3.4
Residents in our school are integrated into the school community.	23	96%	4%		3.7	3.6

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
The coursework provided to residents by the residency program is relevant to my school context and classroom.	22	100%	0%		3.5	3.3
The mentors in my school have grown into more effective practitioners through participation in the residency program.	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.4
The residency program graduates in our building positively impact the culture of the school.	18	100%	0%		3.6	3.6
The residency program is preparing residents to be effective teachers.	23	100%	0%		3.8	3.6

The residency program offers residents a good balance of theoretical and practical strategies to strengthen their effectiveness in the classroom.	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.3
The residency program provides feedback and support to mentors to improve their ability to coach residents.	22	95%	5%		3.4	3.4
The residency program provides graduates with relevant professional development opportunities.	15	100%	0%		3.5	3.5
The residency program selects mentors who are effective teachers.	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.5

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
The residency program supports me in meeting my responsibilities as a training site principal.	22	95%	5%		3.4	3.3
Effectiveness						

How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in adapting a curriculum to explore opportunities for students beyond their school community?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.2
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in adapting a curriculum to reflect the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.1
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in building, nurturing, and facilitating caring, humanizing relationships with students and families?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.3
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in creating a welcoming and affirming classroom environment for all students?	18	100%	0%		3.4	3.3
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in demonstrating professionalism and collaborating with other teachers?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.3

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in demonstrating the content knowledge to teach subject matter?	18	100%	0%		3.4	3.2	
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in developing and implementing consistent behavioral and academic expectations for students?	18	100%	0%		3.4	3.2	
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in differentiating instruction to meet the needs of different kinds of learners?	18	100%	0%		3.4	3.2	

How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in engaging in ongoing critical self-reflection to address personal biases and their impact on students and families?	18	100%	0%		3.4	3.2
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in establishing clear classroom routines, procedures, and systems?	18	100%	0%		3.4	3.2
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in planning and teaching a curriculum that explores opportunities for students beyond their school community?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.2

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
-------------	-----------------------	---	---	--	--------------------------------	---

How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in planning and teaching a curriculum that reflects the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.1
How effective are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher in using student data in planning and instruction?	18	100%	0%		3.3	3.1
How effective overall are the residency program graduates working in your school compared to that of a "typical" new teacher (in comparable areas and grade levels)?	19	100%	0%		3.4	3.2
Preparation						
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in adapting a curriculum to explore opportunities for students beyond their school community?	23	100%	0%		3.4	3.2
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in adapting a curriculum to reflect the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	23	100%	0%		3.3	3.2
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in building, nurturing, and facilitating caring, humanizing relationships with students and families?	23	100%	0%		3.4	3.3

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in creating a welcoming and affirming classroom environment for all students?	23	100%	0%		3.4	3.3	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in demonstrating professionalism and collaborating with other teachers?	23	100%	0%		3.6	3.3	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in demonstrating the content knowledge to teach subject matter?	23	100%	0%		3.3	3.2	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in developing and implementing consistent behavioral and academic expectations for students?	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.2	

How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in differentiating instruction to meet the needs of different kinds of learners?	23	96%	4%		3.4	3.2	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in engaging in ongoing critical self-reflection to understand their personal impact on students and families?	23	100%	0%		3.4	3.2	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Strongly Agree or Agree Much More Effective or More Effective Much More Prepared or More Prepared	Disagree or Strongly Disagree Less Effective or Much Less Effective Less Prepared or Much Less Prepared		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in establishing clear classroom routines, procedures, and systems?	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.3	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in planning and teaching a curriculum that explores opportunities for students beyond their school community?	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.2	

How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in planning and teaching a curriculum that reflects the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	23	100%	0%		3.3	3.2	
How prepared are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher in using student data in planning and instruction?	23	100%	0%		3.5	3.2	
How prepared overall are residents compared to a "typical" new teacher (in comparable areas and grade levels)?	23	100%	0%		3.3	3.3	

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective or Effective	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective or Not Effective		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
Overall, how prepared are you to teach as the teacher of record?	24	92%	8%		3.3	3.3	
Agreement							

As a residency program graduate, I entered the classroom with a good balance of theoretical and practical strategies.	24	96%	4%		3.3	3.3
As a residency program graduate, I entered the classroom with stronger skills than the average first year teacher at my school.	23	96%	4%		3.5	3.4
My residency program coursework was relevant to my current school context and classroom.	24	88%	12%		3.1	3.3
My residency program experience enabled me to develop relationships with teachers to whom I turn for classroom-based guidance and support.	23	91%	9%		3.3	3.3
My residency program prepared me to be an effective first year teacher.	23	87%	13%		3.3	3.3
My residency program prepared me to meet the academic needs of students identified as English language learners.	23	74%	26%		3	3.1
My residency program prepared me to meet the academic needs of students receiving special education services.	23	78%	22%		3	3.2

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective or Effective	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective or Not Effective		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
The coach affiliated with my residency program provides useful and relevant feedback.	23	83%	17%		3.3	3.1	
The coach affiliated with my residency program supports me to improve my effectiveness as a teacher.	23	91%	9%		3.4	3.1	
The feedback I currently receive from residency program staff helps me improve my practice.	24	54%	46%		2.7	3	
The professional development I currently receive from residency program staff helps me improve my practice.	24	58%	42%		2.6	3	
Effectiveness							
What is your current level of effectiveness in adapting a curriculum to explore opportunities for students beyond their school community?	24	71%	29%		2.8	3.1	

What is your current level of effectiveness in adapting a curriculum to reflect the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	24	75%	25%		3	3.2
What is your current level of effectiveness in building, nurturing, and facilitating caring, humanizing relationships with students and families?	24	96%	4%		3.5	3.6
What is your current level of effectiveness in creating a welcoming and affirming classroom environment for all students?	24	100%	0%		3.7	3.6

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective or Effective	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective or Not Effective		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)
What is your current level of effectiveness in demonstrating professionalism and collaborating with other teachers?	24	96%	4%		3.4	3.5
What is your current level of effectiveness in demonstrating the content knowledge to teach subject matter?	24	88%	12%		3.5	3.4

What is your current level of effectiveness in developing and implementing consistent behavioral and academic expectations for students?	24	79%	21%		3.1	3.3
What is your current level of effectiveness in differentiating instruction to meet the needs of different kinds of learners?	24	92%	8%		3.3	3.3
What is your current level of effectiveness in engaging in ongoing critical self-reflection to understand your personal impact on students and families?	24	83%	17%		3.3	3.4
What is your current level of effectiveness in establishing clear classroom routines, procedures, and systems?	24	88%	12%		3.3	3.4
What is your current level of effectiveness in planning and teaching a curriculum that explores opportunities for students beyond their school community?	24	63%	37%		2.8	3.1
What is your current level of effectiveness in planning and teaching a curriculum that reflects the assets of your students, school, and the surrounding community?	24	75%	25%		3	3.2

Survey Item	Number of Respondents	Very Well Prepared or Prepared Strongly Agree or Agree Very Effective or Effective	Somewhat Prepared or Not Prepared Disagree or Strongly Disagree Somewhat Effective or Not Effective		RTR Average (4 point scale)	NCTR Network Average (4 point scale)	
What is your current level of effectiveness in using student data in planning and instruction?	23	70%	30%		3.1	3.2	