

A Review of School-University Partnerships for Successful New Teacher Induction

Carolyn S. Hunt, Illinois State University

ABSTRACT: The first few years of teaching are a critical time in the development of expert teaching. However, many universities are missing valuable opportunities to foster diversity and critical thinking by participating in the professional development of new teachers. This literature review explores research into how universities have attempted to support school districts as they work to implement more intensive forms of new teacher induction. The review demonstrates that school-university partnerships have strong potential for connecting theory to practice in meaningful ways in the first years of teaching. The author offers suggestions for implementing successful partnerships for new teacher induction and introduces questions for future research in the field.

NAPDS Essentials Addressed: #2/A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community; #3/Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need; #4/A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants; #8/Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings

Introduction

The benefits of school-university and Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships for preservice teachers are well documented, and it is widely acknowledged that PDS programs have great potential for improving teacher quality. As Darling-Hammond (2010b) argued, “Creating high-quality professional development schools that construct state-of-the-art practices in communities where students are typically underserved is critical to transforming teaching” (p. 43). Benefits of PDS programs to preservice teachers include more authentic learning experiences, more confidence in their knowledge and readiness to teach, more structured field experiences with more consistent feed-

back, and opportunities to act as professional colleagues (Darling-Hammond, 2010b; Edwards, Tsu, & Simpson, 2009). Benefits to the school include improved veteran teacher practices, gains in student performance, and higher teacher retention rates (Darling-Hammond, 2010b; Edwards et al., 2009).

Despite these clear benefits of PDS programs, the first years of teaching can be extraordinarily challenging for new classroom teachers. Although most PDS models include professional development and support for inservice teachers and may implement specific strategies for new teacher induction, the bulk of the research on PDSs focuses on preservice teachers (Burton & Greher, 2007). Therefore, it may be advantageous to explore the potential benefits of expanding school-univer-

sity partnerships to include more comprehensive efforts for intensive new teacher induction. Such explorations may shed light on how principles from Professional Development Schools and the wider research on new teacher induction can be used in concert to more fully support novice teachers in their first year.

Unique Challenges for Novice Teachers

A specific focus on new teacher induction is important because the first few years of teaching are a critical time in the development of expert teaching (Davis & Higdon, 2008). New teachers enter the classroom with a wide variety of preservice experiences. Whether they enter the field through a traditional teacher education program or an alternative route to certification, they are rarely fully prepared to successfully meet the myriad challenges of teaching (Cuddapah & Clayton, 2011). Faced with increasingly diverse classrooms and intense pressures to perform to professional and curricular standards, new teachers struggle to apply what they know about teaching in meaningful ways (Worthy, 2005). Thus, nearly 50% of all new teachers choose to leave the profession within the first five years (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Induction programs have been designed and implemented across the country, in both PDS and traditional settings, in an attempt to provide beginning teachers with the kinds of supports necessary to become effective professionals.

Currently, most teacher induction programs are initiated within individual school districts and vary widely in effectiveness (Buczynski & Sisserson, 2008). The most common program design has been to assign more experienced teachers to serve as one-to-one mentors (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Unfortunately, without sufficient support, mentors often fall into the role of a “buddy” who checks in with the new teacher as few as

two or three times per year (Stanulis & Floden, 2009; Worthy, 2005). More intensive induction is needed in order for new teachers to successfully navigate the challenges of teaching in a diverse, high-stakes environment while ensuring that all students learn (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Wong, 2004).

Intensive New Teacher Induction

Intensive new teacher induction programs are those which consist of “bundles or packages of supports” (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004, p. 38). One of the most important components of this support package is a quality mentor from the same field, but other supports are also necessary in order to increase the retention and efficacy of new teachers (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004; Wong, 2004). Intensive induction can take many forms, but successful programs have been shown to offer time for new teachers to collaborate with others (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004) and to observe the modeling of effective teaching (Wong, 2004). Additional components of successful programs include appropriate support from administrators and induction that continues beyond the first year of teaching (Wong, 2004). Tenore, Dunn, Laughter, & Milner (2010) added that induction should be a school-wide effort to provide a network of support aimed at integrating beginning teachers into a professional learning community. The primary goal of intensive induction should be “to prepare strong teachers who participate in a community of educators and over time become leaders in their schools, districts, and the broader educational community” (Stanulis, Burrill, & Ames, 2007, p. 137).

The need for intensive induction experiences is supported through current educational policies such as *Race to the Top* which encourages districts competing for federal grant money to provide supports to teachers and principals in an effort to enhance teacher effectiveness and improve student achieve-

ment (Goldrick, Osta, & Maddick, 2010). In response, states have proposed new policies for teacher induction which include improvements such as expanding mentoring beyond the first year of teaching, careful selection and training of mentors, and more time for teachers and mentors to work together (Goldrick et al., 2010). To assist with the challenge of providing quality induction programs for new teachers, some universities have partnered with school districts (Buczynski & Sisserson, 2008; Cuddapah, & Clayton, 2011; Davis & Higdon, 2008; Stanulis & Ames, 2009; Staunulis & Floden, 2009). The purpose of this article is to explore ways in which universities can support school districts as they work to implement more intensive forms of induction to support new teachers.

Partnerships for New Teacher Induction

Universities have not traditionally been involved in the induction of beginning teachers. New teachers have been expected to enter the field as full professionals with little opportunity for apprenticeship or mentoring (Worthy, 2005). The result is that many new teachers are left feeling helpless and overwhelmed and may abandon what they have learned in teacher education programs in order to survive their first year (Worthy, 2005). This gap between the university and the everyday classroom is exacerbated by the fact that university involvement in the field is often indirect, infrequent, generic, and disconnected from the community (Sleeter, 2008, Worthy, 2005). Many universities are missing valuable opportunities to foster diversity and critical thinking by participating in the professional development of new teachers (Sleeter, 2008).

Nevertheless, the extension of university support into the first years of teaching holds strong potential for ensuring high quality teachers for all students. As Feinman-Nemser (2001) stated,

Building an induction program that extends and enriches initial preparation and addresses the realities of specific teaching contexts would provide a forum for school and university educators to think together about the learning needs of teachers and K-12 students. It would also provide a basis for designing more powerful and coherent forms of ongoing professional development. (p. 1038)

She further argued that learning to teach should be seen as a continuum that extends after college into the first few years of teaching and that school-university partnerships to support new teachers are a requirement for serious induction that builds on preservice preparation. Similarly, Solomon (2009) argued that current teacher education programs cannot continue as isolated institutions but must combine their efforts with the school districts that they serve. New relationships with schools are needed in order to help teachers to connect theory to practice in ways that can leverage change (Darling-Hammond, 2010a).

Fortunately, there are many examples of successful university-school partnerships which can light the way for districts and universities that want to overcome these obstacles in order to provide intensive induction for new teachers. For instance, PDS principles are a good foundation for intensive induction because they include goals to “support professional teaching practice, to enhance the professional education of novice and veteran teachers, and to encourage research and inquiry related to educational practice” (Sandholtz & Dadlez, 2000, p. 7). Furthermore, some Professional Development Schools have made significant efforts to provide intensive new teacher induction (e.g. Gilles, Wilson, & Elias, 2009). Additionally, some universities have partnered with districts solely to support new teacher induction (e.g. Chubbuck, Clift, Allard, & Quinlan, 2001). The studies included in this review highlight

some of the most effective strategies and difficult challenges in implementing intensive new teacher induction within partnerships between universities and schools.

Method

I conducted a literature search using EBSCOhost, ERIC, and Google Scholar. Key descriptors and search terms included *new teacher induction*, *mentoring*, *novice teachers*, *beginning teachers*, *school-university partnerships*, and *professional development schools*. The review was limited to peer-reviewed journal articles published since 2000. Articles were only included in the review if new teacher induction through a school-university partnership was the primary focus of the article. As such, articles that mentioned new teacher induction as a component of the partnership but did not specifically address it in their research questions were not included. I carefully read each of the 25 selected articles at least twice and wrote detailed abstracts, which included citation information, the purpose of the article, research questions, methods, findings, implications, and salient quotes. I then generated initial codes (Miles & Huberman, 1994) from the abstracts. Finally, I conducted an in-depth thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2006) to identify common themes. These themes, discussed in detail below, included: new teachers' perceptions of induction, the effects of induction programs, mentor training, induction in alternative certification programs, and conflicting ideologies between schools and universities.

What New Teachers Have to Say About Induction

New teachers often experience high levels of stress, fatigue, and insecurity as they negotiate their previous understandings with the realities of teaching (Worthy, 2005). They are

frequently given the most challenging teaching assignments (Andrews, Gilles, & Martin, 2007; Fletcher, Strong, & Villar, 2008) which can lead to frustration and an intense need for both professional and emotional support (Chubbuck et al., 2001; Worthy, 2005). Studies that consider the voices of new teachers can shed light on these needs and point the way towards providing the best possible supports.

One such study, conducted by Chubbuck et al. (2001), examined the expressed needs of novice teachers and how those needs were met within the Novice Teacher Support Project (NTSP). The NTSP is a partnership between a university and two regional offices of education in Illinois that aims to support new teachers as they move from initial to standard licensure. They evaluated formative evaluations from the first and second years of the project and found that new teachers expressed the need for more access to practical and logistical information, more time to dialogue with experienced teachers, and opportunities to reflect on their practice with others in the same situation. The novice teachers strongly expressed the need for emotional support from their peers in a safe environment separate from colleagues who might negatively evaluate their ideas, such as senior staff and administrators. A school-university partnership is ideal for meeting the varied needs of beginning teachers. Universities can provide a non-evaluative space for peer discussions while schools can provide valuable contextual information.

In a similar study, Andrews et al. (2007) reported the support strategies used within a new teacher induction program funded by a grant partnership between two universities and surrounding districts in a mid-city to semi-rural environment. Surveys were given to beginning teachers and administrators in order to determine which supports were actually provided and which were perceived as the most valuable. Statistical analyses of the survey data revealed a discrepancy between

the supports administrators believed were available and those actually reported by the beginning teachers. Data also showed that the supports that new teachers considered most valuable such as time for collaboration with other teachers were provided the least often. Mentors were the most common form of support, but there was a large variance in the perceived quality of the mentoring experiences.

Wilkinson (2009) conducted a survey of seven cohorts within an alternative certification program to determine beginning teachers' satisfaction with the level and types of support from mentors, colleagues, and administration. Effective forms of support included help with lesson planning, finding materials, and making difficult teaching decisions. Survey data indicated that the cohorts who received more consistent support had higher retention rates than the cohorts who reported less support. In this program, the university was involved with the school district's induction program in meaningful and intensive ways. The university was involved in the recruitment and selection process of teachers, provided a full time coordinator and program leaders with release time from college teaching, provided training to administrators and mentors, held weekly seminars, and facilitated peer interaction among new teachers.

Gilles, Wilson, and Elias (2010) interviewed past and present teacher fellows, mentors, and administrators about their perceptions of the action research component of a teacher fellowship program supported by a PDS between a Midwestern university and a local elementary school. They explored how action research contributed to collaboration and what factors added to the program's growth and sustainability. The participants indicated that action research encouraged teacher accountability, interactions between staff, and a cycle of professional growth. The authors concluded that action research allows for teacher ownership and collaboration,

which can be powerful agents for change especially with university support. This teacher fellowship program is a powerful example of how professional development schools can support intensive new teacher induction (Gilles & Wilson, 2004; Gilles, Wilson, & Elias, 2009).

These studies show that beginning teachers often benefit from and desire intensive forms of support in their first years of teaching and that there are ways that universities can foster such support. For example, Gilles et al. (2009, 2010) demonstrated how university faculty can help connect theory to practice by facilitating action research as part of a professional development school initiative. This sort of support builds on teachers' experiences within their school contexts and allows novices to be agentive within a professional learning community. Another possible role of the university is to provide a non-evaluative space for beginning teachers to explore difficult issues and to develop their professional identities (Andrews et al., 2007; Chubbuck et al., 2001). These studies also highlight the importance of administrative support. However, administrators are not always prepared to offer intensive supports and may have different perspectives of their induction program than novice teachers (Andrews et al., 2007). Administrators may need training in intensive induction and building school capacity for professional learning communities (Andrews et al., 2007), and universities can be a valuable resource in providing such professional development (Wilkinson, 2009).

Although these studies offer valuable insights into the specific needs of new teachers, there are some significant limitations. For instance, only the perceptions of teachers involved in the programs were considered, and there were no control groups of teachers participating in other programs or not receiving induction support. Therefore, it is difficult to determine whether these induction programs are more effective than

other less intensive programs. Moreover, the primary warrant of these studies is that teacher induction is important because it can increase the low retention rates that are particularly common among high-needs schools. While teacher retention is a pressing issue, it is also critical to foster quality teaching. Data from classroom observations and measures of student achievement may help to identify the components of effective induction programs for new teachers.

The Effects of New Teacher Induction

There are several compelling reasons to include measures of teaching practices and student achievement when evaluating new teacher induction programs. For instance, retention of new teachers is only helpful if the participants are high quality teachers who are able to teach effectively in the given environment. As Fletcher et al. (2008) argued, "A goal of an ideal induction program is not only to improve retention of new teachers but also to help them become effective instructional leaders" (p. 2283). Moreover, solid evidence of the effectiveness of programs can assist policy makers in making fully informed decisions (Fletcher et al., 2008) and may be necessary to secure the funding for successful intensive induction for new teachers (Wood, 2001). Several studies offer evidence of the positive effects of intensive induction programs beyond retention and job satisfaction.

Luft, Roehrig, and Patterson (2002) examined the effects of three different types of induction programs for new secondary science teachers. Three groups of five teachers each experienced different levels of support. The first group received university-based, science-focused induction which consisted of workshops and site visits throughout the year conducted by a university faculty member or research assistant. The second group participated in formal induction activities planned and implemented by school administrators

and staff. The third group received informal supports from other teachers as needed. Using semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and collected documents, the researchers found that the beginning teachers in the science-focused support group implemented more student-centered and inquiry-based lessons, held beliefs which were more closely aligned with student-centered teaching practices, and felt fewer constraints to their teaching than new teachers in the less intensive induction programs. The authors concluded that there is a need for more specialized induction support specific to teachers' content areas and that such support is best provided when universities and school districts work together.

Fletcher et al. (2008) analyzed elementary students' total reading scores on the Stanford Achievement Test in three California school districts in order to determine how variation in teacher support programs are related to student achievement. Using a value-added model and a regression equation, they determined that class factors such as percentage of minority students, percentage of poverty, and the level of prior achievement had negative impacts on measures of student achievement, which appeared to limit the effectiveness of new teachers. They also found that new teachers were more likely to be assigned to these classes with more diverse and impoverished children and that the students of new teachers in mentoring programs were more likely to make gains in achievement than the students of the experienced teachers in the study. They concluded that mentoring programs may have a positive effect on student achievement and that closing the achievement gap may depend on supporting new teachers.

Davis and Higdon (2008) described The Teachers Fellow program, a partnership between one university and several school districts in central Texas, which has been in operation since 1994. The program offers newly certified elementary teachers a \$15,000

fellowship which includes tuition, mentoring support, and a master's degree in lieu of a district salary. The university supplements the districts' induction program with seminars and graduate coursework for new teachers and training for mentors. The new teachers participate in activities such as analyzing videotapes of their lessons, reflective journal writing, peer coaching, and a classroom based inquiry project. A qualitative study compared five teachers who participated in the program and five teachers who only participated in the districts' induction program and found that the teacher fellows were more likely to use effective teaching practices such as hands-on activities and modeling and that they received more frequent and meaningful support from their mentors (Davis & Higdon, 2008). In an earlier study of the same program, Davis and Waite (2006) identified several strengths of the program including providing a mentor in the same field, time for collaboration, and an external network of support. They argued that the school district-university partnership offered a unique opportunity for the sharing of resources and for linking theory and practice.

Stanulis and Floden (2009) compared twelve teachers who participated in an intensive mentoring program developed between an urban, Midwestern school district and the local university to a group of twelve teachers who did not participate. The participating teachers participated in eight after school beginning teacher sessions and were paired with a mentor who was released one day of each week to work with several new teachers. The group that received more intensive mentoring demonstrated a greater use of effective teaching skills as evidenced by the AIMS observation instrument and expressed more positive views about their mentoring experiences. The university provided training for the mentors that consisted of six hours per month of focused study groups and six professional development sessions throughout the year.

Helfledt, Capraro, Capraro, Foster, and Carter (2009) described a partnership between one university and six urban school districts in a program designed to recruit new teachers into high needs schools. Teachers in the program took a full-time, paid, year-long teaching internship in lieu of student teaching. The university participated in the selection, initial training, and continued professional development of mentors and provided an online learning community for interns. The internship was shown to be effective through several means. There was a 100% retention rate among the interns, and they remained in their positions at a higher rate than other teachers in the state despite assignments in challenging, urban schools. Through statistical analysis of the Teaching Intern Professional Scale given at the beginning and ending of the year, the researchers determined that there was significant growth in the participants' confidence, readiness to teach, and self efficacy. Furthermore, the interns were consistently rated as proficient by their administrators as demonstrated by a state-mandated evaluation tool.

These studies make a valuable contribution to the literature and exhibit several strengths. They utilized control groups in order to make direct comparisons between teachers who received intensive induction and those who did not. Additionally, they use mixed methods designs which allowed for a more systematic evaluation of programs while still considering the new teachers' perspectives. This wider view successfully demonstrates the benefits of induction beyond teacher retention and job satisfaction and makes a strong case for the investment in partnerships to support new teachers.

Training Mentors for Intensive Induction

Across the studies reviewed thus far, the importance of providing high quality mentors has been frequently identified as a crucial

investment for effective new teacher induction. Moreover, the research on Professional Development Schools has often highlighted the need for training mentors for teacher candidates and novice teachers (Nolan et al., 2009; Sandholtz & Dadlez, 2000; Sandholtz, 2002; Witsell et al., 2009). A few researchers have focused specifically on the training of mentors for new teacher induction and demonstrated ways in which universities can contribute to quality mentoring (Ganser, 2002; Gilles & Wilson, 2004; Kelley, 2004; Moss, 2010; Myers, McMillan, Price, Anderson, & Fives, 2007). For example, Evertson and Smithey (2000) conducted a comparison between twenty-three mentors who participated in workshops designed in partnership with two school consortia in a large Midwestern state and twenty-three mentors who participated only in their district's orientation sessions. The treatment group of mentors participated in a four-day initial mentor training workshop and monthly follow-up sessions given by university facilitators from two universities. In the workshops, mentor teachers used a variety of activities such as role playing and analyzing case studies to explore central questions related to quality mentoring, and they learned specific techniques for working with novice teachers. Analysis of video-taped interactions between mentors and novice teachers in both groups revealed that the treatment group used conferencing skills more effectively. According to meeting notes and goal setting forms, the mentors in the treatment group were more likely to make specific plans for supporting the new teachers and were more likely to elaborate about which mentoring activities needed to be done, how they would be accomplished, and the expected results. Classroom observations indicated that novice teachers of mentors in the treatment group rated higher on effective teaching practices such as motivating students and managing behavior and that student outcomes improved earlier in the semester. Based on these findings, the authors claim

that "a mentor alone is not enough; the mentor's knowledge and skills of how to mentor are also crucial" (p. 303).

This study has strengths and weaknesses. One strong point is the use of a wide variety of evidence to determine the effectiveness of the mentor training including the mentors' perceptions, analysis of mentors in action, reviews of written plans, teacher practices, and student outcomes. A weakness is the short, three-month time period for the study. More longitudinal studies are necessary in order to determine what lasting effects training programs for mentors may have. Additionally, there was unexplained variance between the two school sites in the areas of task-avoiding and disruptive behavior among students. The authors did not attempt to explain this finding, but it could suggest that some factors related to school capacity and cultures are not easily overcome by mentoring alone.

In another study devoted to mentor training, Stanulis and Ames (2009) explored the ways in which one experienced teacher conceptualized her role and struggled to create learning opportunities for the new teachers assigned to her. The mentors in this program were recruited and interviewed by university induction leaders and the school district's human resource managers. Each mentor was matched with three novice teachers according to teaching responsibilities and was released from their teaching duties one day of each week in order to work in the mentee's classrooms. The university provided six days of professional development throughout the year and mentors participated in six hours of mentor study groups each month. The study showed that these training opportunities enabled one mentor to differentiate her mentoring practices in order to meet the individual needs of new teachers. Specific supports were designed in response to the mentor's requests and included methods such as providing relevant articles and mentoring coaches to support the development of mentoring skills. The authors concluded that

induction providers need to carefully and seriously consider the needs of mentors and beginning teachers.

Although this study focused on just one mentor, it provides a valuable, close up view of a mentor's work. As the authors argue, case studies such as this one are a good source for new mentors and mentor trainers to examine difficult situations and to spark discussions of possible strategies for working with novice teachers. University faculty members, especially those who are already participating in professional development school partnerships, are uniquely positioned to assist mentors as they grapple with the challenging work of supporting new teachers.

Alternative Certification Programs

Another possibility for school-university partnerships is the development of alternative certification programs. Due to teacher shortages of highly qualified teachers in high-needs schools, more than 40 states have created alternative pathways to teacher certification (Darling-Hammond, 2010a). There is a wide body of research on school-university partnerships for alternative certification (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2005; Rice, 2010; Zeichner & Schulte, 2001). Several studies have highlighted ways in which universities can support new teacher induction as part of the alternative certification route (Cuddupah & Clayton, 2011; Masci & Stotko; Wilkinson, 2009).

Masci and Stotko (2006) evaluated the Professional Immersion Masters of Arts in Teaching (ProMAT) program which is a cooperative alternative certification program between Johns Hopkins University and Montgomery County Public Schools in Maryland. In this program, new teacher candidates commit to serving several years in the increasingly urban district in exchange for tuition assistance for 39 hours of graduate level coursework based on the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Principles. The

candidates complete methodology courses and student teaching in their first year of the program and are teachers of record in their second year. The university provides support throughout the two years in the form of initial methodology classes, weekly observations and feedback from a university supervisor, and participation in an online network. The school provides a mentor for the second year of the program but does not provide release time, thus meetings between the mentor and intern must occur during common free times or after school. The authors administered exit surveys of new teacher satisfaction and analyzed students' Praxis II Pedagogy scores. They argued that this alternative certification partnership is a good model for others to follow based on the high degree of intern satisfaction and higher Praxis scores than other teacher candidates across the state in four out of six certification areas.

Cuddupah and Clayton (2011) analyzed a professional cohort designed for new teachers from alternative certification programs within the framework of Wegner's communities of practice. The cohort was a partnership between the university and the school district which offered fifteen bi-weekly two-hour sessions for new teachers led by experienced educators referred to as co-facilitators. The university contributed to the program by assisting with the design of the induction program and training and coaching the co-facilitators. The authors claimed that the cohort was a valuable opportunity for novice teachers working in urban schools to develop a sense of community in which they could share information about teaching practices, negotiate meanings, and develop an identity as a teacher.

Wilkinson (2009) described an alternative certification program that recruits teachers for a large urban district. In exchange for a five-year commitment to teaching in the district, a district foundation pays tuition for a graduate-level teacher preparation program provided by a local university. The program includes a

comprehensive teacher induction program with a wide variety of supports. Wilkinson (2009) is supportive of alternative certification programs because of their effectiveness at recruiting teachers for underserved schools and because they include a higher percentage of minority teachers than traditional teacher education preparation programs. Despite these positive elements of alternative certification programs, one can question the feasibility of placing teachers in classrooms with little previous experience, pedagogical knowledge, or exposure to foundational educational theories. Alternative certification programs can be successful when implemented properly, but some are “truncated programs that short circuit essential elements of teacher learning” (Darling-Hammond, 2010a, p. 240). Such programs could serve as indoctrination into the status quo of a particular school rather than an induction into quality teaching.

Despite disagreement about the effectiveness of alternative certification programs, there are some lessons to be learned about school-university district partnerships in these studies. Primarily, there is clearly a need for effective intensive induction programs specifically geared to the unique needs of new teachers working in challenging urban schools with high turnover rates. As Rice (2010) argues,

Regardless of the source and type of their preparation, novice teachers entering these [struggling] schools may need site-specific training, induction, and professional development that will prepare them to be effective in the particular environments in which they are teaching. Researchers and policymakers should work toward identifying and investing in high-quality, site-specific training for teachers working in particularly challenging environments. (p. 170)

Traditional colleges of education that aim to prepare teachers for diverse, urban com-

munities and struggling schools need to find ways to match the on-site support offered through these programs. Traditional programs also lack the diversity among teacher candidates that is represented in these studies and may need to modify recruitment and admission practices in order to make teacher education more accessible to candidates from underserved communities (Sleeter, 2008). Professional Development Schools can be seen as a compromise between traditional colleges of education and alternative certification programs because they maintain the benefits of traditional programs while addressing some of the issues of preparing teachers to teach in diverse settings (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995) and retaining teachers (Latham & Vogt, 2007).

Conflicting Ideologies

Whether school-university district partnerships exist within alternative certification or traditional programs, there are likely to be difficulties and conflicts as schools and universities develop collaborative relationships (Darling-Hammond, 2010a). Collaborations between university researchers and school practitioners necessarily involve the sharing of power across “lines of turf” (Buczynski & Sisserson, 2008). There is a large body of research exploring the tensions that can arise within school-university partnerships (e.g., Brown et al., 2010; Ledoux & McHenry, 2008; Lefever-Davis, Johnson, & Oearman, 2007; Martin, Snow, & Torrez, 2011; Parkinson & Welsh, 2009; Stephens & Boldt, 2004). The following research studies illuminated some of the conflicts that can occur when the theory of the university collides with the practice of the school during new teacher induction efforts.

Buczynski and Sisserson (2008) described an induction program in the Southwestern United States in which university professors co-taught classes for new teachers with instructors provided by the school district. This co-

teaching arrangement allowed for the connection of theory to practice in an interesting way. The participants felt as though the university instructors offered a solid understanding of theory while the district instructors were able to connect class content directly to district standards and contexts. The study found that the classes were effective at encouraging the sharing of instructional practices among new teachers, and they had the unanticipated effect of increasing the teachers' openness to the concept of co-teaching. However, it was necessary for the co-instructors to negotiate their roles which were affected by professional identities and institutional affiliation. Additionally, the new teachers did not view the two instructors equally and were confused at times by what they perceived as varying expectations.

Stanulis et al. (2007) described Michigan State University's normative-reductive development of a conceptual framework for a new teacher induction component of their teacher education program. First, an advisory board of teachers and administrators was formed in order to form an initial draft. Then, ten induction consultants who were experienced educators were hired to design an induction curriculum. Philosophical conflicts arose between the university faculty and the consultants throughout the design and implementation of the curriculum, and negotiation was necessary in order to agree on foundational concepts that served the purposes and needs of the university, the schools, and the new teachers. The university faculty believed that the purpose of induction should be to encourage new teachers to participate in a collaborative learning community, to make informed teaching decisions, and to become educational leaders. In contrast, the induction consultants believed that the main purpose of induction was to help the new teachers fit into the existing school culture and to provide them with general strategies for classroom management. The authors explained how they compromised in order to allow for the induction consultants' "cynicism of reality."

Although negotiation is essential in order to develop an induction program that is viable, it is also important to work toward changing a status quo which views teaching as control and limits the abilities of teachers to meet the needs of their students. This study raises the question of how universities can help new teachers to implement best practices despite pressures to "fit in" without forcing a philosophical agenda on a school in a top-down manner. The authors hinted at a possible solution when they shared how the new teachers in the program expressed a desire to talk with their mentors about deeper issues than procedures. Rather than arguing over their own agendas for induction programs, university and school faculty could benefit from listening to the voices of new teachers and carefully considering their needs. These studies illustrate the importance of maintaining open lines of communication within school-university partnerships in order to ensure that all stakeholders agree about the purposes of induction and to promote successful problem solving.

Looking Forward

The examples shared in this paper illustrate some of the ways that universities can successfully partner with school districts in order to provide quality induction programs for new teachers as well as some of the challenges. Yet, there is still much to learn about the possibilities of such partnerships. What other specific actions can universities take in order to ensure that the training and support that they offer to new teachers and their mentors is meaningful and effective? Are certain activities more helpful than others? How might professional development schools extend their involvement into the first years of teaching? What are the advantages and disadvantages of different spaces for teacher learning? Should mentoring partnerships operate differently for urban, diverse, or high poverty districts than they do for more

mainstream districts? What are the long term benefits of induction programs? These are just a few of the questions left to be answered as universities and school districts work together to assist new teachers to connect theory to practice in ways that will allow for increased student achievement.

More research is needed on the particular effects of school-university partnerships in new teacher induction. Many of the studies reviewed here focused on general supports for induction rather than on the specific impact of the university's contributions. Moreover, additional research is needed on the effects of induction partnerships in high-needs urban and rural schools. New teachers in these schools are often recruited through alternative routes. How can traditional teacher education programs and PDS programs recruit and retain teachers in such schools?

Most importantly, more research conducted by teachers and university faculty working within school-university partnerships is needed. Professional Development Schools around the country are committed to supporting preservice and inservice teachers in a variety of ways. The National Association for Professional Development Schools (2008) names as an essential component of PDS partnerships the "ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need" (p. 3). As such, it is likely that new teacher induction is a focus for many of these initiatives. In fact, many studies mention supporting new teachers and those who mentor them (e.g., Hoffman, Dahlman & Zierdt, 2009; Nolan et al., 2009; Witsell et al., 2009), yet there are very few research studies that specifically examine teacher induction with PDS partnerships. Research that highlights the important work that teachers and university faculty are doing in their daily work to support new teacher induction can be useful for other PDS schools and for those involved in alternative forms of school-university partnerships. ^{SUP}

References

- Andrews, S. P., Gilbert, L. S., & Martin, E. P. (2007). The first years of teaching: Disparities in perceptions of support. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 4-13.
- Buckzinsky, S. & Sisserson, K. (2008). School district and university co-teaching: Toward instructional synergy in an induction/M. E. program. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 17(1), 47-74.
- Burton, S. L., & Greher, G. R. (2007). School-university partnerships: What do we know and why do they matter? *Arts Education Policy Review*, 109(1), 13-22.
- Chubbuck, S. M., Clift, R. T., Allard, J. & Quinlan, J. (2001). Playing it safe as a novice teacher: Implications for programs for new teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(5), 365-384.
- Cuddapah, J. L., & Clayton, C. D. (2011). Using Wenger's communities of practice to explore a new teacher cohort. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(1), 62-75.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010a). Construting 21st century education. In V. Hill-Jackson & C.W. Lewis (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What went wrong with teacher education, and how we can fix it* (pp.223-247). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010b). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 35-47.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughling, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(8), 597-604.
- Davis, B., & Higdon, K. (2008). The effects of Mentoring/Induction support on beginning teachers' practices in early elementary classrooms (K-3). *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 22(3), 261-274.
- Davis, B. H., & Waite, S. F. (2006). The long-term effects of a public School/State university induction program. *The Professional Educator*, 28(2), 1-10.
- Edwards, G., Tsu, A. B. M., & Stimpson, P. (2009). Contexts for learning in school-university partnership. In A.B.M. Tsui, G. Edwards, & F. Lopez-Real (Eds.), *Learning in school-university partnerships: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 3-24). New York: Routledge.
- Evertson, C. M. & Smithey, M. W. (2000). Mentoring effects on proteges' classroom prac-

- tice: An experimental field study. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(5), 294–304
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013–1055.
- Fletcher, S., Strong, M., & Villar, A. (2008). An investigation of the effects of variations in mentor-based induction on the performance of students in California. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2271–2289.
- Gamser, T. (2002). Building the capacity of school districts to design, implement, and evaluate effective new teacher mentor programs: action points for colleges and universities. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 10(1), 47–55.
- Gilles, C., & Wilson, J. (2004). Receiving as well as giving: Mentors' perceptions of their professional development in one teacher induction program. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 12(1), 87–106.
- Gilles, C., Wilson, J., & Elias, M. (2009). School-university partnership: Perceptions of the teachers. *School-University Partnerships*, 3(1), 100–112.
- Gilles, C., Wilson, J., & Elias, M. (2010). Sustaining teachers' growth and renewal through action research, induction programs, and collaboration. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 37(1), 91–108.
- Goldrick, L., Osta, D., & Maddock, A. (2010). Race to the top: Phase two: Teacher induction and teaching and learning conditions. *The New Teacher Center*, 1–10.
- Helfeldt, J. P., Capraro, R. M., Capraro, M. M., Foster, E., & Carter, N. (2009). An urban schools-university partnership that prepares and retains quality teachers for "high need" schools. *The Teacher Educator*, 44(1), 1–20.
- Hoffman, P., Dahlman, A., & Zierdt, G. (2009). Professional learning communities in partnership: A 3-year journey of action and advocacy to bridge the achievement gap. *School-University Partnerships*, 31(1), 28–42.
- Humphrey, D., & Wechsler, M. (2005). Insights into alternative certification: Initial findings from a national study. *Teachers College Record*, 109(3), 483–530.
- Ingersoll R. & Smith, T. M. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NAASP Bulletin*, 88(638), 28–40.
- Kelley, L. M. (2004). Why induction matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(5), 438–448.
- Latham, N. I., & Vogt, W. P. (2007). Do professional development schools reduce teacher attrition?: Evidence from a longitudinal study of 1,000 graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(2), 153–167.
- Ledoux, M. W., & McHenry, N. (2008). Pitfalls of school-university partnerships. *Clearing House*, 81(4), 155–160.
- Lefever-Davis, S., Johnson, C., & Pearman, C. (2007). Two side of a partnership: Egalitarianism and empowerment in school-university partnerships. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 100(4), 204–210.
- Luft, J. A., Roehrig, G. H., & Patterson, N. C. (2003). Contrasting landscapes: A comparison of the impact of different induction programs on beginning secondary science teachers' practices and beliefs. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(1), 77–97.
- Martin, S. D., Snow, J. L., & Franklin Torrez, C. A., (2011). Navigating the terrain of third space: Tensions with/in relationships in school-university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(3), 299–311.
- Masci, F. J., & Stotko, E. (2006). Preparing high quality teachers for urbanized schools: A program evaluation of a partnership model. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(1), 46–68.
- Moss, J. (2010). A partnership in induction and mentoring: Noticing how we improve our practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(7), 43–53.
- Myers, S. D., McMillan, S., Price, M. A., Anderson, C. W., & Fives, H. (2007). Partnering with secondary schools to prepare highly qualified teachers: Alternative certification through a professional development school model. *Journal of the National Association for Alternative Certification*, 2(1), 18–27.
- National Association for Professional Development Schools. (2008). *What it means to be a professional development school*. Retrieved from <http://napds.org/9%20Essentials/statement.pdf>.
- Nolan, J., Badiali, B., Zemabl-Sau, C., Burns, R., Edmondson, J., . . . Wheland, M. (2009). The Penn State-State College Elementary professional development school collaborative: A profile. *School-University Partnerships*, 3(2), 19–30.
- Parkinson, D. D., & Welsh, K. M. (2009). Is authentic cross-cultural collaboration possible between universities and public schools within a professional development school model? Perceptions from the field. *School-University Partnerships*, 3(1), 14–27.
- Rice, J. K. (2010). High stakes accountability and teacher quality: Coping with contradictions. In

- V. Hill-Jackson & C.W. Lewis (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What went wrong with teacher education, and how we can fix it* (pp.153-177). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Sandholtz, J. H. (2002). Inservice training or professional development: Contrasting opportunities in a school/university partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(7), 815-830.
- Sandholtz, J. H. , & Dadlez, S. H. (2000). Professional development school trade-offs in teacher preparation and renewal. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 27(1), 7-27.
- Sleeter, C. (2008). Equity, democracy, and neoliberal assaults on teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(8), 1947-1957.
- Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681-714.
- Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston teacher residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 478-488.
- Stanulis, R. N., & Ames, K. T. (2009). Learning to mentor: Evidence and observation as tools in learning to teach. *The Professional Educator*, 33(1), 1-11.
- Stanulis, R. N., Burrill, G., & Ames, K. T. (2007). Fitting in and learning to teach: Tensions in developing a vision for a university-based induction program for beginning teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 34(3), 135-147.
- Stanulis, R. N. & Floden, R. E. (2009). Intensive mentoring as a way to help beginning teachers develop balanced instruction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60 (2), 112-122.
- Stephens, D., & Boldt, G. (2004). School/university partnerships: Rhetoric, reality, and intimacy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(9), 703-707.
- Tenore, F. B., Dunn, A. C., Laughter, J. C., & Milner, R. H. (2010). Teacher candidate selection, recruitment, and induction: A critical analysis with implications for transformation. In. V. Hill-Jackson & C.W. Lewis (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education: What went wrong with teacher education, and how we can fix it* (pp.93-118). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Wilkinson, G. A. (2009). Supportive induction slows the revolving door. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 4(1), 97-110.
- Witsell, K., Keenan, D., Nelso, F., Daniel, L., Syverud, S., Hall, K., & O'Farrell, C. (2009). Evolving through collaboration and commitment: The story of the North Florida urban professional development school partnership. *School-University Partnerships*, 3(2), 42-57.
- Wong, H. K. (2004). Induction programs that keep new teachers teaching and improving. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88(638), 41-58.
- Worthy, J. (2005). "It didn't have to be so hard": The first years of teaching in an urban school. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(3), 379-398.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Schulte, A. K. (2001). What we know and don't know from peer-reviewed research about alternative teacher certification programs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(4), 266-282.



Carolyn S. Hunt is an instructional assistant professor in the School of Teaching and Learning at Illinois State University. Her research interests include embedded professional development, literacy coaching, and second language literacy.