Educational Partnerships to Advance Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation

Kenneth R. Howey, *Senior Fellow, Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government*
Nancy L. Zimpher, *Chancellor, State University of New York*
April 2010

Commissioned by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education for the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning

INTRODUCTION

Here we offer a *rationale* for our belief that partnerships are critical to the preparation of teachers, especially their clinical preparation, and to parallel school renewal as well. Next, drawing upon years of experience working in a variety of educational partnerships, we submit as well a *set of recommendations* to guide future partnership development and sustainability. We acknowledge the paucity of research on partnerships and do not assume strong empirical support for what we suggest. Rather, we present this paper as a heuristic tool designed to stimulate needed dialogue about just what types of educational partnerships are needed, why, and what it will take for these partnerships to provide high quality clinical preparation.

A RATIONALE FOR PARTNERSHIPS

The preparation of teachers is a critically important and complex endeavor, and there is considerable evidence that, in many instances, this preparation has been inadequate. In a recent major study of teacher preparation, Levine (2007) concluded:

> Teacher education is the Dodge City of the education world. Like the fabled Wild West town, it is unruly and chaotic. Anything goes and the chaos is increasing as traditional programs vie with nontraditional programs, undergraduate programs compete with graduate programs, increased regulation is juxtaposed against deregulation, universities struggle with new teacher education providers, and teachers are alternatively educated for profession and craft.

In this rapidly changing environment, the study warns, America's teacher education programs must demonstrate their relevance and their graduates' impact on student achievement – or face the very real danger that they will disappear (p.3).

A second set of data, derived from those studies documenting the rapid withdrawal of tens of thousands of novice teachers from teaching, especially in challenging school settings, implicates the nature and quality of teacher education in this retreat from the profession. Howey (2010) portrayed the problems as follows:

> The exodus of teachers is most pronounced in urban, high-poverty schools. Teachers are not only leaving the profession in increasing numbers, but early in their careers as well. Unless major changes are made in the next five years, more than a million of our newly minted teachers will leave these schools for other teaching positions – and in many instances leave teaching altogether. Two major problems intersect. While youngsters drop out of school for a variety of reasons, their lack of

> academic success is the key factor. The primary determinant of student academic success, regardless of the conditions in which these youngsters live, is a competent and caring teacher. Likewise, teachers leave for a multitude of reasons. However, the inadequacy of their initial preparation to make them ready specifically to teach in high-poverty urban schools, combined with a lack of support and high-quality professional development once they assume a position, are key factors in their early departures. The quality of teaching speaks directly to the student retention problem, and the quality of teacher preparation speaks directly to both the teacher retention problem and to the quality of teaching (2010, p.1).

Another reason for this revolving-door exodus of so many teachers is the type of school in which they began their teaching. If we are to stem the flood of newly minted teachers who are quickly exiting teaching, then we need to view teacher preparation as part, albeit likely the most critical part, of an interrelated sequence of policy/practice endeavors, including recruitment, initial preparation, placement, retention and optional career paths and leadership roles for veteran teachers.

Twenty years ago the Holmes Group (shortly to become the Holmes *Partnership*) began its milestone report, *Tomorrow's Schools*, with this rationale for a network of lighthouse partnership endeavors they referred to as Professional Development Schools:

> The whole Holmes Group effort hinges on a complex set of reforms happening all together: liberal education – that is, deep understanding of the disciplines by teachers and their students; reconstituted, coherent education studies; and clinical studies expertly supervised in authentic, exemplary settings. Where they all come together is in the Professional Development School – in essence, a new institution. By "Professional Development School" we do not mean just a laboratory school for university research, nor a demonstration school. Nor do we mean just a clinical setting for preparing student and intern teachers. Rather, we mean all of these together: a school for the development of novice professionals, for the continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession (1990, p.1).

Tomorrow's Schools, from this vantage point, made a compelling case for the continuing development of teachers in the promotion of more ambitious conceptions of teaching and learning, suggesting it as the primary means of school renewal. The report called as well for relevant, responsible research and development, done in schools and with teachers centrally engaged in these scholarly endeavors along with their university colleagues. The confluence of these ambitious goals, the leaders of the Holmes Group asserted, called for nothing less than inventing a new institution: "The foregoing principles call for such

profound changes that the Professional Development School will need to devise for itself a different kind of organizational structure, supported over time by enduring alliances of all the institutions with a stake in better professional preparation for school faculty" (1990, p.7).

While inroads have been made across the country in instituting PDSs and Partner Schools, enabled by the pioneering work of practitioners/scholars like Levine and Trachtman (2009) and the standards for such schools developed by NCATE, much work remains to be done to meet the original goals put forth by the Holmes Group. Further, major challenges confront us more centrally now than 20 years ago. Systemic, strategic responses to the following questions have not been forthcoming:

- **How can we *recruit* more competent and caring individuals into teaching, especially individuals of color who are primary stakeholders in schools largely populated by low-income, minority students?**
- **How can we prepare teachers in preparation programs that have explicit missions and curricula specifically designed to build on diverse cultural and ethnic capital, and at the same time address conditions that constrain low-income youngsters from succeeding in school?**
- **How can we ensure that more experienced, highly qualified teachers are assigned to these low-income schools first, to meet the needs of the students therein, and second, to provide high-quality support to programs of induction for novice teachers placed in those settings?** The problems of initial teacher placement and teacher distribution across schools generally have been exacerbated, not resolved, and the implementation of well-conceived programs of induction remains uncommon.
- **How can universities, school districts and teacher unions jointly select and prepare highly qualified clinicians and coaches who have not only the talent but also the time to assist prospective, novice and even veteran teachers?** Policies and practices to support such individuals, both on university campuses and in P-12 school districts, are lacking.
- **How can prospective teacher competencies and, especially, their impact on student learning be better determined through multiple measures and assessment procedures over time?**

As Elliott (2010) points out, this last challenge intersects with two other critical and complementary assessment challenges. First, we need to more effectively address how teachers can better gain proficiency in assessment procedures themselves to both advance their students' learning and to improve their teaching. They are woefully lacking in these abilities at present. Second, we need to address how teachers can better influence the rapid development of state longitudinal data systems on individual

students and teachers and use these data to better understand students, communities and schools. Elliott underscores the necessity of collaboration for all parties to more effectively generate and apply key data elements, as follows:

> All (three) can most effectively be mastered by candidates when they are exposed to environments where there are close working relationships among the various school and preparation program partners, where collaboration and mutual responsibility are expected, and where engagement with data to understand and solve problems is nurtured (2010, p.1).

John Goodlad, for a quarter of century, has promoted the *simultaneous* renewal of teacher preparation and P-12 schools in the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). The NNER, using study results that eventually became the Agenda for Education in a Democracy, was founded on the understanding that praxis is crucial to the renewal of schooling. Clark, Foster, & Mantle-Bromley (2006) spoke to this agenda as follows:

> There must be a clear connection between theory and practice. Those who develop theory and those who practice in the field must work closely together. Across a variety of settings and among different kinds of institutions – urban, rural; research-extensive, four-year liberal arts; northeastern, southern and western – we have discovered congruency among boundary–spanning positions in school-university partnership work (2006, p.22).

To summarize this rationale for partnerships, we contend, as do so many others, that initial teacher preparation and continuing teacher education, especially as embedded in the school site and within the instructional day, are the primary drivers of continuing school renewal. Praxis is critical to the renewal of both teacher preparation and the conduct of schooling. Theory both informs and is derived from practice, and the roles of professors and teachers can often be blended in a variety of boundary-spanning positions. Teacher preparation should be more clinically driven, but not merely as a capstone experience separated from academic preparation. As we have illustrated in a companion paper on clinical preparation, even coursework in general or liberal studies, not just in the disciplines for which teachers are preparing to teach, can have a strong clinical component. We illustrated this by describing a course in urban sociology that had prospective teachers engage in a rigorous asset mapping experience with parents and youngsters in the neighborhood surrounding a central city school.

We believe that in order to prepare highly qualified teachers, the in-depth knowledge and scholarly traditions of universities need to be present and be more clinically rich. The schools in which clinical experiences are anchored should fully manifest the attributes called for in *Tomorrow's Schools*. If these PDS beacons of light are to shine further and more brightly, P-12 schools and schools of education

will need to exert more leadership. Finally, if new and badly needed clinical practitioner roles are to be forthcoming, the teacher unions will have to pick up the torch. Often, individual roles and responsibilities will need to be blended while institutional and organizational lines are blurred and made more permeable. For example, teachers will be asked to share more fully in the instruction and assessment of prospective teachers and will often participate as partners in scholarly inquiry. Alternatively, professors will need to demonstrate their teaching abilities with P-12 students periodically and participate more fully in the redesign and renewal of P-12 schools. Teacher unions will have to expand their professional platforms to drive new teacher leadership and clinical practitioner roles.

A WORKING DEFINITION OF PARTNERSHIPS

We turn now to a brief delineation of the core attributes of an educational *partnership* before we share, from our experience, those policies, conditions and actions that we have found make them work.

Clifford and Miller (2007), aided by a grant from the National Science Foundation, reviewed the literature on partnerships between the P-12 sector and institutions of higher education and termed these K-20 partnerships. After reviewing a disparate literature, they determined that the partnership construct needed more precise definition. We applaud their work and share their conclusions here as helpful in differentiating partnerships from a host of other working and social relationships and institutional exchanges. They identified four common patterns, primarily from organizational studies, and drew on these to develop the following definition:

> A K-20 partnership is an organization (i.e., a social entity in which people routinely engage together in tasks) that is formed through a formalized agreement among partners, comprising at least one actively-engaged college/university and one actively-engaged K-12 school district and is intended to accomplish mutual benefits that the partners, alone, could not accomplish (2007, p.11).

They go on to elaborate on four attributes. In order to be a partner organization, goals are shared; routines are established which persist over time, thorough paths of interpersonal relationships and tasks are routinely completed. Next, they require partnerships to represent at least two different organizations, not just individuals from different organizations. Partnerships call for *formalized arrangements*. The partner organizations have to commit to support the work that is undertaken by individuals within the organizations. In the absence of such formal commitment, individuals from different organizations would be viewed as having working relationships. The third element of their working definition underscores that there are mutual, not necessarily equal benefits, which can include knowledge advancement, improved

reputation, the provision of services (often unavailable otherwise), and organizational/professional learning and change. The fourth and final element of their definition focuses on *interdependence* among partners. Partners need one another to achieve ends they could not, or at least could not easily, achieve by themselves.

A WORKING EXAMPLE OF AN EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIP

To this point, our references have been to partnerships primarily between higher education and the K-12 sector, and particularly as manifested in Professional Development or Partner Schools. While the initial preparation of teachers is often the core activity in of these schools, we have emphasized from the outset that PDSs are also concerned with the continued development of experienced professionals as the primary means of school renewal and as laboratories for relevant research and development.

More recently, the two of us have been engaged in broader, community-wide partnerships that attempt to develop more seamless "educational pipelines" for all students, beginning with stronger preschool interventions for many youngsters living in or on the edges of poverty and extending to access to and success in post-secondary education. These *cradle-to-career partnerships* engage a wide range of stakeholders and, while maintaining the goals of PDSs, they embrace even more ambitious missions. .The STRIVE partnership in Cincinnati is seen as a prototype in this regard. It has five major goals, as follows, with indicators to assess the degree to which the goals are achieved.

Goal 1: Every child will be PREPARED for school.

The first three years of a child's life, when the human brain develops more rapidly than at any other subsequent period, are a time of enormous social, emotional, physical, and intellectual growth. For children to grow into successful adults, they need supportive and healthy early foundations.

OUTCOME INDICATOR: *Percent of children assessed to be ready for school, employing the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment for Literacy (KRA-L).*

Goal 2: Every child will be SUPPORTED in and out of school.

In order for students to succeed, they must be supported inside and outside of school. Awareness and understanding of what children and youth are currently experiencing socially and emotionally are critical to helping them succeed academically.

OUTCOME INDICATOR: *Percent of students with more than 20 developmental assets, employing the Search Institute's Developmental Assets framework.*

Goal 3: Every child will SUCCEED academically.

Student academic success is the core objective of all the strategies implemented as a part of STRIVE. Education partners from early childhood through college are committed to establishing

high standards for all students and providing a rigorous curriculum that challenges students and prepares them with the skills and knowledge to succeed in the 21st century.

OUTCOME INDICATORS:

Percent of students at or above proficiency in reading and math.
Percent of students who graduate from high school.

Goal 4: Every student will ENROLL in College.

Ensuring that more students enroll in education beyond high school is vital to our region's economic health. To be successful, students need rigorous academic preparation, college-access advice and financial support.

OUTCOME INDICATOR:

Average score on the ACT.
Percent of graduates that enroll in college.

Goal 5: Every student GRADUATES and ENTERS a career.

The 21st century global economy demands education beyond high school, whether it is a high-skilled certification or a two-or four-year degree. The benefits include increased income, job growth and better health and well being.

OUTCOME INDICATOR:

Percent of college students prepared for college level coursework.
Percent of students who are retained in college.
Percent of students who graduate from college.
Number of college degrees conferred.

Progress towards these goals is measured annually and reported to the community at large.

LESSONS LEARNED ABOUT EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS

We believe that the lessons we have learned in working with cradle-to-career partnerships are applicable as well to PDS partnerships, and we turn to those now. We have identified an interrelated set of eight conditions and activities that reflect successful K-12 partnerships, often extending beyond the mission of PDSs and the attributes identified by Clifford and Miller.

The eight are as follows:

1. Developing a clear, mutually agreed upon mission with success for *all* students at its core.
2. Negotiating a correspondingly clear theory of action or complementary theories of action.
3. Emphasizing shared accountability while often differentiating responsibilities.
4. Exerting strong leadership, often shared and distributed, with authority over budget, personnel and institutional priorities.

5. Making the distinctive properties, strengths and limitations of each partner as clear and transparent as possible as a means of engendering respect for each partner's culture and organization.
6. Negotiating and developing boundary-spanning roles and responsibilities.
7. Pursuing integrative change strategies and simultaneous renewal.
8. Employing continuing assessment and regular reporting to the community while acknowledging and rewarding the contributions of different partners.

A CLEAR, MUTUALLY AGREED UPON MISSION WITH SUCCESS FOR *ALL* STUDENTS AT THE CORE OF THE AGENDA

Whether the partnership is binary (between P-12 schools and teacher educator providers), trinary (formed between the university or universities, the school district and the teachers union), or community-wide (with all major stakeholders involved, including the civic, corporate, business, religious, grass roots, and philanthropic sectors as well as the educational partners), our position is that success in school for all children should be at its core. The key to that academic success is that all children have competent and caring teachers.

In the systemic cradle-to-career partnerships we are concerned with creating a more sustainable, seamless educational system. We are committed to systemic change. Systemic change is complex, costly and long-term. The changes which will be required to ensure success for all students will come neither easily nor quickly, but our firm belief is that they will come. Thus, we must be very clear and in collective agreement about the nature of our mission and willing to stay the course over several years. Systemic change is not about a specific model of school "reform," but rather about building capacity and overcoming problems at the partnership, district, school and classroom levels so that a reasonable form of continuous improvement can occur for *all* involved. In order to do this, it is essential to focus on the interrelationships and interdependence of the primary aspects of the educational enterprise. The following propositions illustrate this and guide our systemic change strategy and tactics:

- High quality learning is directly related to high quality teaching.
- High quality teaching is directly related to high quality initial teacher preparation and continuing professional development.
- High quality teaching is also directly related to how well schools are organized for success. Empirically supported elements of effective schools include a supportive and collaborative school culture, a climate characterized by caring relationships, a fluid organizational structure, and shared instructional leadership.

- Schools that serve as centers of their communities underscore the need for community engagement in and responsibility for the success of their schools. Communities strengthen schools and schools strengthen their communities.
- The quality of a school as an entity, its organization, culture, and climate, is directly related to the vision and leadership provided by the district, the union and the broader community partnership in which universities can serve as the *lead anchor* institution.
- While the provision of high quality teachers for to every all youngsters is the key to success, these community-wide partnerships are also able to address numerous types of out-of-school support for youngsters as well, and not only in terms of their education but also their health and welfare (Howey, 2006, pp. 19,20).

One brief anecdote might help underscore collective agreement about staying the course in terms of the core STRIVE mission to encourage *all* children to succeed in school, graduate and have access to post-secondary education. Early on in one of many tempestuous meetings, gathering together diverse stakeholders, a couple of urban school superintendents challenged the goal that all youngsters graduate and have access to post-secondary education. They viewed a couple of teacher educators who embraced this goal as overly idealistic and a bit out of touch. They pointed out we were only at about a 50 percent graduation rate at that time. We asked them what they thought would be a reasonable annual increase through the collective efforts of many who were now at the table. They responded perhaps 5 percent. We replied: “You know we are committed to reporting our progress through a variety of media and public outlets annually; let’s see where we are in *ten years*.” They smiled. We shook hands.

A CORRESPONDING CLEAR THEORY OF ACTION OR COMPLEMENTARY THEORIES OF ACTION

Our experience is that individual partners in these cradle-to-career, community–wide partnerships do commonly agree on the ultimate mission, namely, success in schools for all youngsters. What that means at each milestone and how we assess our progress are stickier matters, though, and how we best proceed to meet the mission calls for a good deal of negotiation. This is because partners have different, often conflicting theories of action. In a study of Philadelphia’s “Children Achieving” systemic reform endeavor (Neild, Useem, Travers and Lesnick, 2003), five different theories of action were identified and the lack of reconciliation among these considerably constrained the reform agenda. These competing theories of action were as follows:

- *Managerial*. Participants from the business and government sectors were most likely to assess "Children Achieving" from a managerial perspective and theory of action. They believed in clear expectations for achievement coupled with strong accountability measures. They wanted to decentralize key management functions. They believed that school principals were the key to improving organizational performance and deserved broad discretion in decision making while at the same time being held accountable for results.
- *Redistribution of Resources*. Grassroots leaders, civic leaders and members of the "Children Achieving" staff embraced a theory of action calling for a redistribution of resources that would provide support to the schools and students most in need. They believed that schools reflected the inequalities of the broader society. They challenged district policies and union contract provisions that resulted in the least experienced and often least qualified staff members going to the schools with the highest concentrations of families in poverty.
- *Democratic Revitalization*. Grassroots groups and foundation personnel were proponents of democratic revitalization, and this guided their theory of action. They argued for a broad public dialogue on the purposes of education to create a covenant between a community and its schools. In their view, the purpose of decentralization was to increase parental and community engagement and authority in local school councils.
- *Capacity Building*. Higher education leaders and some civic leaders advocated policies and initiatives that would strengthen the capacity of individuals and schools to perform effectively. They focused on the ongoing learning of educational practitioners. They viewed fuller professionalization of the teaching force and school reform models as the primary means of change.
- *Market*. Several business and government leaders argued that Philadelphia schools would improve only if they were placed under market conditions, in which parents were consumers and could choose what they considered to be the best schools for their children. Those who espoused this theory of action advocated vouchers, charter schools, the privatization of schools, and the outsourcing of district services as the most prominent mechanisms of reform.

These theories of action obviously are not mutually exclusive, but they often reflect strongly held, contrasting views. The preparation of teachers, for example, and their robust and rigorous continuing development are viewed by many as a vested agenda for a higher education system with a track record in

this area that is seen by many as far from stellar. In a time of scant resources, combined with a history of failing schools, there is understandably considerable pressure to support charter schools and alternative avenues of teacher preparation. Finding areas of agreement, developing complementary theories of action and negotiating hybrids will be necessary. Collective vision and mission, in fact, evolve over time from collective *action*.

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY BUT DIFFERENTIATED RESPONSIBILITY

In the Cincinnati STRIVE partnership, the presidents of the participating universities stood tall. They proclaimed that the large number of failing students was an unpardonable condition for which they surely shared responsibility and accountability since they were the major providers of teachers for those schools. Others joined in. Several childhood pre-school interventions and providers found they were not following best-evidence practices. After-school, weekend, and summer-support programs were all over the map. There was little finger pointing, however. Rather the prevailing attitude was, “We are all the part of the problem, and we are all going to be part of the solution.” The partners agreed to get clear baseline data and set reasonable metrics to measure progress, or lack thereof, overtime. They agreed annually to report to the public at large on their progress collectively, and, within this reporting procedure, to identify just *who* contributed what to move the dial forward. This would underscore both their collective accountability and reinforce and reward *complementary responsibilities* as well. Depending upon the specific endeavor, some partners contributed funds, some materials, some training and yet others provided leadership in assessment, coordination and communication.

STRONG LEADERSHIP, OFTEN SHARED, DISTRIBUTED AND LAYERED

Just as responsibilities are distributed across partners, so is leadership. Leadership is provided by different individuals at different points in time. What was insisted upon in the STRIVE partnership, however, is that the head, president or CEO of every partner organization be present at meetings; no substitutes, no excuses. It is essential that those who have authority for institutional priorities, budget and personnel be there and be engaged. To institute fully functioning PDSs will take time, cost money and call for changes in policies and practices and in the way we conduct our work. Recall Clifford and Miller’s emphasis on *formalized agreements* with a commitment to support the work and, we would add, the ability to support the work.

It is especially important in *partnerships* that leadership be rotated and shared at different levels of the partnership. The leaders of partner organizations operate at the governance and management level. At the operational level, where the work is done on the front lines, leadership is needed as well. In the STRIVE partnership, the president of the University of Cincinnati led at the management level, while the Ed school dean exerted great leadership at the operational level, with a wide variety of faculty in different work groups addressing the five major goals.

Formal leadership, exercised by the heads of key partner organizations, can be shared and/or rotated at the governance or management level. Leadership at the operational level will be differentiated and distributed among many individuals depending upon the match between the task at hand, the talents of different individuals and the time they have to take on the task. This formal leadership has to foster the collective agency of the partnerships. Elmore (2002) emphasized the crucial nature of distributed leadership as follows:

> The idea behind distributed leadership is that the complex nature of instructional practice requires people to operate in networks of shared and complementary expertise rather than in hierarchies…The schools that I have observed usually share a strong motivation to learn new teaching practices and a sense of urgency about improving learning for students and teachers. What they lack is a sense of individual and collective agency, or control over the organizational conditions that affect the learning of students and adults in their schools (2002, p.24).

MAKING PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS' DISTINCTIVE STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS TRANSPARENT

Michael Fullan, the noted change theorist, argues that when attempting something radically new, losses will be immediate while potential gains are long term and theoretical. Hence, powerful social attractions are needed to engage and sustain partners. The first of these Fullan identifies as moral purpose. An obvious example of this is that *all* youngsters have the right to competent and caring teachers. However, moral purpose is not by itself enough, especially when bringing people together in new role-relationships. Fullan continues:

> We also need the enormous power of people working together. We need to maximize the severe debilitating negativity of people in constant conflict; and avoid even the lost opportunities of people being too nice to each other, or otherwise avoiding confronting problems….In the absence of quality relationships every solution costs money. Without trust, people, at best, will only do things you pay them for; with trust, people will double your investment and go the extra mile. To say the obvious, we

> need resources beyond money to achieve transformation. The third set of social attractors is quality ideas: knowledge building, knowledge sharing and constantly converting information into purposeful knowledge use. Content does matter, since there is no point having moral purpose and great relationships without them being fueled by great ideas (2003, p.35).

The need for trust in and respect for different partners — by the partners themselves — is essential. A central means to garner such trust is to have formal sessions, tours, even mini-internships designed to make each partner's organization and culture as transparent as possible; to work very hard to understand one another's work place. In this process, it is important to have each partner speak to their distinctive qualities, not to belabor their strengths, and to address as well their concerns and limitations. A partnership should be founded on bringing complementary strengths to common concerns. Drawing on Fullan's premises, we have found that as individuals and organizations engage in new interactions over time, trust deepens, knowledge expands and moral purpose is sustained.

THE NEGOTIATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF BOUNDARY-SPANNING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Individuals who are able to assume major responsibilities in two or more of the partner institutions or organizations make an invaluable contribution. They are like the mortar holding bricks together, and provide a firm foundation for the partnership. There are many examples of boundary-spanning roles. For example, there are many veteran teachers who maintain their P-12 teaching responsibilities but maintain some release or redirected time in which they teach or co-teach courses for prospective teachers with university professors. In some instances these veteran teachers rotate out of their P-12 responsibilities in teacher-in-residence models to serve full time on college campuses for a year or two and assist in the redesign of teacher education programs, as well as teach or co-teach courses. There are many professors who devote large portions of time to working with P-12 colleagues to design new curricula, facilitate school renewal or engage in joint research and development endeavors intended to enhance student learning.

The arrangements supporting these dual responsibilities range from individual ad hoc negotiations to formalized contractual and memorandum-of-agreement procedures. Again, recall Clifford and Miller's attributes of a partnership. Some institutions have made major commitments in these regards. At the University of Missouri–St. Louis (UMSL), for example, there are now 35 endowed E. Desmond Lee Professorships. These select professors have appointments not only with the university but also with a community organization which, as a part of its mission, enriches education for the youth of St. Louis.

Thus, formal ties are created across the community by UMSL with such agencies as the St. Louis Zoo, the Missouri Botanical Garden, and the St. Louis Art Museum. These joint responsibilities can impact the highest levels of an organization. A Des Lee Professor of Education, for example, served on the St. Louis Superintendent of School's Cabinet as Director of Professional Development for the district. This individual was also heavily involved in teacher preparation at UMSL and worked toward a more seamless education for new teachers in the district. This challenging dual role worked because responsibilities were clearly delineated and supported at the highest levels in both organizations and the incumbent had continuing access to the leaders in both camps. The leaders in both organization understood how they benefited by working closely together. UMSL got great clinical support for its prospective teachers. St. Louis Public Schools got better new teachers and greater support for veteran teachers.

We recently served on a joint task force sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, now renamed the Association of Public Land Grant Universities (APLU). In 2004 the task force published a report titled *Crossing Boundaries,* which examined urban systematic partnerships and various boundary-spanner roles within them. The report concluded that, while a range of boundary spanning roles existed, there were few institutions that had policies and contracts for integrating them more formally into their organizations and reward structures. The recommendations made then, hold today: better delineate the nature of these roles and how they can be supported by both organizations, and delineate these positions in contract language and organizational policy. Recall again Clifford and Miller's admonition in these regards: establish funding streams and develop recruitment, selection, and training protocols. Finally, develop clear assessment procedures and accountability parameters.

FOCUSING ON INTEGRATIVE CHANGE STRATEGIES AND SIMULTANEOUS RENEWAL

Our view is that there are serious structural flaws in our educational enterprise. Pre-school initiatives vary greatly in quality and quality control and are largely unrelated to P-12 education agencies at every level: local, state and national. P-12 agencies rarely coordinate their efforts with similar agencies focused on post-secondary education. Deep chasms exist, and antipathy between parties is not uncommon. K-12 students, in contrast to those in many other advanced countries, have abbreviated school days and school years. Major school reform endeavors concentrate on secondary schooling with only nominal attention to the critical formative first years of school. We find this latter state of affairs particularly disturbing. We recently contributed a chapter to a report published by the National Commission on Teaching and

America's Future titled "Building a 21st Century U.S. Education System," and we portrayed this particular problem as follows:

> The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) (1996) called for schools organized for success. What do such schools look like? Studies of effective schools have yielded a growing corpus of knowledge that demonstrates that youngsters, in their early formative years especially, succeed academically when schools are organized so that youngsters remain together for multiple years with the same teachers working closely together in teams. Teachers on these teams have differentiated but complementary responsibilities for providing high quality instruction and support to their students. The curriculum in these schools is organized so that only a few subjects are taught at any given time and correspondingly fewer, albeit major, ides and concepts are pursued in greater depth and for sustained periods of time.
>
> Despite increasing evidence as to how teachers and the curriculum should be organized and time structured in school, elementary teachers commonly continue to be prepared to work alone in lock-step, graded organizations wherein they attempt to teach a wide range of subjects to a different group of youngsters every year. An outdated school structure and a competitive rather than cooperative school culture remains pervasive. A major reason for this is the manner in which most teachers are prepared. In order to move to a new and improved model of schooling, both how schools are organized and how teachers are prepared will have to change in a simultaneous model of renewal and reform (2007, p.90).

We can think of no better example of the need for *simultaneous renewal*. It is long past time that we begin to prepare elementary teachers to work in team arrangements in which they would teach only one or two subjects but in greater depth. They would also embrace another specific functional area of expertise. This latter type of expertise provides an illustration of what we mean by *integrative* change strategies. At present, novice teachers tend to be assigned to a "mentor." Individuals in this role assume a range of disparate responsibilities, are typically provided little preparation for the role, and often have no release time to provide sustained assistance to the novice teacher. In contrast, we advocate a *distributed* consulting teacher model to assist the novice teacher. In this model, one veteran teacher provides modeling and coaching in a content area, a second provides assistance with technology, a third, with gaining understanding of the local school community, and a fourth serves as a confidant, making sure that the novice learns the "lay of the land," gaining local knowledge about the school and school community. The strategy becomes *integrative* in that the novice teacher gets the types of assistance that no one "mentor" can easily provide while, at the same time, a collaborative school culture is also being

reinforced through the shared responsibilities and increased expertise gained by different veteran teachers. This strategy better integrates teacher preparation and enhanced school renewal.

These examples of simultaneous renewal and an integrative change strategy call for changes in both the P-12 sector and higher education and underscore once more the need for strong and sustaining partnerships.

CONTINUING ASSESSMENT AND REGULAR REPORTING TO THE COMMUNITY

One of the strengths of a partnership with a common mission and a sustaining agenda is that it can coalesce resources otherwise operating independently, often for the same scarce resources. For example, in the STRIVE partnership, over two dozen different preschool providers were identified, offering widely varying services. When a comprehensive review of the literature on early children interventions was undertaken in partnership, it became clear just which evidence-based interventions produced the best results. Multiple providers then worked together to implement a common model and, as a collective, they received greater funding from local philanthropic sources then they would have otherwise received. A key to *sustainability* is that a baseline is established, metrics for assessment are collectively developed, and results are reported regularly to the public with those providing the services clearly identified and rewarded when progress is made. As we all know, success begets success and money and resources follow success.

In addition, best-evidence, data-based decision making combats both competing theories of action and inaction. Incremental success reinforces those engaged to stay engaged and generates buy-in and support from those stakeholders who were not involved initially in the partnership. Whether the focus is on readiness for elementary school or readiness for college, whether the focus is the recruitment, retention and success of more minority teachers or the impact of veteran teachers on novice teachers' development, whether the partnership is a PDS or a cradle-to-career partnership, *shared accountability* works, and accountability is greatly reinforced through public reporting. The willingness and ability to make changes when data show results that are not what they should be, is greatly enabled by an attitude of "we are all in this together" rather than all-too-common finger pointing. On the other hand, when results show sustained growth over time, a collective community pride of the type generated by a championship-caliber football or baseball team is manifested. The attitude is that we are making progress - just look at the list of organizations and individuals who worked together to make it happen. Collective pride trumps apathy or assigning blame every time.

In summary, we attempted first to illustrate why strong educational partnerships are needed. We know first-hand the complexity of preparing teachers well and how powerful the interaction can be between the renewal of teacher preparation and the renewal of P-12 schools. We referenced numerous individuals and networks of individuals, including NCATE and leaders within NCATE, who have advocated for and documented the power of partnerships. We briefly drew on the works of two scholars who reviewed various descriptions of educational partnerships in order to develop a further working definition of this contract. This definition set the table for an overview of what conditions and activities we personally have found to enable partnerships, especially community-wide, cradle-to-career educational partnerships. While the mission of these partnerships is even broader and more ambitious than the bold agenda set forth for PDSs, we suggest nonetheless that the lessons we have learned from our efforts in these endeavors is informing as well for partnerships focused more centrally on teacher preparation and, in the case of this Panel, the improved *clinical* preparation of teachers. Again, we are not suggesting that there is strong empirical support for what we have found to be helpful. Systemic educational partnerships are relatively new phenomena, as is their study. However, we hope the paper serves as a heuristic tool for thinking about how we might advance bolder and more effective partnerships and points to where further scholarly activity is needed to guide these future developments.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EMBEDDING CLINICALLY RICH TEACHER PREPARATION IN EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIP

1. Clearly identify the properties and attributes of schools that would serve as designated sites for the enriched and extended clinical preparation of prospective teachers. These schools would be analogous to teaching hospitals and would have to meet clear standards in order to qualify for additional funding. These funds would support clinical practitioners as well as teacher interns and residents working under their guidance. These schools might be called Professional Development Schools or Partner Schools and build upon the properties of and standards attached to such schools. These schools would draw upon the resources of both universities (and alternative preparation providers) and P-12 schools. The teacher union should be a partner as well, especially in terms of its responsibility in the joint preparation of clinical practitioner roles such as coaches and consulting teachers. The governance of these schools should be a shared responsibility.
2. Convene the leadership of the major educational associations and organizations to jointly lobby for funding at both the federal and state levels to support these schools.

3. A follow-up commission to this Blue Ribbon Panel should be identified to engage the role groups and stakeholder organizations represented on this blue ribbon panel. They should be charged to more clearly delineate clinical practice roles for both those in post- secondary institutions and the P-12 sector. They should address matters of title qualifications, selection criteria, preparation, salary and stipends for services provided, and evaluation and accountability procedures attached to these positions. The matter of release time for veteran teachers to assume these responsibilities needs to be addressed as well.
4. The funding for PDS or Partner Schools should enable as well the further exploration of boundary-spanning roles wherein university professors assume expanded roles in continuing school renewal, supporting productive learning communities and practitioner inquiry. Conversely, K-12 teachers can be engaged more fully in the redesign of programs of teacher preparation and assume joint instructional responsibilities to ensure academic preparation has a rich clinical base.
5. This commission should further delineate as well the attributes of internship, residency and induction programs in terms of the sequencing, length and nature of each.
6. A clearly defined *program* of research should be initiated, with this scholarly inquiry an essential element of a PDS, Partner or Clinical Preparation School. The purpose of this research would be to examine the effects of specific clinical practices on prospective teacher performance and development over time. This would include such clinical practices as teaching clinics, case study, lesson study, coaching and portfolio-driven assessment procedures. Joint inquiry between university scholars and K-12 teachers should be emphasized. NCATE could ask leaders from its constituent members to nominate outstanding teachers, teacher educators, and teacher education researchers to begin this process by reviewing present research, identifying gaps and needed new directions for inquiry and then building a conceptual map which would guide requests for proposals.
7. The role and responsibilities of clinical faculty across universities should be reviewed, especially their status vis-à-vis clinical faculty in other professions. How to promote the periodic teaching responsibilities of clinical university faculty in P-12 schools should be addressed as well.

References

Clark, R.W., Foster, A.M. and Mantle-Bromley, C. (2006). Boundary spanners across the National Network for Educational Renewal in K. R. Howey and N.L. Zimpher (Eds.), *Boundary Spanners*, (pp. 27-46). Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Clifford, M. and Miller, S.B. (2007). K-20 Partnership: A Definition and proof-of-concept. Madison, W.I.: Wisconsin Center on Educational Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Elmore, R. (2002). "Hard questions about practice." *Educational Leadership* (59)8: 22-5.

Elliott, E. J. (2010). *Assessment as a critical element in clinical experience for teacher preparation.* Washington D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Fulton, M. (2003). *Change forces with a vengeance*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Goodlad, J.I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K.A. Sirotnik and J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnership in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 3-31). New York, New York: Teachers College Press.

Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools, principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Howey, K.R. (2006). Why boundary-spanning? in K.R. Howey and N.L. Zimpher (Eds.), *Boundary Spanners*, (pp.27-46). Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Howey, K.R. (2010). A Dual dropout crisis, part 2, *Observations*. Albany, N.Y.: The Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.

Howey, K. R. and Zimpher, N. L. (2007). Creating P-16 urban systemic partnerships to address core structural problems in the educational pipeline in B. Wehling (Ed.), *Building a 21st century U.S. educational system* (pp 87-97). Washington, D.C.: The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Joint Task Force for Urban/Metropolitan Schools (2004). *Crossing boundaries: The urban education imperative.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Levine, A. (2006). Educating School Teachers: Executive Summary. The Education Schools Project. www.edschools.org (retrieved April 8, 2010).

Levine, M. and Trachtman, R. (2009). Professional Development School Pathways to Teacher Quality in Urban Areas: Linking PDSs to Improve Teacher Induction and Alternative Routes to Certification. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.
http://www.ncate.org/public/010410CommissionedPapers.asp (retrieved April 14, 2010).

Neild, R.C., Useem, E., Travers, E. and Lesnick, J. (2003). *Once and for all: Placing a highly qualified teacher in every Philadelphia classroom*. A report from *Learning from Philadelphia's School Reform*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Standards for Professional Development Schools (2001). Washington, D. C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education http://www.ncate.org/public/standards.asp

Striving Together: 2009 Strive report card (2003). Retrieved April 20, from STRIVE website: http://www.strivetogether.org/2009reportcard