PDS

PARTNERS
BRIDGING RESEARCH TO PRACTICE

A journal of the
**National Association for
Professional Development Schools**

in Wicomico County, allowing for teacher candidates to connect theory to practice in their freshmen year of college. This practice prompted the principals of North Salisbury School and Prince Street Elementary School to offer space and staff support in their schools to provide similar opportunities to more teacher candidates.

- At Glen Avenue Elementary School, the PDS site coordinators and liaison collaborate to implement experiences for interns to become familiar with key staff members throughout their building. Interns shadow, interview, and/or attend a panel discussion to include support staff such as cafeteria workers and custodians, student support educators, and behavior specialists. These opportunities provide the interns with an understanding of how each staff member can support them, and their P-12 students, throughout their internship experiences.
- Salisbury University teacher candidates and interns truly become a part of their Wicomico County Public School communities. One can see these future teachers participating in staff versus students sporting events, performing in school talent shows, grilling hamburgers at back to school nights, dressing up with fellow team members in group Halloween costumes, or taking part in spirit week activities.

Conclusion

The PDS partnership between Salisbury University and Wicomico County Public Schools plays a significant role in the identity of each individual institution. The partners have developed a genuine professional friendship and support one another in the community. True collaboration is simply understood by all partnership stakeholders, no matter what their roles may be. For example, SU's Regional PDS Coordinator enjoys sharing how her two daughters attended four different PDS schools in Wicomico County. When they were young and played school with their dolls, one pretended to be the teacher while the other pretended to be the intern!

Since being honored with the NAPDS Award for Exemplary PDS Achievement last spring, the Salisbury University – Wicomico County Schools PDS partnership has strengthened, benefiting all involved.

- SU's Department of Education Leadership recently hired WCPS's retiring Director of Curriculum and Professional Development, which allowed for a very smooth professional transition.
- SU has leveraged grant funds to offer College and Career Readiness Bootcamp experiences for WCPS high school students.

- The University and the school district have worked together to offer more SU dual enrollment courses for students in Wicomico County.
- SU is working with WCPS's Supervisor of New Teacher Induction to identify ways to support its recent graduates teaching in Wicomico County.
- Teacher candidates in on-site pre-professional courses have been taking part in clinical instructional rounds, visiting additional WCPS classrooms beyond those selected for their clinical practice placements. This allows them to witness different teaching styles and debrief on what they observe regarding student learning.

Once again, the Salisbury University – Wicomico County Public Schools PDS stakeholders appreciate being asked to share what makes their partnership exemplary with NAPDS members. Stay tuned for more great things to come!

Rick Briggs is the Chief Academic Officer of Wicomico County Public Schools. Ruth Malone is a lecturer at Salisbury University. Laurie Henry is the Dean of the Seidel School of Education at Salisbury University. Sara Elburn (SJELBURN@ salisbury.edu) is a Regional PDS Coordinator at Salisbury University. Paul Gasior is a Clinical Practice Coordinator at Salisbury University. ◈

NAPDS Exemplary Award Article

Innovative School-University Partnerships: Insights and Understandings from a Year-Long Internship

S. Michael Putman, Drew Polly, and Miranda Fitzgerald
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

As educator preparation programs (EPPs) seek to enact programmatic innovations to effectively prepare candidates to enter the profession, they must create structures that empower teacher candidates (TCs) to apply their knowledge in increasingly complex situations within authentic contexts, i.e., the classroom (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015). These opportunities, or clinical experiences, represent an important vehicle for TCs to develop pedagogical skills as they observe and learn from clinical educators (CEs) while enacting the methods and strategies learned within university coursework (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2015; Zeichner, 2021). When delivered within school-university partnerships, opportunities to define, implement, and refine clinical experiences for TCs are maximized, thus enabling EPPs to systematically examine key elements to increase TCs readiness to teach (Snow et al., 2016; Zeichner, 2021). This article describes the multi-year development and implementation of an intensive year-long clinical experience delivered within the context of a school-university partnership. Subsequently, key

findings and lingering questions are presented to provide stakeholders, including other EPPs, with sources of information to consider within the development and delivery of clinical experiences.

School-University Partnerships

Acknowledging the importance of systematic clinical experiences, many universities continue to examine ways to create clinically rich experiences within a program of study that is cohesively linked to K–12 students and schools within partnerships (Burns & Badiali, 2018). School-university partnerships represent opportunities to develop and implement aligned clinical experiences as university faculty and K-12 school personnel engage in ongoing and substantive dialogue and collaborate to craft a common vision of effective teaching (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 2018; Gutierrez & Kostogriz, 2020). Subsequently, in carefully structuring and scaffolding learning experiences, they can create experiences that are intentionally designed to facilitate TCs' application of knowledge developed through coursework directly with K-12 students in school settings (Darling-Hammond, 2014; Goodson et al., 2019). When partnerships are

enacted as instructional communities of practice, there is an emphasis on ensuring practitioner knowledge and expertise has equal value to that of the EPP faculty (AACTE, 2018; Darling-Hammond, 2014; Supovitz, 2002). Stakeholders from each group share the responsibility for the mutual development of TCs.

Research on school-university partnerships has documented that intensive, comprehensive clinical experiences increase TCs' readiness to teach (Snow et al., 2016) and improve their evaluations early in the student teaching semester (Polly et al., 2012). Opportunities for clinical experiences should be sustained over time and characterized by the application of knowledge in increasingly complex situations, with many opportunities for reflection and collaboration with others (Brownell et al., 2019; Hammerness et al., 2005). When CEs and faculty provide consistent feedback and joint guidance originating from the same guiding principles, TCs were more prepared to teach in their own classroom (Bartanen & Kwok, 2021; Dunst el al., 2020). One study also found candidates participating in a year-long placement benefited from sustained interactions with students (Vagi et al, 2019).

Despite the benefits of school-university partnerships, there are some challenges. Notably, there is a need for considerable planning and coordination by university faculty with CEs and local education agencies to identify and establish placements where TCs can observe and practice the knowledge and skills taught in coursework for an extended period of time (Brownell et al., 2019). In larger programs, despite planning and coordination, TCs may have distinct experiences given differences in university faculty's instruction or guidance from CEs with varied knowledge and experiences (Goldhaber et al., 2017).

In seeking to better understand clinical experiences enacted within school-university partnerships, the authors engaged with a local school district to create a structured, year-long internship, referred to as the City Schools Initiative (CSI). CSI was founded on principles of effective school-university partnerships, including extended time in K-12 settings and coherence between coursework and clinical experiences. In what follows, we describe the development and delivery of the program, with specific focus on the necessary communication and coordination, and key understandings relative to each year of delivery.

Context for Program
City Schools District
The district, City Schools [pseudonym], is comprised of eight schools, including six elementary schools, which served approximately 5,459 students in the 2019-2020 school year. Five of the elementary schools were included in the partnership. The district has a very diverse student population, with a racial distribution of 33% white, 29% African American, 32% Hispanic, and 1% Asian, Native American, Native Hawaiian. Five percent of the students identify as two or more races.

University Educator Preparation Program
The collaborating EPP was an undergraduate elementary education program at a public university in the Southeast United States. The program is comprised of 60 credit hours of coursework completed over four semesters. Clinical experiences are incorporated within each semester, with the complexity of experiences and time in the field increasing during each semester, as specified within state licensure requirements. Clinical experiences within the first three semesters focus on the development of specific skills and knowledge introduced within coursework. The fourth semester, student teaching, consists of 16 weeks of full-time engagement in a classroom.

The first semester of the program, TCs enroll in coursework focused on instructional design and assessment, child development, and primary grades (K-2) reading and math instruction. Clinical experiences for this semester require TCs to spend 30-40 hours in the classroom working with individuals and small groups of students,

with a related focus on developing their capacity for instructional planning and assessment. The second semester of the program is focused upon the development of knowledge and pedagogies associated with specific content areas, including social studies, science, language arts, and math (grades 3-5). TCs also enroll in a course that is focused on applied practices in reading, which includes methods to integrate literacy into the content areas. TCs accumulate an average of 60-70 hours in a classroom, with 40-45 hours accrued during a two-week period where they spend ten consecutive days in a classroom, observing instruction and delivering lessons in each content area to small groups of students.

The final two semesters, referred to as the Year-Long Internship (YLI), are characterized by a year-long clinical placement in the same school/classroom. In the first semester of the YLI, TCs engage in coursework focused upon advanced instructional design, assessment, classroom management, and instructional differentiation. They spend 6-8 hours in the classroom each week for approximately 10-12 weeks, accumulating 70-80 hours in the classroom over the course of the semester. Within these clinical experiences, TCs teach a minimum of three lessons, delivered to small groups and the whole class, and examine facets of the classroom associated with concepts introduced in coursework. YLI clinical experiences are arranged through the College's Office of Field Experiences [pseudonym] and communicated to TCs at or near the beginning of the relevant semester. While there is some coordination that occurs between university faculty and supervising CEs, it is generalized in nature and there are no programmatic requirements regarding direct collaboration to ensure coherence between content and teaching experience. During the second semester of the YLI, TCs complete full-time student teaching, where they spend 16 weeks embedded in the classroom, gradually assuming all teaching responsibilities under the guidance of a clinical educator. TCs also receive direct support from a field supervisor from the university. Supervisors tend to be site coordinators from the Office of Field Experiences or adjunct faculty, who are either master level teachers or administrators. University faculty are typically not active within the supervision of student teachers.

Organizational Structure of City Schools Initiative
The City Schools Initiative (CSI) represented an adaptation of the previously described, "traditional" YLI. In developing and delivering the program, the authors sought to enhance the clinical experiences of TCs through a direct partnership between the program and City Schools. Three specific aspects of CSI deviated from the EPP's typical processes associated with the first semester of the YLI. First, field placements were identified and coordinated by university and district administrators, as opposed to the Office of Field Experiences, and these placements were communicated to TCs in the semester prior to the YLI. Subsequently, TCs began their clinical experiences prior to the

start of the academic year, attending district-level professional development meetings, participating in a "Meet the Teacher" event, and being present on the first day of school. Second, the required number of clinical hours per week was increased to a minimum of 10 hours over two separate days, with a related focus on TCs taking on greater instructional responsibilities. This included teaching small group and whole class lessons each week, beginning around the third week of the semester. The third adaptation is represented by the direct collaboration between university faculty and CEs to support TCs within these instructional processes. Importantly, faculty and CEs communicated regarding course content, instructional design, and procedures for conducting observations of and providing feedback on the instructional activities of the TCs.

The implementation of the partnership between the EPP and City Schools occurred across three academic years. The activities associated with each year are described, with particular attention toward the organizational facets, the coordination and communication necessary to maintain the partnership, and the key understandings that arose from each year, with subsequent references to how these were addressed or impacted delivery in the following year. Table 1 summarizes key CSI organizational features, including the number of participants and instructional activities, and displays adaptations made to the program from the understandings that originated within each year of delivery.

CSI - Development Activities and Year 1
The initial activities of the partnership encompassed an 18 month time period that included the development (Phase I) and first year of delivery of the program (Phase II). Phase I focused upon establishing the parameters of the partnership between the program representatives and City Schools' administrators and teachers. Initial meetings between administrators sought to develop organizational details of the partnership, including the selection of the clinical sites and mentor teachers, professional development activities, and formative feedback mechanisms to identify and facilitate improvements in processes and outcomes. Of critical importance was developing a relationship between the district and the program that was mutually beneficial. That is, while the educator preparation program benefited from the expertise and resources of the district, the EPP sought to provide a tangible benefit to the participating district and teachers. After discussing the district's needs, it was determined within these initial meetings that the EPP would facilitate professional development on a mutually agreed upon topic for participating CEs and TCs.

Phase I also included meetings between the team of university faculty and participating clinical educators. The goal of the meetings was to develop shared goals and understandings around pedagogical strategies and principles (e.g., high

Table 1: CSI Features Across Partnership Years

CSI Features	Year 1 (2017-18)	Year 2 (2018-19)	Year 3 (2019-20)
Funding	Small, university-funded grant, which was used to provide a stipend for CEs and to purchase books for Year 1 PD	Grant was used to purchase books for Year 2 PD	No funding
Teacher candidates	20	19	18
Clinical educators	20	19 (6 returning for second year, 13 new)	18 (10 returning for second year, 2 returning for third year, 6 new)
Faculty	4	4 (3 returning from first year)	4 (all four returning)
University courses	Classroom management and the learning environment Instructional design and pedagogy Assessment Students with exceptionalities Equity and diversity in the elementary classroom (n=14)	Classroom management and the learning environment Instructional design and pedagogy Assessment Students with exceptionalities Assessment, design, and implementation of classroom reading instruction (n=18)	Classroom management and the learning environment Instructional design and pedagogy Assessment Students with exceptionalities Assessment, design, and implementation of classroom reading instruction
TC instructional activities in elementary classrooms	TCs taught 3 edTPA Literacy lessons Some TCs taught math small groups weekly Some TCs led morning meetings and non-instructional roles (taking students to specials, lunch, etc.)	TCs taught 3 edTPA Literacy lessons TCs taught at least 3 individual or small group reading lessons TCs taught math small groups weekly Some TCs led morning meetings and non-instructional roles (taking students to specials, lunch, etc.)	TCs taught 3 edTPA Literacy lessons TCs taught at least 3 small group reading lessons TCs taught math small groups weekly Some TCs led morning meetings and non-instructional roles (taking students to specials, lunch, etc.)
CSI Features	Year 1 (2017-18)	Year 2 (2018-19)	Year 3 (2019-20)
Communication and coordination	Monthly meetings among all stakeholders prior to Year 1 launch Ongoing communication between university and district administrator University faculty provided instructions to TCs during courses and visited schools to observe and interact with TCs, CEs, and building-level administrators University faculty provided regular updates to university administrator University team participated in monthly meetings	University faculty provided instructions to TCs during courses and visited schools to observe and interact with TCs, CEs, and building-level administrators University faculty provided regular updates to university administrator University faculty created and shared newsletters that contained information relevant to all stakeholders University faculty created and shared tools to support communication between TCs and CEs about sharing instructional roles and responsibilities in the classroom	University faculty and administrator provided orientation to CEs over Zoom University faculty only entered schools to complete observations and feedback. Supervision during student teaching was virtual for the entire spring semester University faculty provided TCs with course activities and suggestions during virtual synchronous courses to address any concerns
Professional development (PD)	Focus: Effectively teaching children from low-income backgrounds, grounded in Paul Gorski's (2018) *Reaching and Teaching Students in Poverty: Strategies for Erasing the Opportunity Gap* Format: Book study, in which TCs summarized portions of the book and the group engaged in discussion focused on classroom application	Focus: Instructional practices to engage students in active learning, grounded in Himmele and Himmele's (2017) *Total Participation Techniques: Making Every Student and Active Learner* Format: Book study, in which TCs led sessions by targeting specific instructional techniques described in the book	None

leverage practices, classroom management) between the stakeholder groups. Furthermore, the groups discussed methods to deliberately and systematically link course content and assignments with experiences in the clinical setting to enhance TCs' classroom teaching and learning opportunities. Instructional design requirements for the university were presented and plans were made to ensure the TCs could develop instructional plans under joint guidance of the university faculty member and CE. Finally, university faculty presented information on programmatic assessment requirements, e.g., edTPA, to ensure CEs were familiar with them.

Phase II commenced with TCs beginning their YLI, simultaneously completing coursework and engaging in clinical experiences within their

assigned classroom. During the first year of CSI, all participating TCs (n=20) were enrolled in courses focused on classroom management and the learning environment, instructional design and pedagogy, assessment, and students with exceptionalities. Fourteen of the TCs were also completing a course focused on equity and diversity in the elementary education classroom. Phase II culminated in the student teaching experience.

Communication and Coordination
Communication represented a focal area, especially within Phase I, as the parameters of the partnership were discussed and developed among the university and district stakeholders. Monthly meetings among all stakeholders commenced six months prior to the first semester of the YLI. Subsequently, the university administrator and district administrator regularly communicated between the scheduled meetings to discuss ongoing organizational facets and to ensure continuity within participation among the stakeholders. The latter was important as placement changes proved necessary just prior to the start of Phase II due to changes in CE responsibilities or, in some cases, CEs leaving the district. The university administrator associated with the project provided TCs with information on their school placement and CE approximately three months prior to the beginning of Phase II, with recommendations for contacting the CE prior to the end of the academic year to maximize opportunities to participate in the district's beginning of the year activities.

Primary communication in Phase II (Year 1) shifted as the course instructors adopted more active roles within these processes. For example, the instructors provided detailed and explicit directions to TCs within course-based interactions. Several instructors regularly visited school sites to observe and interact with TCs, which also provided direct opportunities to hold formal and informal conversations with building-level administrators and CEs. Information was then shared with the university administrator, who continued to communicate with the district administrator on a regular basis. The university team met monthly to discuss ongoing developments, with the instructors engaging in informal conversations to make ongoing adaptations at the course level.

Key Understandings
Various formative and summative data was collected during Year 1 to assess the program as well as to develop key understandings to plan for future iterations of the program. With regard to district personnel, in addition to documented communications among the stakeholders, a questionnaire was sent to CEs approximately halfway through the first semester to collect information on successes and challenges and to note areas for improvements. Data collection from TCs, the primary beneficiaries of CSI, was more extensive and included reflections, questionnaires/surveys, teaching observations, edTPA scores, and focus group interviews.

Several key understandings developed as a result of the analysis of the data sources. Paramount among the themes was that the extended time in school settings provided opportunities for TCs to develop relationships with each other, CEs, and course instructors. Furthermore, TCs noted the deeper relationships with the students as a result of being in the classroom multiple days. These relationships resulted in more effective interactions with the students, as measured through observations conducted using the CLASS instrument (see Putman et al., 2022). The CEs felt the TCs were able to gain a greater understanding of the scope of the activities that occurred across a full school day and had more opportunities to engage in non-instructional activities, i.e., managing the whole class while going to and from different locations in the school. In turn, the CEs noted that TCs were more comfortable in the classroom and building having spent many hours there.

Interestingly, communication was cited by both the TCs and CEs as an area that needed additional emphasis within the program in the future. This included faculty to faculty and faculty to CE communication. For example, TCs felt the faculty did not coordinate with each other regarding assignments and due dates, thus creating anxiety for the TCs as well as challenges to meet the expectations associated with the assignments and faculty. Similarly, information about due dates was not shared with CEs, thus, they felt they could not effectively offer proactive support within the completion of various assignments. The need for time and space to be set aside for meetings between the CEs and faculty members as well as meetings between TCs, CEs, and faculty was identified. Outside of these meetings, it was deemed important to develop a newsletter or a calendar that reflected significant dates and deadlines, which could be accessed by TCs and CEs and updated on an ongoing basis.

While the professional development provided opportunities for TCs to learn about supporting students from low wealth backgrounds and to apply that knowledge in their presentations, there was consensus among university faculty, district leaders, and clinical educators that the professional development should have been more informal and provided for conversation among the participants, as opposed to oriented towards presentations about content and concepts with limited time for discussion. Professional and personal responsibilities also impacted CEs engagement with the readings for the professional development sessions, thereby limiting the intended benefits.

CSI - Year 2
In Year 2 of the CSI, a new group of TCs began their YLI during the fall semester. Similar to Year 1, the first semester of YLI included completing coursework and participating in field experiences within the classrooms of their assigned clinical educators. All participating TCs (n=19) were enrolled in the same set of courses as Year 1(i.e., classroom management and the learning environment, instructional design and pedagogy, assessment, and students with exceptionalities). All TCs also completed a new course focused on elementary literacy assessment and data-driven individualized and small-group targeted literacy instruction. Within the course, TCs learned about the schools' approaches to using data to inform instructional decision making. They also conducted and analyzed a variety of literacy assessments with a focal student(s) in their placement classroom to identify strengths and areas of instructional need, developing and implementing a plan for individualized or small-group literacy instruction. The addition of this course further increased TC's instructional opportunities during their first semester of their YLI. Again, Year 2 of CSI culminated in the student teaching experience; however, due to the pandemic, roughly half of student teaching occurred virtually.

Communication and Coordination
Communication between the university and district administrators commenced approximately six months prior to the start of Year 2 as the university and district administrators met to discuss ongoing facets of the program, including professional development. The district administrator communicated with building principals to create a list of CEs and to determine the number of placements at each school location. Due to staffing and position changes, a number of CEs were unable to participate in Year 2, thus a final list of placements was generated in May, limiting the opportunity to hold meetings with faculty and CEs prior to the end of the school year. As a result, an orientation meeting was held in August, which included the university administrator and faculty, TCs, the district administrator, and CEs.

Similar to Year 1, during the first semester of TC's YLI, course instructors again played active roles in communicating with TCs during courses about their clinical experiences and connections among coursework and clinical experiences. Course instructor visits to school sites to observe and interact with TCs in their placement classrooms and to communicate formally and informally with building-level administrators and clinical educators also continued.

To address communication challenges that were reported by TCs and CEs during year one, a course instructor created and shared newsletters that contained information relevant to all stakeholders during year two. Specifically, newsletters included reminders for CEs (e.g., providing feedback to TCs on their instruction, supporting TCs work on course assignments), reminders for TCs (e.g., meeting with their CE one per week, working weekly with small groups), important links (e.g., TC course assignment calendar), reminders about important dates (e.g., faculty observations, PD sessions), and contact information for CSI course instructors. The newsletters provided a way to ensure that all stakeholders received consistent information about important events

and key roles of individuals and groups within the PDS partnership.

Through interactions during coursework, faculty identified that TCs were having a wide range of opportunities to provide instruction in their clinical classrooms, with some TCs taking on few roles and others taking on many roles. To support TC and CE communication about sharing instructional roles and responsibilities, faculty designed a table to guide TCs and their CEs to reflect on instructional opportunities in which TCs were already engaged and to intentionally plan for TCs to take on additional instructional roles and responsibilities throughout the semester. Because these conversations initially took place during a joint professional development session, some CEs who also participated in Year 1 shared their experiences, and how they shared instruction with their TC.

lessons on which they received feedback from both their CEs and course faculty. Finally, TCs found it beneficial to have opportunities to attend both district and school-level professional development sessions and discuss these experiences with their CEs and grade-level partners.

While TCs valued the strong relationships they build with CEs and other school-building personnel, they also recognized room for improvement in these areas. Based on conversations during course sessions, it became clear to university faculty that there was variation in TCs' opportunities to take on additional instructional roles and responsibilities throughout the semester. In addition to developing a newsletter to provide partnership information to all stakeholders, faculty also developed resources to guide communication among TCs and CEs about sharing instructional roles and responsibilities in

study and coursework to their teaching. This included designing and implementing instruction that promoted higher-order thinking and active learning among their students. Furthermore, TCs' questionnaire responses revealed challenges associated with making connections across courses that focused on similar topics. For example, while TCs were enrolled in two courses that were related to assessment, they didn't make explicit connections among these courses with regard to using data to inform instruction. Finally, TCs' questionnaire responses suggested that they would benefit from additional support to build a deeper understanding of the diversity of students in their classrooms and in planning responsive instruction.

CSI - Year 3
Year 3 of the partnership took place between August, 2020 and June, 2021 in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the pandemic, the district modified students' attendance and instruction, with half of the elementary students attending school on Mondays and Tuesdays and the other half attending school on Wednesdays and Thursdays. On Fridays teachers taught virtual lessons via Zoom. Given this schedule, TCs were present in their clinical classrooms in person two days each week, with additional opportunities to facilitate virtual learning on Fridays with CEs. The district retained this format for the entire fall semester, but moved to a 100% virtual format from January, 2021 to February, 2021. As a result, TCs' student teaching experience included both a virtual and in-person component. Below we describe aspects of Year 3 of the partnership.

Online coursework. During the Fall 2020 semester, all participating TCs (n=18) were enrolled in the same set of courses as in Year 2. Due to the conditions associated with the pandemic, TCs participated in bichronous instruction (Martin et al., 2020) on Zoom that included synchronous and asynchronous class activities and in-person clinical activities. During synchronous sessions, faculty were able to utilize breakout rooms to enable TCs to complete activities similar to previous years of the partnership, including looking at samples of student work and providing feedback, examining the partner districts' curriculum resources, and developing plans to establish and maintain learning environments. Since TCs still worked with students during their clinical practice experiences, the course assignments did not change from previous years. TCs also still taught weekly lessons to small groups, in person and virtually.

Communication and Coordination
Due to the pandemic and related need for immediate adaptations, communication between the administrators was very limited, primarily consisting of emails that occurred approximately three months prior to the start of the academic year. While CEs were identified and communicated to TCs to ensure participation in beginning of the year activities, direct coordination between the district and university was severely curtailed. Furthermore, communication with CEs changed

> In-person observation with immediate feedback after the lesson were deemed of vital importance. Subsequently, a request was sent to the district administrator involved in the project to obtain permission for faculty to enter schools and conduct in-person observations of TCs

Key Understandings
Key understandings from Year 2 were informed by communication among faculty and the university administrator, communication among faculty and CEs, communication among faculty and TCs, interactions among stakeholders during professional development sessions, and questionnaires completed by TCs at the end of their CSI experience.

A number of key understandings emerged from Year 2 of the partnership. Based on preliminary analysis of TCs' response to the questionnaire, Year 2 TCs again emphasized the benefits of immersing themselves in elementary-grade classrooms early and often. They regarded the additional time in classrooms as providing a number of benefits, including supporting them to build strong professional relationships with their CEs and grade-level teaching partners, the students in their classrooms, and with parents. Other benefits TCs referenced related to having additional time in the classroom, including the many opportunities they had to plan and teach

the classroom as part of joint PD, which may have been especially important for the 13 CEs who were new to the partnership during Year 2. Thus, during Year 2, a key takeaway was the importance of supporting CEs to understand their roles and mentors and CEs to ensure that they were providing both the mentorship and time needed to provide increasing instructional opportunities for TCs throughout their internship experiences.

One additional challenge reported by TCs in their responses to the questionnaire was related to time management. TCs noted that despite the value of increased instructional responsibilities in the classroom, managing their time and balancing priorities was challenging. For example, TCs found it particularly challenging to take on additional responsibilities early in their student teaching semester while simultaneously trying to complete edTPA.

A final take away from Year 2 was that TCs would have benefitted from additional support to apply learning from the professional development book

due to the lack of physical in-person orientations and meetings. Faculty and CEs met via Zoom for a 60 minute orientation session that included opportunities for past CEs to share advice to new CEs and for faculty to seek input from CEs on specific concepts that should be emphasized in courses and clinical activities that could be modified. One suggestion that arose and was implemented involved having TCs plan the small group mathematics lessons on their own and rely less on being given specific resources from the CEs.

The district level policies resulting from the pandemic required additional coordination to enable the continuation of the in-person observations provided by faculty during the first two years of CSI. While the faculty discussed conducting observations virtually, the benefits of in-person observation with immediate feedback after the lesson were deemed of vital importance. Subsequently, a request was sent to the district administrator involved in the project to obtain permission for faculty to enter schools and conduct in-person observations of TCs. This request was granted, allowing faculty to move forward. This provision meant that observations in the fall would be different from those conducted during student teaching, which were being conducted virtually.

Key Understandings
Data collected in Year 3 primarily consisted of focus groups interviews conducted with TCs. TCs continued to identify opportunities to build relationships and the extended opportunities to be present within the classroom as the most beneficial aspects of the partnership. Given the context, TCs reported that participating in an online open house with caregivers also served as a method to establish themselves as teachers. TCs also identified the school-based, teaching observations conducted by the faculty as one of the most positive aspects of the partnership. Specifically, they noted the ability to receive constructive feedback on their teaching before full-time student teaching as an important facet.

Anecdotally, faculty realized that while leading this cohort with online courses and less time in schools, there was a need to be more explicit and detailed with communication and expectations for TCs' activities. The newsletter and e-mails became the primary manner that faculty used to communicate with TCs. Faculty also recognized the necessity of being explicit in embedding recommendations for clinical practice in courses as assignments. For example, instead of suggesting to TCs and CEs that candidates teach mathematics in small groups each week and look at student work, TCs had to teach small groups and write weekly reflections about their experiences teaching, informally assessing, and building relationships with their small group.

Summary of Lessons Learned and Future Considerations
Beyond the key understandings, CSI led to a number of insights associated with effectively delivering clinical experiences within school-university partnerships. They include: the necessity of communication and coordination within planning and delivery of the experiences, the importance of attention toward resource allocation and usage, and the need for documentation of partnership activities. Furthermore, within each of these insights, there are questions that remain unanswered and some that arose during the delivery of the program.

Regular communication and coordination represent critical areas of focus to maximize the likelihood of successful partnerships.

> Participation in CSI ultimately facilitated candidates' ability to connect theoretical constructs related to effective teaching practices to application in the classroom through the extended community built amongst the TCs, faculty members, and the CEs

Within CSI, the administrators, faculty, and CEs engaged in discussions across the planning and delivery of the program each of the three years, albeit in limited ways in Year 3. Subsequently, and perhaps as expected, the most beneficial approaches were the in-person meeting in Years 1 and 2. These provided a regular venue for the planning and coordination necessary to align expectations and perspectives. Similarly, the ongoing in-person professional development activities conducted with TCs and CEs enabled information to be communicated to both groups simultaneously, thereby ensuring consistency. The monthly newsletter evolved as a communication mechanism, becoming an important source of information for important dates and reminders about activities that TCs should be doing in classrooms. During Year 3 when the pandemic prevented in-person meetings, the newsletter became the primary form of communication. Lastly, communication at the building level, which was necessary for ongoing support of TCs, was facilitated by assigning university-based faculty to specific schools. This enabled "in the moment" conversations that could address situations or ongoing questions that arose at various points in the semester.

Planning for the effective allocation of resources, both financial and human, are important. Grant and university funding was used to purchase resources for professional development and provided a small stipend for CEs given the additional expectations within their role. Subsequently, the majority of the CEs participated in the professional development meetings and there was general receptivity to the support mechanisms, i.e., observations, that were necessary to maximize TCs' growth. Despite the lack of continued financial resources in Year 3, the number of CEs that participated for a second year was high, thus demonstrating financial resources are helpful, but not the sole determinant of participation. Anecdotal conversations revealed that CEs valued the opportunities to mentor TCs and students benefited from the additional classroom instructional support.

In terms of human resources, it became apparent that a multi-year partnership in a small district is challenging, given the limited number of teachers who met state qualifications to serve as CEs and who were willing to work with TCs each year. Long-term sustainability and expansion represent focal points for future planning, especially with regard to personnel. At the district-level, there is a need to consider how to have a critical mass of experienced CEs, while also having some form of rotational system in place to avoid over-taxing those most willing to participate. Similarly, it is important to consider how experienced CEs can acquire a more significant leadership role within the program. Within the university, there is the immediate need to consider mechanisms to ensure the sustainability of the program beyond the primary administrator and faculty involved, while also determining ways to expand the model to other schools and districts. This means examining resource allocation as well as incentives to participate, considering whether this is adequately represented in the promotion and tenure processes.

Additionally, there is a need to be more explicit and nuanced about documenting the various mentorship activities between CEs and TCs during the partnership. Focus groups and surveys with TCs indicated that CEs provided feedback and support in various ways, but as the data was reviewed, many reports were general and did not include specific examples about how CEs mentored and supported TCs. Data from CEs as well as a more detailed report and analysis of mentorship activity would be helpful for the partnership and could be used to inform others implementing similar programs.

Early data analysis has revealed positive effects of participation in CSI on candidate-student interactions and teacher self-efficacy, both generally and specific to culturally responsive teaching (see Putman et al., 2022). Anecdotally, principals have also shared that by the end of student teaching, TCs were exhibiting skills more aligned with a first-year teacher. However, the long-term impact of the program on practices and effectiveness is not yet known. Given the number of CSI TCs that were hired by the district (Year 1, 13; Year 2, 7; Year 3, 6), there is the potential to investigate outcomes using metrics such as teacher effectiveness ratings and student performance data. Relatedly, a question that will require greater examination is why larger

percentages of TCs are not seeking/accepting or being offered positions within the district.

Finally, several questions arose at the candidate-level based on feedback from TCs and performance data collected. Associated with the ubiquitous references to the relationships formed through participation in CSI, when two or more TCs were placed on the same grade level team, the candidates cited this structure as enhancing their experience, including improved teaching performance. Thus, further investigation is needed to determine the overall impact on TCs' performance and efficacy. TCs also felt that additional time should have been built into CSI to allow them to actively reflect upon their experiences. They indicated that with the course schedule, course assignments, and requirements for clinical experiences, there was little time to process some of the experiences and content. Thus, within the structure of delivery, a future question involves considering how to more effectively integrate time for TC reflection. Finally, in the first two years of the program, CSI faculty supervised TCs within the student teaching semester. It is not clear if this impacted performance; yet, given what is known about relationships and the development of instructional communities of practice (Supovitz, 2002), there is a potential positive correlation between TC performance and supervision.

Conclusion

Scholars continue to call for educator preparation programs (EPPs) to examine programmatic attributes and structural features that contribute to TCs' preparation to enter the complex and challenging environment of today's schools (Burns & Badiali, 2018). CSI was an intensive, structured field experience that was created and delivered through a school-university partnership. Examining the various facets associated with CSI revealed the importance of communication and collaboration within the partnership to maximize the benefits for all stakeholders. Participation in CSI ultimately facilitated candidates' ability to connect theoretical constructs related to effective teaching practices to application in the classroom through the extended community built amongst the TCs, faculty members, and the CEs (see Putman & Polly, 2021; Putman et al., 2022). Yet, there are questions that remain unanswered to ensure the long-term success of the partnership in producing teachers who can engage students in high quality learning opportunities.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2018). *A Pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation.* Author.

Bartanen, B., & Kwok, A. (2021). Examining clinical teaching observations scores as a measure of preservice teacher quality. *American Educational Research Journal*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831221990359

Brownell, M. T., Benedict, A. E., Leko, M. M., Peyton, D., Pua, D., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2019). A continuum of pedagogies for preparing teachers to use high-leverage practices. *Remedial and Special Education, 40*, 338-355. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932518824990

Burns, R. W., & Badiali, B. J. (2018). Clinical pedagogy and pathways of clinical pedagogical practice: A conceptual framework for teaching about teaching in clinical experiences. *Action in Teacher Education*, *40*(4), 428-446. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2018.1503978

Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. M. (2015). Framing teacher preparation research: An overview of the field, part 1. *Journal Of Teacher Education*, *66*, 7-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114549072

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 547–561. https//:doi.org/10.1080/0161956x.2014.939009

Dunst, C. J., Hamby, D. W., Howse, R. B., Wilkie, H., & Annas, K. (2020). Research Synthesis of Meta-Analyses of Preservice Teacher Preparation Practices in Higher Education. *Higher Education Studies, 10*, 29-47. https://doi.org 10.5539/hes.v10n1p 29

Goldhaber, D., Cowan, J., & Theobald, R. (2017). Evaluating prospective teachers: Testing the predictive validity of the edTPA. *Journal of Teacher Education, 68*(4), 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117702582

Goodson, B., Caswell, L., Price, C., Litwok, D., Dynarski, M., Crowe, E., Meyer, R., & Rice, A. (2019). *Teacher preparation experiences and early teaching effectiveness*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

Gorski, P. C. (2018). *Reaching and teaching students in poverty: Strategies for erasing the opportunity gap.* Teachers College Press.

Gutierrez, A., & Kostogriz, A. (2020). The influence of chronotopes on pre-service teachers' professional becoming in a school-university partnership. *Teachers and Teaching, 26*, 475-489. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1873761

Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 358-389). Jossey Bass.

Himmele, P. & Himmele, W. (2017). *Total participation techniques: Making every student an active learner* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

Polly, D., Frazier, J. W., Hopper, C., Chapman, M. W., & Wells, R. (2012). Examining the influence of a support seminar on pre-service teachers' preparedness for student teaching. School-University Partnerships: The Journal of the National Association for Professional Development Schools, 5(1),102–107.

Putman, S. M., Cash, A. H., & Polly, D. (2022). Examining the impact of structured clinical experiences within a school-university partnership on student-teacher candidate instructional interactions. *The Teacher Educator*. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2021.2014006

Putman, S. M., & Polly, D. (2021). Examining the development and implementation of an embedded, multi-semester internship: Preliminary perceptions of teacher education candidates, clinical educators, and university faculty. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *96*(1), 99-111. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2020.1864250

Snow, D., Flynn, S., Whisenand, K., & Mohr, E. (2016). Evidence sensitive synthesis of Professional Development School outcomes. *School-University Partnerships*, *9*(3), 11-33.

Supovitz, J. (2002). Developing communities of instructional practice. *Teachers College Record*, *104*, 1591-1626.

Vagi, R., Pivovarova, M., & Barnard, W. (2019). Dynamics of preservice teacher quality. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 85*, 13–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.005

Zeichner, K. (2021). Critical unresolved and understudied issues in clinical teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *96*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2020.1864241