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The majority of our nation’s public schools fail to prepare students from low-income families to succeed in college and life. In particular, urban school systems struggle to prepare students for high school graduation. Nearly half of the students who enter Chicago Public Schools (CPS) high schools as freshmen do not graduate.

The odds that children growing up in urban America will finish college are even more alarming. Only 8 percent of students who entered CPS high schools as freshmen in 1995 graduated with a bachelor’s degree by the time they were 25. Of those students, only 3 percent were African American males or Latinos.

Many view these problems as intractable. The Urban Education Institute (UEI) does not share this view. It has amassed decades of empirical evidence that documents the extraordinary influence schooling can have on the lives of poor children in urban areas. UEI believes it has the opportunity and ability to influence the lives of future generations of children nationwide by building knowledge born from exemplary practice and scholarship, by creating new methods to develop and support teachers and school leaders, and by creating scalable models of schooling. UEI follows in the tradition of John Dewey, one of America’s most influential education scholars, who was a professor at the University of Chicago soon after its founding. Like Dewey, UEI brings together expert practitioners working at the classroom, school, and system levels with distinguished researchers and scholars from across disciplines to improve pre-K through 12 education for children in urban schools. In essence, UEI seeks to join research and practice to transform schools—and thereby to transform lives.

UEI also follows another tradition at the University of Chicago by building a deep understanding of urban life. The discipline of sociology was originally defined by scholars at the University as they sought to understand the growth and decline of urban neighborhoods. The University’s conception of social work, espoused by the School of Social Service Administration, grew out of the recognition that urban communities have unique experiences and needs. UEI builds on this tradition as it defines a new pathway to improve urban schooling.

This prospectus describes UEI’s efforts to find solutions to the challenges faced by urban schools. It begins with a brief overview of the major components that comprise UEI and then outlines the conceptual underpinning of the institute.
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UEI is a significant undertaking. The Institute employs over 300 part- and full-time personnel and has an annual operating budget of approximately $30 million. UEI is comprised of three primary components: the Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR), the Urban Teacher Education Program (Chicago UTEP), and the four campuses of the University of Chicago Charter School. These three components are developing innovative operating models that are being actively emulated by others nationwide.
The Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) leads UEI’s applied research effort, informing practice, policy, and the public about the state of schooling in Chicago. Since its founding in 1990, CCSR has studied and influenced reform efforts in Chicago. Recently it has inspired the creation of similar organizations in New York City, Newark, Baltimore, and Kansas City, as well as across Texas, with over a dozen other cities or states currently considering replication. Research conducted at UEI also undergirds efforts to develop and test tools that can contribute to school improvement efforts. Two such tools, the **Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (STEP)** and **6to16** are described in greater detail later in this prospectus.

UEI prepares and supports teachers, teacher leaders, and principals with a focus on instilling strong subject matter and specialized pedagogical expertise and skills to succeed in urban contexts. Since 2003, this work has been anchored by the **Urban Teacher Education Program (Chicago UTEP)**, which develops aspiring teachers and provides them with a Master of Arts in Teaching—upon completion of the program. Chicago UTEP’s goal is to prepare teachers to persist, succeed, and lead in urban schools. Aspiring teachers are provided with opportunities to train in multiple classrooms over an entire year, rather than the few months or weeks typical of a more traditional teacher education program. Graduates receive three years of in-classroom coaching upon entry into Chicago schools. UEI also extends its work with teach-
UEI Conceptual Domains of Work

Following the pedagogical principles championed by Dewey, UEI “learns by doing.” UEI staff do not seek knowledge by watching from the sidelines; rather, they actively engage in the work of education. Their work focuses on three domains: (1) using evidence to improve schools and influence policy, (2) training and supporting urban teachers and leaders, and (3) creating reliably excellent schools. In each of these domains, UEI is building empirically tested, replicable models designed to influence urban schooling.
Domain I: Using Evidence to Improve Schools and Influence Policy

The best classrooms, the most effective schools, the most profitable businesses, and the finest universities use evidence to improve practice. Unfortunately, educators and policymakers historically have failed to use evidence effectively to improve teaching and schooling. Teachers typically do not receive scores from standardized achievement tests until after students have moved to the next grade. Teachers, principals, and school system leaders are overwhelmed with a plethora of data that they have neither time nor expertise to interpret or use. At the same time, scholars often work in isolation, conducting research and publishing findings that are inaccessible or unusable to practitioners. UEI aims to address these challenges by creating evidence and models that span the work of teachers, principals, schools, school systems, and scholars.

For teachers, using evidence to improve practice means using fine-grained diagnostic assessments that provide information about the academic and social progress of each child—evidence that enables teachers to adjust instruction to meet the diverse needs of individual children. Principals must use these same diagnostic data to align school resources. Specifically, school leaders must leverage evidence, instruction, time, expertise, training, and academic and social supports to address the needs of individual children. The University Charter School uses diagnostic evidence from multiple sources to (1) enable teachers to improve their instruction and (2) define and measure progress and drive improvement at the school level.

Building evidence-based practice for teachers also requires the use of regular, meaningful evaluation of instructional practice. Deep conversations about instructional practice must start early—when teachers are preparing to teach—and then occur regularly throughout teachers’ careers.

Accordingly, Chicago UTEP has created tools to assess aspiring teachers regularly and rigorously as they learn to teach. These tools are designed to (1) help new teachers reflect upon their practice across critical aspects of teaching and (2) provide coaches with data to provide individualized, targeted, and strategic support in the first three years of teaching. Similarly, teachers at all campuses of the University Charter School receive evidence about their strengths and weaknesses that is based on a research-based conception of teaching excellence.

Evidence-based practice for principals also means gathering, interpreting, and acting upon data sources that provide information about school performance. These data sources include standardized test scores, high school and college persistence and graduation rates, and such predictive indicators as attendance and on-track rates. CCSR’s innovative Data and Practice Collaborative promotes this kind of reflection, working closely with the directors of the University Charter School campuses, schools in the USI Network, and other affiliated schools to interpret, internalize, and apply data to drive school improvement.

The use of evidence to interpret
and drive systemic changes likewise requires the measurement and analyses of progress at multiple levels. Researchers must gather data on students and schools and on the influence of district policy. They must use sophisticated analyses to decipher test-score trends amidst changing test forms, shifting demographics, new policy tides, and a mobile student and teacher population. And they must go beyond analyses of standardized tests and consider such other indicators as school persistence, high school placement and graduation, and entry and success in post-secondary education. The Consortium on Chicago School Research provides all of these services for CPS by producing reliable, independent longitudinal analyses that do not merely assess progress but instead provide insights that help drive progress.

In short, UEI contributes to the creation and rigorous use of evidence at multiple levels. These interlocking strategies of using data and information to improve education at the classroom, school, and system level are mutually reinforcing and necessary to catalyze and sustain improvements in student learning.

**Domain II: Training and Supporting Urban Teachers and Leaders**

If we expect teachers and school leaders to persist and succeed in urban schools, dramatically new forms
of training, support, and accountability must be designed, tested, and implemented at scale.

Fifty percent of urban teachers leave the profession within five years. In the most challenging urban schools, a two-year turnover rate of 80 percent is not unusual. The principal position in Chicago shows similar churn. These turnover rates reveal a complex problem that requires multifaceted solutions. For UEI, this work begins with a clear, empirically based conception of effective teaching and learning and the use of high-quality diagnostic data to guide instruction. It requires radically redesigned methods for preparing aspiring teachers; supports for teachers new to the profession; and accountability and incentive systems that reinforce the establishment of effective, evidence-based instruction within the school.

Chicago UTEP is at the heart of UEI’s strategy to address the human capital challenges facing urban schools. Chicago UTEP develops deep content-area expertise in teacher candidates through rigorous coursework and a full-year teaching residency (prior to full-time employment). Critically, Chicago UTEP provides graduates with three years of in-classroom coaching support upon entry into the classroom. Chicago UTEP coursework, residency, and coaching all focus on training teachers for the distinctive challenges of working in an urban environment. The amount of training and support that Chicago UTEP provides distinguishes it from traditional teacher training programs. The retention rates for Chicago UTEP graduates dramatically exceed national, state, and Chicago averages.

Ninety-five percent of the teachers trained by Chicago UTEP in the last three years are still teaching. In 2009, Chicago UTEP expanded the program to include the training of secondary math and biology teachers, to undergird UEI’s commitment to contribute to school improvement pre-K through 12.

Improving human capital and building capacity for schools is also dependent upon providing innovative training and support for school leaders. Principals indicate that a lack of time and structures to collaborate with fellow principals and a lack of knowledge about how to interpret and use data are barriers to improving schools. Providing principals with meaningful networks is essential to developing and retaining successful leaders in urban schools.

UEI employs a network-based strategy to work with incumbent teachers and principals across Chicago and the nation. For example, the USI Network (1) creates the space and time for school leaders to reflect on and assess student learning, (2) uses data to inform decision making, and (3) deepens the capacity to deliver high quality instruction and share effective tools and practices. CCSR’s Data and Practice Collaborative ensures that the network schools have consistent opportunities to assess and use school-level data to inform improvement.

However, even the most highly trained teachers with deep, ongoing support cannot overcome the pressing organizational barriers to improvement that exist in many urban schools. This brings us to UEI’s third domain of work: creating and sustaining excellent urban schools that are designed to build
knowledge about what is required to do this work well.

**Domain III: Creating Reliably Excellent Schools**

Empirically based practices and well-trained teachers and leaders are essential to creating good schools. At the same time, UEI finds better ways to train and support teachers and leaders by operating schools. At UEI, research informs practice, and practice actively informs research. UEI’s work in schools is not a traditional university-school partnership—in which a higher education institution supports a group of local schools, contributing institutional resources and other assets in an attempt to improve results. While these partnerships can lead to the improvement of individual schools, it is evident that such efforts, by themselves, do not necessarily produce the knowledge the nation and the education field need.

UEI “learns by doing” by operating four charter school campuses that serve children on the South Side of Chicago. Admitted by lottery, nearly all of the children attending UEI’s schools are African American. Approximately 80 percent of those students are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch, which is the federal marker for poverty in schools.

This approach to producing reliably excellent schooling includes: (1) a shared conception of excellent instruction; (2) regular diagnostic assessment, targeted interventions, and a team that monitors each student’s academic and social progress; (3) expanded instructional time, including extended school day, week, and year; (4) a dynamic student support system that addresses individual student needs in real time; (5) intense training, supports, and incentives for teachers and school leaders; and (6) systematic and targeted engagement of family and community in the improvement of teaching and learning.

UEI’s schools engage in evidence-based practice on a daily basis. Teacher practice is public, with explicit accountability and support systems in place for improving instruction. The University Charter School campuses use diagnostic evidence—at the school level, in classrooms, and for individual students—to improve practice and to systematically engage staff members and parents in support of student learning and development.

UEI’s approach to schooling is dependent upon strong teachers and leaders. The University Charter School campuses are staffed with teachers who share a common conception of effective teaching, collaborate consistently, and have robust opportunities to learn and improve practice. The schools depend upon well-trained leaders who work strategically to create an organizational climate conducive to successful instruction and collaboration.

By operating schools, UEI can empirically assess various instructional approaches, school organizations, uses of evidence, and forms of teacher preparation and support. The aim of these combined efforts is to test the best available thinking about urban schooling and to develop and disseminate conceptions of school organization and practice that can serve as a model nationally.
The preceding sections introduced a conceptual frame for the work of UEI and its mission of creating knowledge to improve schools. While the three primary organizational components within UEI have a longer history, UEI as an integrated unit is still in its early years. It was established in 2008, drawing together distinct entities that had functioned in large measure independently and initiating an ambitious national agenda.

UEI’s influence and impact is most powerful when the work of researchers, practitioners, program evaluators, and innovators intersect and build synergies that exceed the contributions of any single component. This section provides several examples—spanning the boundaries of research and practice and the organization’s various domains—that best illustrate how UEI contributes to improving urban schooling.
The Five Essential Supports for School Improvement

In the early 1990s, two staff members from the Consortium on Chicago School Research joined the superintendent’s team to help redesign the CPS central office. Their work on formulating a system-wide improvement agenda resulted in the creation of the essential supports framework. It has been extensively validated over the years and fully articulated in the book *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago* (University of Chicago Press, 2010). The framework posits that to improve student learning, schools must strengthen significantly their practices in five areas: leadership; parent, school, and community ties; professional capacity; student-centered learning climate; and instructional guidance.

The five essential supports were derived from a rich mix of traditional research and practical improvement activities. Drawing upon prior research on effective schools, CCSR continued to refine and deepen the ideas through its own research over the next 15 years. At the same time, the model was influenced by direct work in schools carried out by a precursor of UEI. Sustained conversations with stakeholders across the city further informed the development of the framework.

Chicago Public Schools adopted the essential supports as a framework for school improvement, publishing a document titled *Pathways to Achievement: Self-Analysis Guide* (1994) that was distributed to all schools. *Pathways* provided clinical guidance to practitioners working on core aspects of school improvement. Ten years later, in 2005, CPS institutionalized the five essential supports when its Office of Strategic Planning and Development launched the Five Fundamentals for School Improvement as the definition of a good school and the basis for school improvement plans.

The five essential supports also became the framework for the bi-annual school surveys conducted by CCSR. The ongoing administration of these surveys has helped to create the largest data archive for a school district in the United States. In addition, CCSR provides confidential reports to individual schools on how they are doing in relation to the five essential supports.

Improving Elementary Literacy Instruction

Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (STEP), developed in the mid-1990s, is a formative assessment tool that provides teachers and leaders with timely information about what students in pre-kindergarten through third grade know and need to learn as they develop their literacy skills. The development of STEP characterizes the distinctive approach of the Urban Education Institute. While originally developed to support literacy learning in a small number of public schools, STEP has evolved over time into a powerful formative assessment and data management strategy that is being used in schools and districts across the country to inform and guide literacy instruction.

STEP was conceived, tested, and validated by school-based practitioners and university-based research-
ers as a tool to provide teachers with evidence of progress to improve their instruction. Through ongoing monitoring meetings, STEP is used to shape individual student learning plans that help teachers (1) differentiate instruction based on the unique and diverse needs of their students and (2) align all resources (people, academic and social supports; time and money) in the school with the specific diagnosed needs of individual students. A robust professional development strategy accompanies the implementation of STEP to ensure that teachers and administrators implement the program with consistency and fidelity while developing expertise in teaching reading. Thus, STEP is a tool that facilitates student learning and fosters teacher development.

Currently, more than 10,000 students benefit from the STEP assessment and data management tool in schools in Illinois, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. Schools using STEP include some of the highest performing urban schools in the country (Uncommon Schools, Achievement First, and KIPP). In the spirit of building scalable tools and practices to improve student learning, STEP is contributing to the mission of UEI by providing a tool for achieving the goal of producing reliably excellent schooling.

**Improving College Readiness**

CCSR’s post-secondary transition project has released a series of reports focused on how CPS graduates perform in their transition to college. The researchers associated with this project are considering all aspects of this transition, including student aspirations, participation in the college search, the application process, and college retention and graduation.

Findings have influenced CPS practice in meaningful ways. For instance, researchers discovered that completion of the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) greatly influenced whether students eventually enrolled in college. As a result, CPS created a system for teachers, counselors, CPS staff members, and others to track completion of the FAFSA. CCSR’s research is credited by CPS as the reason this system was created.

This post-secondary research has also been critical in influencing perceptions about the types of colleges to which CPS graduates apply relative to their qualifications. The project’s report *Potholes on the Road to College* tracked students who indicated they had aspirations to go to college to see how many actually did and the extent to which the colleges they attended “matched” the students’ level of qualifications. This concept of “match” has been integrated into training given to college counselors in CPS high schools.

The post-secondary transition research has also been the motivation for the creation of a new innovation by UEI: 6to16. 6to16 is a college readiness support model for grades 6 through “16” (college graduation) that aims to increase the number of low-income, first-generation college students in urban schools who succeed in high school and college. 6to16 uses an innovative, technology-based approach to (1) strengthen academic preparation, (2) increase knowledge of high school...
and college opportunities, and (3) build student efficacy to attain high school and college goals. 6to16 features a classroom-based curriculum complemented by online learning and access to social capital for students via a team of e-mentors. The project is being piloted in schools in Chicago and New York City, as well as with the KIPP school network nationwide.

Evidence to Improve High School Practice: The Freshman Year and the On-Track Indicator

In 1999, CCSR released a report that first identified an “on-track indicator” for high school graduation. Through further research published in 2005 and 2007, CCSR identified such factors as absences and grades in freshman classes as highly predictive of high school graduation. In particular, the researchers identified the freshman year as the critical year for students in setting the path toward graduation. Over 80 percent of students who were on-track at the end of their freshman year graduated.

CPS embraced CCSR research on the freshman year, leading to the implementation of a number of new policies, practices, and positions. Following this early research, CPS added the on-track indicator to the accountability system. More recently, CPS began using CCSR’s indicator to identify at-risk students as they enter high school and to follow them through the freshman year. School leaders have access to rosters that track absences and grades for freshmen, identifying those in need of intervention. In addition, many schools now have “on-track coordinators” or freshmen teams to coordinate interventions to get students on the path to graduation.

The on-track indicator and research on the freshman year is also being used at UEI to further strengthen schools’ ability to help at-risk students. The Data and Practice Collaborative creates individualized reports for schools that help them recognize important on-track trends. Importantly, researchers from DPC consider trends for different groups of students. For instance, researchers disaggregate results by gender and achievement level to help school leaders craft carefully tailored interventions for subsets of students.

The research on the freshman year and the on-track indicator has had an influence nationally. The National High School Center adopted the indicator as an early warning system tool, which districts across the country now use. Several large districts—including Dallas, Albuquerque, Philadelphia, Omaha, Prince George’s County (MD), and Rochester (NY)—have been trained by CCSR to use the indicator as part of their accountability and intervention strategies. The use of the indicator was also recommended in the U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences practice guide on dropout prevention.
Looking Forward

This prospectus has described the work of UEI across three intersecting domains: (1) using evidence to improve schools and influence policy, (2) training and supporting urban teachers and leaders, and (3) creating reliably excellent schools. One important aspect of the intersection of these domains is the integration of knowledge to inform, improve, and influence policy and practice. This work has already had a significant influence on schools and policy in Chicago. Looking forward, UEI’s focus will be on leveraging the research findings, tools, and practices to more extensively influence urban schooling at the national level.
Each component of UEI is designed as a scalable model that is useful for research organizations, teacher training programs and schools, and school systems dedicated to the improvement of urban schooling.

CCSR is designed as a model for how a city, region, or state can build an objective, evidence-based organization to inform and improve practice and policy making. CCSR is being replicated in New York City, Baltimore, Newark, and Kansas City, as well as statewide in Texas. Equally important, within CCSR, research methods, tools, and practices are designed not only to improve the trajectory of children’s lives in Chicago but also to be exported to schools, school systems, and research organizations nationwide.

Likewise the Urban Teacher Education Program is a model for how a university can build and support a pipeline of effective urban school-teachers. Chicago UTEP is convening higher education institutions across the country to (1) inform them of its design and (2) promote a new conception of training and supporting teachers in urban schools. The unique nature of Chicago UTEP’s preparation approach—the extended residency; the focus on educating aspiring teachers about urban community decline and development; the engagement in issues of race, class, and culture; and the three-year commitment to coaching, support, and professional development of all graduates—includes unique design components that can take root elsewhere. This is but one example of the opportunity for UEI to influence the preparation of urban teachers, both locally and nationally.

Similarly, the University Charter School campuses represent an empirically tested, financially scalable design for how to improve the educational outcomes of children growing up in urban America. In particular, UEI views its approach to elementary schooling as a model with potential to influence the design of urban schools broadly. The Chicago Model for Urban Schooling captures the essence of the University of Chicago elementary school approach of framing college success as the explicit outcome of continuous engagement from pre-school through secondary school. Faculty members from the Committee on Education are currently collaborating with practitioners and staff members from UEI to write a book on the Chicago Model for Urban Schooling that will elaborate on the conception and clarify how the model can be implemented, tested, and broadly shared.

Finally, taken as a whole, UEI represents a model for how higher education institutions can engage systematically in the improvement of pre-K through 12 schooling. The meaningful intersection of applied and scholarly research, teacher education, and support with the operation of schools provides the opportunity to influence thinking on the significant role universities can play in school reform efforts.
Conclusion

UEI was established to create knowledge on the improvement of urban public schooling in Chicago and across America. Its undertaking builds on the efforts of its University of Chicago predecessors, whose desire to understand the unique character of urban areas profoundly influenced the conceptualization of sociology and social work. To accomplish UEI’s mission, it must leverage the sum of its parts in new ways and embark on an ambitious effort to share what it learns across the country.

Clearly, building knowledge to improve the quality of urban schooling is a long-term endeavor, requiring a deep commitment and tireless effort. Undertaking this work in a serious way will require significant resources—both to endow core components of the UEI enterprise and to ensure appropriate operating supports for particular bodies of work. And this work will require focus—UEI must persistently query whether the work underway and the methods for doing it demonstrate legitimate results.

This work will also require extraordinary ingenuity. Many view the problems UEI is trying to solve as intractable. UEI is not of that view. It has empirical evidence of the extraordinary influence schooling can have on the lives of poor children in urban areas. And it believes by building knowledge—born from exemplary practice and scholarship—by creating new methods to develop and support teachers and school leaders, and by creating scalable models of schooling, it will positively influence children’s lives across the nation.
The Urban Education Institute develops and refines its best ideas, practices, and tools in schools it operates and then scales these tools and practices in schools and networks it supports. It develops teachers, teacher leaders, and school leaders capable of implementing and promoting ambitious intellectual work in the classroom. It conducts research to inform policy and practice in the Chicago Public Schools. It documents its work carefully, leveraging the unique assets of UEI, the University’s Committee on Education, and other resources at the University of Chicago. Integrating research with on-the-ground work in schools allows UEI to develop empirical evidence about practices that lead to success in high school, college, and beyond. UEI uses this evidence to inform policy, practitioners, and the public and impact practice across the nation. UEI truly joins the forces of practice and research to improve urban schools.