TEACHER QUALITY TOOLKIT
2ND EDITION

prepared by

Patricia A. Lauer, Ph.D.
Ceri B. Dean, Ph.D.
Mya L. Martin-Glenn, M. A.
Margaret L. Asensio, M. Ed.

October 18, 2005

MCREL

©2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

In 1996, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future published *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. Citing research on teaching practices and policies, the authors emphasized the close connection between teachers and student learning: "What teachers know and can do makes the crucial difference in what children learn" (p. 5). The commission's document drew widespread attention to the issue of teacher quality; since its publication, policymakers, educators, and researchers have been searching for ways to improve America's teaching force.

One of the commission's recommendations was to "reinvent teacher preparation and professional development" (p. vii) to address teacher learning from the preservice through the inservice years. As Feiman-Nemser (2001) asserts, "each phase in a continuum of teacher learning has a unique agenda shaped by the requirements of good teaching and by where teachers are in their professional development" (p. 1014). This suggests the need for a developmental approach to teachers' learning, one that addresses the needs of teacher candidates, emerging teachers, and practicing teachers (Wasley, 1999).

This Teacher Quality Toolkit aims to support the continuum of teacher learning by providing tools and resources that institutions of higher education, districts, and schools can use to improve both preservice and inservice teacher education.

The toolkit incorporates McREL's accumulated knowledge and experience related to teacher quality and standards-based education. The audience for this toolkit includes administrators of colleges of teacher education and teacher preparation programs, pre-kindergarten through grade 12 (PreK–12) school and district administrators, and state and district staff developers.

This toolkit is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 provides background on teacher quality and describes the importance of teacher quality issues in the current policy climate of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. Chapter 2 describes assessments and resources that institutions of higher education can use to improve their teacher preparation programs. Chapter 3 describes assessments and resources that districts and schools can use to improve the professional development opportunities they provide for their teaching staff. Chapter 4 presents assessments and resources for school-university partnerships that are designed to improve both preservice and inservice teacher education. Chapter 5 summarizes the tools and resources provided in this toolkit and presents conclusions about what is needed to improve teacher quality.

CHAPTER ONE:

BACKGROUND

What is teacher quality? Over the years, the definition of teacher quality in the United States has evolved, reflecting the values of American society (National Research Council, 2001). In the early 1900s, teacher quality was related to virtue, and teachers were expected to communicate moral values in their teaching. In the 1940s and 1950s, teacher quality was defined in terms of personality traits, such as compassion and curiosity. Teachers were expected to communicate social values to their students. In the 1960s, teacher quality was based on the technical skills and behaviors of teachers in delivering the prescribed curricula. Today's definition of teacher quality reflects the current era of standards-based reform in education. According to the National Research Council (2001), teacher quality refers to the "knowledge, skills, abilities, and dispositions of teachers" that enable them to "engage students in rigorous, meaningful activities that foster academic learning for all students" (pp. 19 & 22).

How should teacher quality be measured? There is much debate among educators and policymakers about the answer to this question, but most agree that teacher quality is important because of its connection to effective student learning. Sanders and Rivers (1996; see also Sanders, 1998) pioneered the use of value-added assessments to measure teacher quality. According to this approach, students of effective teachers make greater gains on standardized achievement tests than is expected based on the students' past performances. Sanders and Rivers found, for example, that students in Tennessee who were taught by effective teachers for three consecutive years scored up to 50 percentile points higher on the state test as compared to students who had ineffective teachers for three consecutive years. Conversely, students with ineffective teachers did not exhibit the academic growth that would be expected based on their previous performances. In other words, effective teachers add value to student learning by helping their students achieve beyond expectations.

Value-added studies leave little doubt that teachers are critical to student learning, but these studies do not describe the characteristics of effective teachers. A number of research reviews have addressed the importance of various teacher attributes to teacher quality (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001; Allen, 2003; Rice, 2003). The following have been found to be positively associated with student outcomes:

- Years of teaching experience, up to five years (beyond five years, no measurable additional benefit has been found for experience.)
- Advanced degrees in mathematics and science for secondary teachers of those subject areas
- Certification in mathematics for teachers of secondary mathematics

- Coursework in content areas for secondary teachers of those subject areas

- Pedagogical coursework, particularly when tied to a content area (e.g., methods of teaching mathematics)

- Teachers' scores on tests of verbal ability

Although research has identified some of the teacher characteristics that are positively associated with student outcomes, the findings have been limited and, therefore, minimal guidance is available for measuring teacher quality. However, there is general agreement that high-quality teachers possess specific knowledge, skills, and characteristics that promote student learning, and teacher characteristics continue to be of interest to those who make policy recommendations regarding teacher quality.

TEACHER QUALITY AND THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT

Determining what constitutes "teacher quality" is complex. Currently, the most influential policy regarding the quality of U.S. teachers is the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. This Act requires states to develop a plan to ensure that all teachers are "highly qualified." According to the law, a "highly qualified teacher" is one who holds a bachelor's degree and full state certification or licensure and has demonstrated mastery of the subjects he or she teaches, either by having earned a major in the subject or by passing a test or other state evaluation. These criteria reflect the federal government's view that teacher quality is a key component of states' efforts to help all students achieve at high levels.

Alhough the teacher quality provisions of NCLB are an important first step in improving the quality of the U.S. teaching workforce, many educators believe that a high-quality teacher has knowledge and skills that go *beyond* NCLB's definition of "highly qualified." The Southeast Center for Teaching Quality (2004), for example, conducted case studies of 24 high-needs schools from 12 districts in four southeastern states on the effects of NCLB's teacher quality mandates. Teachers and administrators who were interviewed for the Center's report contend that the NCLB definition of teacher quality is insufficient. For example, interviewees thought that the definition should include "additional emphasis on skills such as understanding the developmental stages of student learning, using multiple types of student assessment data, and revising instruction on a daily basis" (p. 5).

Many states are beginning to implement the teacher quality requirements of NCLB, but some are struggling to do so. The percentages of teachers who meet NCLB requirements vary by district and state (Center on Education Policy, 2004). States need time to meet the challenges of NCLB, but educators need strategies now to improve teacher quality and student achievement.

PURPOSE & DESCRIPTION OF THIS TOOLKIT

This Teacher Quality Toolkit is designed to provide institutions of higher education, districts, and schools with tools and resources for improving teacher quality and, ultimately, student achievement. The Toolkit was developed in view of the following premises:

- Improving teacher quality is key to improving student achievement.

- Teacher quality is the joint responsibility of higher education institutions, districts, and schools.

- Program self-assessment is necessary to guide teacher quality improvement efforts.

- Exemplary preservice programs, inservice programs, and school-university partnerships provide models for improving teacher quality.

The first two premises reflect research findings (Sanders & Rivers, 1996) and policy recommendations (NCTAF, 1996) regarding teacher quality. The last two premises reflect McREL's research and knowledge concerning exemplary preservice (Dean & Lauer, 2003) and inservice (McREL, 2000) teacher education programs.

The Teacher Quality Toolkit addresses the continuum of teacher learning by providing tools that can be used to improve both preservice and inservice teacher education (Chapters 2 and 3, respectively). Each chapter provides self-assessment tools that can guide progress toward improved teacher quality and describes resources for designing exemplary programs and practices. Chapters 2 and 3 are self-contained, so that leaders of higher education institutions and school/district leaders may separately consider the information of most interest to them. independently of each other. However, it is recommended that district and school leaders and leaders of higher education institutions use the tools and resources together as suggested in Chapter 4, which describes resources for designing exemplary school-university partnerships.

CHAPTER TWO:
ASSESSMENTS AND RESOURCES
FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This chapter is intended to help institutions of higher education (1) design programs that prepare teachers for standards-based education environments and (2) design a system for evaluating program effectiveness. This chapter begins with an examination of the responsibilities that higher education institutions have to provide quality teacher preparation programs and to be accountable for program outcomes. Next, this chapter describes model programs that meet these responsibilities, along with tools and resources to help higher education institutions assess their own programs and make changes. The assessments themselves are included in the appendices to this toolkit.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE
QUALITY TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Institutions of higher education are responsible for ensuring that their teacher preparation programs are high quality and that the students who graduate from these programs meet teacher licensure requirements. As cited in a U.S. Department of Education report (2000), one of the barriers to improving the quality of teaching is the lack of accountability for high-quality preparation by both teacher education programs and the higher education institutions that provide them. The report called for developing new measures of the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and reporting results on these measures to the public. Accordingly, changes in Title II of the Higher Education Act require colleges and universities with teacher preparation programs to provide information to their states about basic features of the programs as well as students' rates of program completion (Huang, Yi, & Haycock, 2002). States are asked to report these data annually to the federal government, along with information on state standards for teachers, certification/licensure requirements, and criteria used to measure the performance of teacher preparation programs. According to Huang et al., changes in the Higher Education Act are putting pressure on states to make teacher preparation programs more accountable for preparing teachers who can meet some level of performance standards.

As described in Chapter 1, The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 places additional pressures on states to ensure that their teachers are highly qualified. With the enactment of national policies related to teacher quality, it is not surprising that there is heightened national interest in accountability for teacher preparation (Wilson et al., 2001). Cochran-Smith (2001) asserts that the "outcomes question" drives recent teacher preparation policies:

> As we enter the twenty-first century, the outcomes, consequences, and results of teacher education have become critical topics in nearly all of the state and

national policy debates about teacher preparation and licensure as well as in the development of many of the privately and publicly funded research agendas related to student learning. (p. 6)

By emphasizing both student achievement and high-quality teachers, NCLB sends the message that teacher outcomes are expected to be linked to student outcomes. For institutions of higher education, the message translates into accountability for the quality of teacher preparation.

This emphasis on accountability in national policies poses a challenge for higher education institutions that provide teacher preparation programs. As Howey and Zimpher (1999) observed, many lack evidence that their teacher preparation programs are effective. The authors recommend that teacher candidates be assessed throughout their preservice years to measure their development as teachers. They also stress the need to link teacher preparation and performance with K–12 student learning. "The emphasis in assessment," they assert, "must be squarely on coupling teacher performance and teacher learning with *pupil learning*" (p. 301).

Teacher preparation programs that gather evidence of effectiveness can help ensure that their graduates have the knowledge and skills they need to be effective teachers. Diez (1998) described several teacher preparation programs that undertook reform by clarifying the outcomes of their programs, developing performance assessment processes to develop and document the development of student learning outcomes, developing strategies to involve faculty across the institution and in P–12 schools in the reform effort, and designing an evaluation plan to guide continuous improvement efforts (pp. 2–3). Similarly, in a report for the American Council on Education (ACE), Scannell (1999) described an effective teacher education program as one with comprehensive candidate assessment that is integral to instruction and informs decisions about teacher licensure.

Thus, research suggests that assessment and evaluation can help institutions of higher education be accountable and at the same time improve the quality of their teacher preparation programs. To this end, the following sections describe model programs that provide effective preparation for teaching in standards-based classrooms and that have systems for evaluating the effectiveness of these programs.

DESIGNING TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION

In 1996, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future recommended that teacher preparation and professional development programs be organized around standards for students and teachers. The following section describes the characteristics of model programs that prepare teachers for standards-based education systems. The next two sections describe a tool for assessing the adequacy of a program's teacher

preparation and resources for designing programs that address standards-based teaching.

Characteristics of Model Teacher Preparation Programs for Standards-based Education

Standards-based reforms require teachers to possess new types of knowledge. According to education researchers Ball and Cohen (1999), teachers first need a deep conceptual understanding of the subject matter that they teach. This includes an understanding of the methods of reasoning within a field as well as connections among ideas across fields. Second, teachers need to understand children's developmental phases and the ideas that children have about different subject areas. Third, teachers need to know how differences among learners in areas such as culture, language, class, and gender relate to differences in their frames of reference. Fourth, teachers need to increase their understanding about how children learn and to view children as capable of higher order learning. Finally, teachers need to know pedagogy and a variety of instructional strategies.

Given the need for teacher education programs to ensure that teachers have the knowledge required to implement standards-based reforms, what are the components of effective teacher preparation? To answer this question, McREL examined four teacher education programs that were winners of the U.S. Department of Education's National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation in 2000[1] (Lauer, Martin-Glenn, & Dean, 2002). This recognition was based in part on evidence that program graduates have a positive impact on student learning. Lauer et al. studied how the four programs prepare graduates to deliver K–12 standards-based instruction. Data were gathered through interviews of program personnel, review of program documents (e.g., descriptions of program standards), and a survey of program graduates.

Analyses of the interviews and documents identified several components that the four award-winning programs share related to teacher preparation for standards-based education:

---

[1] The four winners of the U.S. Department of Education's National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation in 2000 are Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; East Carolina University, Greenville, North Carolina; Fordham University Graduate School of Education, New York, New York; and Samford University, Birmingham, Alabama.

- Content courses and subject-area methods courses are aligned with national and, to some degree, state K–12 content standards.

- Candidates use content standards documents as part of their course materials.

- Course assignments require candidates to locate standards documents on the Internet and to identify content standards in their lesson plans.

- In methods classes, candidates learn to develop lesson plans that address standards and to assess students' learning in meeting these standards.

- In field experiences, especially student teaching, candidates learn to examine evidence of student learning and to use it to modify their instructional practice.

- To help all students reach high standards, candidates learn to teach exceptional learners and other diverse students.

- Candidates learn to generate student work samples that identify the needs of individual students and to modify instruction based on these needs.

- Candidates are assessed on both their content and pedagogical knowledge. The teacher preparation program uses the results of these assessments to monitor the effectiveness of candidates and the teacher preparation program itself.

- Education faculty collaborate with faculty from arts and sciences at each institution, which helps to ensure that the content that candidates learn is aligned with K–12 content standards.

- Education faculty collaborate with K–12 teachers and administrators, which helps to align teacher preparation curricula with standards and provides feedback to the programs about the performance of their candidates in standards-based classrooms.

The four programs are standards-based models of teacher education. That is, program leaders use standards and data to evaluate and improve their own programs, and, similarly, they prepare candidates to use standards and data to improve the learning of K–12 students.

The Teacher Preparation for Standards-based Education Survey

As the previous section indicates, programs that prepare teachers for standards-based education provide candidates with courses and experiences that address standards-based teaching. The Teacher Preparation for Standards-Based Education (TPSBE) Survey can help programs determine whether they have provided these courses and

experiences for their own candidates. The TPSBE Survey was developed for Lauer et al.'s (2002) study of effective teacher preparation for standards-based education described in the previous section. Survey items were constructed to assess graduates' perceived preparation in the knowledge and skills needed for standards-based teaching (Tell, Bodone, & Addie, 1999; Ball & Cohen, 1999) and graduates' current confidence in implementing standards.

Teacher preparation programs can use the TPSBE Survey to evaluate recent graduates' perceptions of preparedness to teach in standards-based classrooms. The results can help programs identify areas that should be better aligned with K–12 academic standards. Additional information on the development of the survey, its uses, and scoring is provided with the TPSBE Survey tool in Appendix A.

In Lauer et al.'s (2002) study, recent graduates of three award-winning teacher preparation programs responded to the TPSBE Survey. They reported that their primary sources of learning about standards implementation were subject-area methods classes and student teaching. They reported taking more courses in language arts and in mathematics than in other subject areas. Their responses suggest that they had extensive exposure to classroom assessment and instruction that targets the learning needs of individual students. Correlations indicated positive relationships between graduates' reported learning from teacher preparation and their current confidence to implement standards as well as their perceptions of how well prepared they were to teach in a standards-based setting.

Other Resources on Teacher Preparation for Standards-based Education

After higher education institutions obtain the perceptions of their graduates about their preparation, institutions must identify ways to use this feedback to improve their programs. This section describes two resources — one that can help higher education institutions design teacher preparation programs that are aligned with PreK–12 standards, and one on strategies for making program changes.

The Standards-based Teacher Education Project (STEP)™. STEP was established in 1996 by the Council for Basic Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The purpose of STEP is to provide support and guidance to colleges and universities for improving teacher preparation based on three principles:

1. Teachers must know the subjects they are teaching.

2. Teachers must know how to teach students to learn at high levels.

3. Teachers must know how to monitor and assess how well students are learning. (Garvin, 2003, p. 6).

The most recent report on STEP is *Developing Knowledgeable Teachers: A Framework for Standards-Based Teacher Education Supported by Institutional Collaboration* (Garvin, 2003). This report describes the STEP process and the experiences of teacher education programs that have participated in STEP. This report can serve as a handbook on how colleges and universities can change their programs to better prepare teachers for standards-based education. The report provides readers with the following guidance:

- Explanations of the STEP process and how to get started using it

- Models for incorporating STEP processes and structures into teacher preparation programs based on the experiences of four institutions

- Ideas for identifying needed changes and sustaining them in response to state and national teacher quality accountability policies

- Examples of possible STEP variations based on six institutions that have adopted the STEP model

- Perspectives of state and national education officials on STEP

- Tools (e.g., surveys, rubrics, and guidelines) that can be used to align teacher preparation with PreK–12 academic standards

STEP accomplishes its work through collaborations among higher education faculty and local PreK–12 teachers and administrators. The focus of this work is the integration of state and local PreK–12 student learning standards into teacher education programs (Council for Basic Education, 2004). Since 1996, 25 institutions of higher education from five different states have participated in the STEP process. For each participating institution, the STEP process occurs over three years and involves the following sequence of tasks (Garvin, 2003):

- Establishment of a collaborative task force with representation from liberal arts and education faculty, faculty from two-year colleges, and PreK–12 teachers and administrators

- Task force analysis of the higher education institution's teacher preparation program within the frameworks of PreK–12 content standards and teacher licensure standards

- Proposal outlining the changes needed in the teacher preparation program's courses, requirements, experiences, and assessments to better address PreK–12 standards

- Development of strategies for assessing the knowledge and effectiveness of candidates

- Assessment of effects of program changes on graduates' content knowledge and pedagogical skills

- Inventory of teacher educator instructional strategies and identification of instructional models

- Collaborative research projects among faculty and PreK–12 teachers to assess candidate knowledge and skills

- Development of an exit process that ensures candidates have the knowledge and skills to teach a variety of students

Levers for Change. Designing and implementing changes in teacher preparation programs is a significant challenge for higher education institutions. To address this challenge, the U.S. Department of Education sponsored four regional teacher quality institutes during summer 2000. Each participating higher education institution brought a team that included administrators and faculty from education and arts and sciences, PreK–12 administrators and teachers, and community and business representatives. The purpose of the institutes was to help the teams develop collaborative action plans that identify needed changes in teacher preparation, strategies for implementing change, and a timeline for completing objectives.

Following the institutes, the U.S. Department of Education, along with McREL and other regional educational laboratories, reviewed the action plans and selected nine that held promise for transforming teacher education. Researchers interviewed members of the nine teams and reviewed their institutional documents. The result of this research is documented in the McREL publication *Levers for Change: Transforming Teacher Preparation* (Hassel, Walter, & Hayden, 2002), which outlines the six key strategies, or levers for change, that are common to the nine institutions.

The six levers and key action steps are summarized in Exhibit 2.1. Higher education institutions can use these levers to help implement and sustain collaborative changes in teacher preparation.

Exhibit 2.1. Levers and Action Steps to Help Institutions of Higher Education Change Teacher Preparation

Levers for Change	Key Action Steps
Establishing Mission and Goals to Focus the Improvement of Teacher Preparation	• Prepare for the challenge of change. • Think about ways to be inclusive in crafting mission and goals without becoming overwhelmed by diverse interests. • Use information to shape and sell the mission and goals. • Be willing to make tough decisions. • Celebrate small successes along the way.
Using Standards to	• Take into account the complex world of standards related to

Levers for Change	Key Action Steps
Structure Improvement of Teacher Preparation	teacher preparation. • Make sure standards at different levels of the system reinforce one another. • Confront the fundamental question of what graduates should know and be able to do. • Start small. • Involve the right people to get the job done. • Create mechanisms to ensure that standards remain the focus of teacher preparation programs over time.
Exerting Leadership to Motivate Improvement of Teacher Preparation	• Find top leaders who are willing to put their full support behind change. • Appoint a person or a small group of individuals to lead the change effort. • Build leadership throughout the institution (and beyond).
Forging Relationships to Facilitate Improvement of Teacher Preparation	• Develop relationships that leverage change efforts. • Create opportunities for people to work together to accomplish critical tasks. • Establish structures that foster relationships. • Pay attention to feedback.
Mobilizing Resources to Support Improvement of Teacher Preparation	• Know what you need. • Look for opportunities to reallocate resources. • Be willing to terminate programs that don't support goals. • Before starting a new program, see if similar programs exist. • Look at the institution's reward structure. • Target resources in ways that leverage change.
Using Information to Initiate and Sustain Improvement of Teacher Preparation	• Leverage the relationship between information and mission and goals. • Make information systems feasible for users. • Capitalize on information to spur improvement.

Source: From *Levers for Change: Transforming Teacher Preparation*, by B. C. Hassel, K. Walter, and E. Hayden, 2002. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

For example, for the Using Standards lever, the report describes Arizona State University's (ASU) process for syllabus development. Faculty members use a common syllabus format that explains how the course addresses both PreK–12 academic standards and the state's teaching standards. The syllabus also describes the opportunities that teacher candidates will have in the course to observe and practice the integration of standards with instruction. An actual ASU syllabus for an education course is reproduced in the report.

An appendix to *Levers for Change* summarizes promising practices that the nine higher education institutions and other institutions attending the teacher quality institutes have used to meet specific improvement goals. For example, one of the practices concerns the effective use of technology in the preparation of teacher candidates. The appendix lists eight potential activities related to this goal, along with the names of the institutions that have implemented the activities. (See Hassel et al., 2002).

DESIGNING AN EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

The U.S. Department of Education developed the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation in 2000 as a means of promoting excellence in teaching and teacher preparation. The Department recognized that there are several ways to measure teacher quality, one of which is graduates' test scores on licensing exams. The awards program was designed to identify teacher preparation programs that could provide evidence about their efforts to provide high quality teacher education. This program raised the bar in teacher education accountability by requiring that winners demonstrate the link between teacher preparation practices, learning by teacher candidates, and effective teaching by graduates that results in improved learning for all PreK–12 students.

With the changes in federal administration in 2001, the awards program was not continued. However, the four winning institutions remain models of teacher preparation and models of how to document program effectiveness. Since one of the purposes of the awards program was to deepen discussion of high-quality teacher preparation, five of the regional educational laboratories conducted a study of the structures and processes used by the four recipients of the award to systematically evaluate their teacher preparation programs. The following sections describe the characteristics of the evaluation systems of the award-winning programs, a tool for assessing the adequacy of a program's evaluation system, and a resource for designing teacher preparation evaluation.

Characteristics of Model Evaluation of Teacher Preparation Programs

Systematic evaluation was selected as the focus for the study of the winners of the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation because the U.S. Department of Education was interested in furthering the discussion about how to determine the overall effectiveness of teacher preparation programs. The findings of this study are documented in two reports — one on the case studies of the four award-winning teacher preparation programs (Lauer & Dean, 2003) and one involving a cross-case analysis (Dean & Lauer, 2003). An overall research question focused the study: What are the structures and processes of systematic evaluation that supports effective teacher preparation? In addition, six guiding research questions were designed to elicit

details about the structures and processes of the evaluation system at each institution studied. (See Exhibit 2.2.)

Exhibit 2.2. Research Questions and Documented Components of the Evaluation Systems of Nationally Recognized Teacher Preparation Programs

Research Question	Components Documented
1. How are individuals, groups, and the components of the teacher preparation program evaluated?	• Performance assessments of candidates (e.g., portfolios) • Standardized assessments of candidates • Samples of work from candidates' PreK–12 students • Feedback from candidates on faculty members and university supervisors • Surveys of graduates and principals • Achievement data of graduates' PreK–12 students • Feedback from candidates, graduates, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers about courses and field experiences through surveys, focus groups, and informal discussions
2. How do teacher preparation programs align evaluation with program standards/goals?	• Program goals are aligned with national teaching standards (e.g., INTASC), state teaching standards, national content standards (e.g., NCTM). • Program goals provide the framework for evaluation, and data are examined with respect to program goals.
3. How do teacher preparation programs develop systematic evaluation?	• Program responses to internal and external catalysts for change (e.g., accreditation review) • Faculty working together within and across departments • Use of system change models that use data to identify areas for improvement • Creation of data collection instruments and procedures • Leadership support • Input from stakeholders
4. How do P–16 stakeholders influence evaluation of teacher preparation programs?	• Formal and informal feedback about program components and program graduates through school partnerships and strong relationships with principals and cooperating teachers • Research collaborations • Teacher-in-residence programs • Assessments of candidate portfolios

	• Contributions to curriculum development
5. How do external influences affect evaluation of teacher preparation programs?	• State policies on teacher preparation are sources for program revision and the impetus for evaluation activities. • Programs are proactive in aligning teacher preparation with state regulations. • National influences are Title 2 reporting requirements and the new emphasis on PreK–12 student learning of teacher graduates.
Research Question	**Components Documented**
6. What are the characteristics of a culture that supports data collection and its use for evaluation of teacher preparation programs?	• An attitude that data are essential and it is safe to examine the results of one's work • Training in using data for evaluation purposes • Time to discuss and analyze data • Incentives that encourage involvement and build commitment to evaluation • Collaboration within and across departments (e.g., liberal arts and sciences)

Note: From *Systematic Evaluation for Continuous Improvement of Teacher Preparation: Volume 1: Cross-case Analysis*, by C. B. Dean and P. A. Lauer, 2003. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Data were gathered through interviews of key participants from each program and through a review of relevant documents. For the cross-case analysis, researchers compared responses to the six guiding research questions across the four sites and identified common themes. They then summarized the structures and processes that the four nationally recognized teacher preparation programs use to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs.[2]

With regard to evaluation structures, common data collection strategies used by the four winners of the national awards program include graduate and principal surveys, performance assessments, portfolios, focus groups, and informal feedback from PreK–12 teachers and principals (Dean & Lauer, 2003). Each of the recognized programs has offices that carry out various functions that support its evaluation program. Formal committees and advisory groups provide input and feedback on program components

---

[2] *Structure* is used to refer to an element of the evaluation system that helps the program collect, analyze, or use data to improve the program, such as school-university partnerships. *Process* is used to refer to a systematic series of actions directed toward an end, such as hiring, and less well-defined actions such as communication.

and help design and implement program improvements. The programs have formal meeting times for teacher education faculty to provide input about the collection of data, to conduct analyses of data, and to discuss ways to use the results of the analysis to guide program improvement. All four programs have established partnerships that provide access to feedback from PreK–12 school stakeholders. Many sets of standards and principles guide the programs, as well as a clearly articulated set of goals and a framework. An important structural feature of these programs is a strong, coherent curriculum that is aligned with program goals. The curriculum drives data collection and determinations about program success.

With regard to evaluation processes, the four recognized programs reported that they use most of their data in a formative way to make decisions about program changes (Dean & Lauer, 2003). However, they also use data to measure candidates' knowledge and skills and to determine graduates' effectiveness in PreK–12 classrooms. Faculty members from all four programs emphasized the important role that communication and collaboration play in their evaluation systems, although the levels of collaboration varied among the programs. Program and institutional leaders are accessible, seek input from a variety of stakeholders, welcome feedback, and value partnerships. Other processes that support program evaluation are faculty hiring and evaluation processes, which emphasize norms of collaboration and a focus on improvement. A key process for these programs was continuous improvement. Program leaders reported that they view the work of program improvement as an ongoing process and not something that is the focus of attention only for defined periods of time, such as an NCATE review.

The Teacher Preparation Evaluation System Audit

Results from Dean and Lauer's (2003) study of the four nationally recognized programs were used to design McREL's Teacher Preparation Evaluation System (TPES) Audit. This audit is designed to assess if teacher preparation programs have established the necessary structures and processes to systematically evaluate their programs and to use evaluation results for improvement. Exhibit 2.2 indicates the questions asked about the evaluation systems of the recognized programs and the components that were documented in response to these questions. These components guided the development of the TPES Audit.

Teacher preparation programs can use the TPES Audit to compare the characteristics of their evaluation systems with those of model programs that have developed systematic evaluation approaches for effective teacher preparation (Dean & Lauer, 2003). Some uses of the TPES Audit include the following:

1. Administrators of teacher preparation programs can use the audit to judge whether they have established the necessary structures and processes to systematically evaluate program outcomes.

2. Teacher education faculty and administrators can complete the audit and use the overall results for discussions about changes needed to conduct systematic evaluation.

3. Audit results can be shared with institutional leaders as a way to justify the establishment of new structure and processes (and associated expenses) for systematic evaluation.

Additional information on the audit, its uses, and scoring is provided with the TPES Audit in Appendix B.

Other Resources on Teacher Preparation Program Evaluation Design

The National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation was designed to recognize teacher preparation programs that could present compelling evidence that their programs were effective in preparing teachers who could help all students meet high academic standards (U.S. Department of Education, 2000). The program application is a resource that can help higher education institutions design better practices for evaluating teacher preparation. Program applicants were required to provide three types of evidence to demonstrate their effectiveness:

- Formative: Evidence that the program gathers and uses data to make adjustments to the various stages of the program (e.g., admissions, course development, field experiences, assessment of knowledge and skills)

- Summative: Evidence of the effectiveness of the overall program in helping graduates acquire the knowledge and skills needed to improve all students' learning (e.g., content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, and skills to examine beliefs about learners and teaching as a profession)

- Confirming: Evidence of the effectiveness of program graduates in K–12 settings

In addition, the evidence had to meet criteria of rigor, sufficiency, and consistency. Rigor was determined by the validity and reliability of the evidence. Sufficiency was determined by the adequacy and the extent of the data used for evidence. Consistency was based on the links between various aspects of the program and the three types of evidence. To help applicants judge the adequacy of their data, the application provided a rubric for evaluating evidence of program effectiveness (see Appendix C). Reviewers of the applications also used this rubric. Teacher preparation programs can use this rubric to help guide the design of data collection activities.

The awards program application also required programs to provide credible evidence from multiple sources. To help applicants judge the credibility of their evidence, the

application provided examples that reflect different levels of credibility. In addition, the reviewers of the applications used these examples to better understand how to judge the evidence that applicants provided. The examples are reproduced in Appendix C. Teacher preparation programs can use these examples to identify the type of data that they should collect for evaluation. (Exhibit 2.2 lists the various indicators that the winners of the 2000 awards used to evaluate individuals, groups, and the components of the teacher preparation program.)

The U.S. Department of Education spent considerable time and resources developing a process to identify teacher preparation programs that were effective based on evidence. Although the program is no longer in operation, completing the award application and using the review process outlined in the application can be a significant source of learning and improvement for teacher preparation programs.

Interviewees from the four recognized programs commented on the benefits of applying for the award (Lauer, 2003). For example, the application required program leaders to think about data in new ways. Interviewees cited as a challenge the identification of confirming evidence and indicated that in the future they would give more emphasis to collecting this type of data. The overall process of applying for the award was beneficial. The programs viewed the national awards program as a type of external evaluation, similar to the process required for a NCATE review. Some interviewees said that applying for the award and preparing data for the site visit by the awards committee helped the programs prepare for NCATE site visits. One faculty member cited the awards program as a source of outside criteria against which the program could measure the effectiveness of its teacher preparation. A division chair indicated that as a result of applying for the award, the teacher preparation program was revising its evaluation forms for more systematic data collection. Thus, the awards program application criteria help programs think in new ways about the evidence of effectiveness of their teacher preparation and about the quality of the data that they collect for accountability purposes.

CONCLUSION

This chapter describes model programs for preparing teachers for standards-based education and tools and resources that can help higher education institutions design similar programs. The goal is to help higher education institutions improve teacher preparation in ways that can improve the quality of the teacher workforce. The focus is on collecting data on the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and using the data for program improvements. The same data help higher education institutions document how they are meeting their responsibilities to states and to PreK–12 schools to provide quality preparation for teacher candidates.

The model programs described in this chapter are the four winners of the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation in 2000 (U. S. Department of

Education, 2000). These programs were recognized because they provided evidence of their effectiveness, including data that confirmed the ability of their graduates to improve the learning of all students. Increasingly, this emphasis on the performance of graduates' own students is becoming the standard by which teacher preparation programs are judged.

It should be stressed that there is no best approach to transforming teacher preparation and no single model of effective teacher preparation. Effective programs vary in context, student body, and mission, but they share a common goal of improving the learning of all PreK–12 students (Dean & Lauer, 2003). To achieve this goal, higher education institutions need tools for assessing the outcomes of their teacher preparation programs and resources for making improvements. By using the assessments and resources described in this chapter, higher education institutions can begin to improve their teacher preparation programs in ways that improve teacher quality and ultimately student achievement.

CHAPTER THREE:

ASSESSMENTS AND RESOURCES
FOR SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) makes it clear that high-quality professional development is key to ensuring that teachers have the knowledge and skills they need to help all students meet high standards. In order to harness the power of professional development, however, school and district staff members must know what is meant by high-quality professional development. This chapter provides that information as well as tools that can assist schools and districts in designing, implementing, and evaluating effective professional development programs.

The chapter begins with a description of the responsibilities of districts and schools in providing high-quality professional development. The next sections include an explanation of the characteristics of effective professional development and descriptions of two assessment tools. The first tool discussed is one that districts and schools can use to assess the extent to which they demonstrate the characteristics of high-quality professional development. The second assessment tool presented is designed for use by schools and focuses specifically on developing a professional learning community, reflecting the role that school culture plays in professional development. The last section of the chapter presents resources that schools and districts can use to design effective professional development programs. The assessments themselves are included in the appendices to this toolkit.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE
QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Professional development serves a variety of functions in the 21st century school system, from expanding teachers' and administrators' knowledge base about the realities of teaching and learning in a context of diversity and accountability, to developing new attitudes about students' capabilities, teacher roles, and use of technology, to contributing to the growth of peers (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory & Public Broadcasting Service, 1990). It's not surprising then, that a number of entities — states, districts, and schools — share responsibility for providing professional development to teachers, administrators, and other school staff.

Federal, state, and local policies recognize the importance of professional development and often require districts or schools to address it in specific ways. For example, under Title I, schools are required to include professional development in their school improvement plans, and states are required to use four percent of their funds to provide technical assistance to schools that do not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) under NCLB. Similarly, districts and schools that do not make AYP must use 10 percent of

their Title I funds to support professional development. Some states assign responsibility for professional development to schools and districts through the accreditation or school improvement process. For example, in Kansas, schools must develop a results-based staff development plan and report the percentage of teachers who reached the professional development goals established as part of that plan.

States, districts, and schools often assume responsibility for professional development in order to accomplish broad goals. For example, states might sponsor professional development that helps teachers understand statewide initiatives, such as the state assessment system. Similarly, districts often provide professional development to enhance teachers' ability to implement new curricula and instructional practices, raise awareness of district initiatives, satisfy state requirements for disseminating information on particular topics, or assist teachers in earning credits for recertification or salary increases (Neville & Robinson, 2003). Increasingly, schools are taking on responsibility for professional development to better meet teachers' learning needs and to address school goals for improved student learning (National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, 1996; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997; Zepeda, 1999; Elmore, 2002).

Districts and schools share many of the same responsibilities for professional development: establishing structures and processes for teacher learning, providing follow-up support, designating resources, and involving everyone in planning, monitoring, and evaluating implementation of what teachers have learned. Schools also have other responsibilities for professional development in addition to those they share with the district. Specifically, according to Youngs (1999), schools must design professional development activities that

- provide teachers with meaningful opportunities to actively engage with new disciplinary ideas and acquire new instructional strategies

- involve collaboration with colleagues and opportunities to engage in reflective inquiry

- take individual teachers' backgrounds into consideration as well as the contexts in which they work [and]

- provide teachers with sufficient time and follow-up support, including regular feedback from accomplished practitioners. (pp. 3–4)

Such activities enable a school to enhance its capacity to enhance student achievement by increasing teachers' knowledge and skills, strengthening the school's professional community, and increasing the degree to which the school's programs are focused, coherent, and sustained over time (Youngs, 1999).

There is increasing agreement that professional development plays a key role in improving student achievement, but only if the professional development is high quality. The next section discusses the characteristics of high-quality professional

development and describes tools that districts and schools can use to gauge the quality of their programs and resources they can use to improve their programs.

DESIGNING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

This section begins with an overview of characteristics of model district and school professional development programs that help ensure that teachers and administrators acquire the skills they need to help all students achieve high standards. This overview is followed by descriptions of (1) a tool for assessing the extent to which a professional development program demonstrates the characteristics of effective professional development and (2) a checklist for determining the degree to which a school exhibits the characteristics of a professional community that supports teacher and student learning. These descriptions are followed by a discussion of additional resources schools and districts might consult to design quality professional development programs that help improve student achievement.

Characteristics of Model Professional Development Programs

What are the characteristics of model professional development programs? A number of organizations have assembled lists over the last decade, but according to Guskey (2003), there still is no consensus about these characteristics. Guskey analyzed 13 well-known lists of characteristics of effective professional development and identified the most common elements among them. These elements include the following:

- Enhancement of teachers' content and pedagogic knowledge

- Provision of sufficient time and other resources

- Promotion of collegiality and collaborative exchange

- Inclusion of specific evaluation procedures

- Alignment of activities with other reform initiatives and with high-quality instruction

- A focus on school-based activities

- Development of leadership capacity of principals and teachers

- Consideration of teacher-identified needs in the planning process

Guskey also notes that, surprisingly, many of the lists do not mention use of student data to drive professional development, nor emphasize that the focus of professional development should be based on research evidence. Only a few of the lists include attention to diversity and equity in designing professional development or state that professional development should take a variety of forms, be driven by an image of effective teaching and learning, take into account phases of change, or promote inquiry

and reflection. Only one of the lists addresses the involvement of parents and other stakeholders.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act provides guidance about effective professional development by providing a list of characteristics of high-quality professional development. The Act makes it clear that high-quality professional development activities should be an integral part of district and schoolwide plans for improvement and that they should be developed with extensive participation of the teachers, principals, parents, and administrators of schools. In addition, among other priorities, professional development should include activities that

1. improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subjects the teachers teach, and enable teachers to become highly qualified;

2. give teachers, principals, and administrators the knowledge and skills to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging State academic content standards and student academic achievement standards;

3. improve classroom management skills;

4. are not 1-day or short-term workshops or conferences;

5. advance teacher understanding of effective instructional strategies; and

6. include instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform and instruct classroom practice. (NCLB, 2001, sec. 9101, p. 1963)

NCLB also emphasizes the importance of regularly evaluating professional development activities as a whole to determine their impact on teacher effectiveness and student academic achievement. It also stresses that the findings of such evaluations should be used to improve the quality of professional development.

The list of characteristics of professional development provided in NCLB is consistent with those described by Guskey (2003). Among the lists that Guskey analyzed were the National Staff Development Council (2001) standards and the principles of professional development developed by the U.S. Department of Education in 1995. These principles were developed in collaboration with hundreds of educators and staff developers who represented a range of education organizations, schools, and districts. They are well aligned with change process literature and other research on the characteristics of effective programs. The principles served as the foundation of the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development, which the U.S. Department of Education established in 1996 to promote discussion and understanding of high-quality professional development. In order to receive the award, schools and districts had to demonstrate that they addressed these principles. The District Professional

Development Program Audit and other resources discussed in this chapter are based on these principles. The principles are listed in Exhibit 3.1.

The second tool described in this chapter is designed to focus on one of the key findings of a study of eight of the school-level winners of the National Award for Model Professional Development. In that study, researchers found that a culture of learning was key to the schools' success in improving student achievement. The book *Teachers Who Learn, Kids Who Achieve* (WestEd, 2000), which is based on the study, explains the central importance of a professional learning community and provides a description of how the eight schools included in the study developed their professional learning communities. Six lessons about what these schools do to help teachers learn emerged from the study:

- Use clear, agreed-upon student achievement goals to focus and shape teacher learning

- Provide an expanded array of professional development opportunities

- Embed ongoing, informal learning into the school culture

- Build a highly-collaborative school environment where working together to solve problems and to learn from each other become cultural norms

- Find and use the time to allow teacher learning to happen

- Keep checking a broad range of student performance data

Exhibit 3.1. Principles of Professional Development Used in the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development

Principle 1	Focuses on teachers as central to student learning, yet includes all other members of the school community.
Principle 2	Focuses on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement.
Principle 3	Respects and nurtures the intellectual and leadership capacity of teachers, principals, and others in the school community.
Principle 4	Reflects best available research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership.
Principle 5	Enables teachers to develop further expertise in subject content, teaching strategies, use of technologies and other essential elements in teaching to high standards.
Principle 6	Promotes continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of schools.
Principle 7	Is planned collaboratively by those who will participate in and facilitate

	that development.
Principle 8	Requires substantial time and other resources.
Principle 9	Is driven by a coherent long-term plan.
Principle 10	Is evaluated ultimately on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning, and this assessment guides subsequent professional development efforts.

Note: From *Mission and Principles of Professional Development*, by the U. S. Department of Education Professional Development Team, 1995. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Others (Newman & Wehlage, 1995; Lee & Smith, 1996; Louis & Marks, 1998) who have studied professional learning communities also have found positive effects on student achievement and teacher practice. Although these authors use slightly different characteristics to describe a professional learning community, they all agree that a professional learning community provides an environment in which teachers can work collectively and collaboratively to examine instructional practice, improve their effectiveness, and increase student achievement.

As noted previously, a professional learning community provides the structures and processes that make it possible for teachers to improve their practice. But becoming a professional learning community is not easy. It takes commitment and time to break the pattern of teacher isolation that is common in many schools and to develop new ways of working together.

The Professional Development Program Audit

The Professional Development Program Audit is a tool for assessing the extent to which a district or school's professional development program addresses the principles of professional development that guided the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development. This tool was derived from materials that were used to judge the extent to which professional development programs reflected the principles for professional development that underlie the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development. Districts and schools that received the award provided evidence that they addressed most, if not all, of the items in the audit.

Districts and schools can use this tool to "take stock" of their current professional development program and to identify areas where the professional development program can be strengthened. Completing the audit also can help district and school staff — and the larger community — understand what effective professional development is and what it might take to design, implement, and evaluate effective professional development. Additional information about the audit, its uses, and scoring is provided with the Professional Development Program Audit tool in Appendix D.

The Professional Learning Community Checklist

A strong professional learning community supports teacher and student learning. That's why the focus in this section is on assessing the extent to which a school exhibits the characteristics of a professional learning community. The Professional Learning Community Checklist was developed from information gathered for a study of high-performing, high-needs schools and from McREL's work with school leadership teams that are working to establish professional learning communities. This tool can be used by schools to develop understanding of the elements of a professional learning community and to gauge the extent to which they exhibit the characteristics of a professional learning community. The checklist itself, along with additional related information about its uses and development, are provided in Appendix E.

Other Resources on Professional Development Programs

Over a period of four years, the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development identified 12 district-level winners and 15 school-level winners. Several resources were developed based on information gathered about these programs. Three of those resources, *Principles in Action* (McREL, 2000), *Learning from the Best* (Hassel, 1999), and *Improving Districts: Systems that Support Learning* (WestEd, 2002), are described in this section. This section also describes several resources developed by McREL to address teaching in a standards-based system and sustaining improvement efforts. Schools and districts can use these resources to design effective professional development programs.

Principles in Action Video. (McREL, 2000) is an engaging documentary-style video that explores the real-life experiences of four winners of the U.S. Department of Education's National Award for Model Professional Development. The *Principles in Action* video is based on interviews with staff developers, teachers, and administrators in two districts (Lawrence, Kansas and Olathe, Kansas) and two schools (Montview Elementary School in Aurora, Colorado and Woodrow Wilson Elementary School in Manhattan, Kansas). The district stories show how to encourage and support an environment for teacher and administrator learning. The school stories demonstrate the power of a school team working together with a common focus and how effective professional development looks in the day-to-day life of schools.

Each story demonstrates how the winners exemplify the principles of high-quality professional development identified by the U.S. Department of Education as part of the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development. Districts interested in understanding how to address Principles 5, 7, and 9 (see Exhibit 3.1 for a statement of the principles) will find the Olathe story most relevant. The Lawrence Public Schools story emphasizes Principles 6, 8, and 10. Similarly, school leaders interested in understanding how to address Principles 1, 3, and 4 may want to pay particular attention to the Montview story; the Woodrow Wilson story features Principle 2.

This resource can be used in a variety of ways and by a variety of school- and district-level staff — principals, staff developers, and district administrators — as well as policymakers and higher education faculty. Districts and schools can use this resource to

- enhance understanding of the components of effective professional development for school and district staff;

- provide the "big picture" view of how districts and schools can design professional development that is comprehensive and coherent;

- illustrate how districts, teacher unions, community members, and higher education partners can work together to support teacher and administrator professional development;

- demonstrate how to align professional development with other elements of the system such as district goals, school improvement planning, and state requirements;

- emphasize the district's role in providing professional development that has an impact on schools, teachers, and administrators;

- show how districts and schools can support school-based professional development (study groups, teacher leaders, peer coaching, action research);

- understand the role principals can play in professional development;

- explain the role of data and collaborative decision making to design professional development;

- demonstrate how to structure formal and informal professional development opportunities; and

- encourage schools and districts to re-think their professional development programs.

Learning from the Best. Effective professional development doesn't happen by chance. It requires careful planning, designated resources, and a commitment to learning on everyone's part. Too often, however, schools and districts find it difficult to develop a comprehensive professional development plan that supports teacher and administrator learning. *Learning from the Best* (Hassel, 1999), a book that is based on the practices of winners of the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development, can help districts and schools develop such plans and improve their professional development. The information in *Learning from the Best* is organized into four sections:

- *Designing Professional Development* – This section addresses how to (1) include professional development participants and organizers in planning, (2) develop an effective plan and (3) share the professional

development plan with the school community. The section includes guidance on ensuring that the plan is tied to the school/district long-term plan, based on needs assessment, research based, includes professional development goals, addresses content and process, identifies resources to support the professional development, and includes evaluation steps.

- *Implementing Professional Development* – This section addresses ways to (1) stay abreast of best practices in teaching, learning, and leadership as the plan is implemented, (2) align school and district policies and practices to support implementation of the plan, (3) identify processes for ensuring successful implementation of the plan, and (4) identify opportunities to make professional development a part of everyday school life.

- *Evaluating and Improving Professional Development* – This section addresses ways to (1) ensure the implementation of the evaluation plan and (2) periodically review the evaluation plan.

- *Sharing Professional Development Learning* – This section addresses ways to (1) keep records of decisions made about the professional development program and (2) keep implementation materials organized and available to others.

The book also includes a review of the literature on professional development keyed to each of these sections.

Improving Districts: Systems that Support Learning. Further guidance on how to design effective professional development is available in a publication that was developed by WestEd in collaboration with McREL and the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). The document, *Improving Districts: Systems that Support Learning* (WestEd, 2002), is based on a study of nine of the districts that received the National Award for Model Professional Development. This book shows how staff and administrator learning is at the core of improvement in these districts. It also highlights how these districts coordinate professional development and four other elements — vision, roles and structures, communication, and data-driven decision making — to support student learning. Exhibit 3.2 presents some implications for action in the area of professional development suggested by this resource.

Exhibit 3.2. Implications for Action Related to High-Quality Professional Development

Study research and best practices on professional development and the change process.
Establish standards for high-quality professional development.
Require that district and school professional development programs follow these standards.
Involve the school community in developing the standards; ensure that all stakeholders understand these standards.
Provide a variety of learning methods and options to meet teachers' and administrators' different levels of knowledge and skills

Note: Adapted from *Improving Districts: Systems that Support Learning* (p. 55), by WestEd, 2002. San Francisco: Author.

Standards-based Practices. As noted on several of the lists of effective professional development analyzed by Guskey (2003), and, in particular, on the list of professional development activities from NCLB discussed previously in this chapter, professional development should help teachers learn how to teach in a standards-based system. Exhibit 3.3 lists a number of the areas that teachers must address to teach effectively in a standards-based system. These areas were included in one section of the Teacher Preparation for Standards-Based Education Survey discussed in Chapter 2. Districts and schools can consult this list and use it as the basis of a needs assessment to identify appropriate professional development opportunities to help their teachers acquire the knowledge and skills they need to teach in a standards-based system.

Exhibit 3.3. Areas that Instruction Should Address in a Standards-based System

Teaching low-achieving students
Teaching limited English proficient students
Teaching students from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds
Engaging students in designing their own learning environment
Encouraging collaboration among students
Challenging students to accept and share responsibility for their own learning
Guiding students in self-assessment

Guiding students in developing conceptual understanding, and thinking and reasoning skills
Engaging all students in learning

Similarly, Exhibit 3.4 presents a list of standards-based practices that teachers need to develop to help all students meet high standards. Again, districts and schools can consult this list when designing professional development experiences or when gathering data about teachers' professional development needs.

Exhibit 3.4. Standards-based Teaching Practices

How to organize instruction around the goals of a lesson
How to plan instruction based on differences in students' prior knowledge
How to plan instruction based on students' individual differences in learning (e.g., due to culture, ability, learning styles)
How to assess a student's level of progress toward the goals of a lesson using a variety of methods
How to adapt instruction during the lesson based on a student's level of progress toward the goals of a lesson
How to work collaboratively with other teachers in lesson planning
How to work collaboratively with other teachers in analyzing student test scores
How to identify what a student must know and be able to do in order to meet a standard
How to choose curriculum and instructional materials based on their alignment with standards
How to assess students for proficiency on standards
How to organize grading around standards
How to verify judgments about student proficiency with other teachers

Leadership Folio Series: Sustaining School Improvement. This set of materials produced by McREL (2003) emphasizes what schools need to do to sustain their improvement efforts. The *Leadership Folio Series* includes five folios that address different topics: professional learning community, professional development, data-driven decisions, resource allocation, and communication. Each folio describes key elements of the topic, guidance for addressing the topic, and a continuum that schools can use to gauge their progress in becoming an organization that can sustain effective programs

and meet new challenges. The continuum for professional development is included in Exhibit 3.5.

Teachers Who Learn, Kids Who Achieve. This book, published by WestEd (2000), is based on a study of the school-level winners of the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development. The book includes profiles of the winning schools, implications for site and district leaders, an analysis of why a range of professional development activities work, and an explanation of the importance of professional community. Schools will find the book's list of informal learning opportunities especially useful for helping teachers and administrators expand their understanding of what "counts" as professional development. Some examples are serving on committees, sharing from conferences, designing curriculum, creating teacher portfolios, planning with a grade-level team, and supervising a student teacher.

Exhibit 3.5. Continuum of Effectiveness of Professional Development Programs

Least Effective	Somewhat Effective	Most Effective
Relevant		
Professional development is based on informal needs assessments and activities are "one-size-fits-all." Evaluation of the program is limited and focused on the quality of the activity rather than improved teacher practice. Changes to the professional development program are not related to the needs of the school.	Professional development is tied to the needs of the school. There are some options for professional development that take into account different levels of teacher expertise. Several sources of data are reviewed annually to determine if the program is improving teacher practice in ways that address the needs of the school. Changes to the professional development program are made if necessary.	Professional development is based on the needs and goals of the school. There are many options for professional development that take into account varied levels of teacher expertise. A variety of data are reviewed throughout the year to ensure that the program is improving teacher practice and student learning in ways that address the needs of the school. Changes to the program are made as needed.
Long Term & Integrated Into Daily Practice		
Professional development activities are disjointed and generally of insufficient duration for teachers to develop new skills. Some time is available for teachers to participate in professional development activities and encouragement is provided. Participation is not an explicit expectation. Funding is sought only on an as-needed basis.	Professional development activities are connected and some are integrated into daily practice. The activities are of sufficient duration for teachers to develop knowledge and skills. Supports in place include a professional development committee, designated time for teams of teachers to participate in school-level professional development, and an expectation to participate. Funds have been earmarked for	Professional development is long-term, ongoing, and integrated into daily practice. The activities are of sufficient duration for teachers to integrate what they have learned into their classrooms. A professional development committee is in place, and funding has been designated for professional development. Participation is a clear expectation for all teachers, and there is a culture of support for risk taking that encourages teachers to extend

Least Effective	Somewhat Effective	Most Effective
	professional development.	their learning.
Provides Feedback		
Teachers may receive informal feedback on what is learned in professional development experiences through chance conversations with colleagues, but no formal feedback on improvements in their practice is provided.	Teachers receive some feedback on their use of what is learned in professional development experiences through the teacher evaluation program or a district- or school-level coach.	Teachers receive frequent feedback on their use of what they have learned in professional development experiences through a variety of collaborative activities (e.g., peer coaching, team-level meetings, mentors, instructional support teachers, observations, self-reflection).

Note: From *Leadership Folio Series: Sustaining School Improvement*, by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, 2003. Aurora, CO: Author.

CONCLUSION

This chapter describes district- and school-level model professional development programs. It also includes tools and resources that can help districts and schools design similar programs. The model programs described in this chapter are the winners of the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development recognized by the U.S. Department of Education during the period 1996–2000. These programs were recognized because they demonstrated that they effectively address the principles of professional development developed by the U.S. Department of Education. Professional development designed with these principles in mind will be consistent with that advocated in the No Child Left Behind Act.

The winners of the National Award for Model Professional Development differ in many ways, but they are alike in their commitment to learning for their students and their staff. By using the assessments and resources described in this chapter that draw from these programs, districts and schools can improve professional development in ways that meet the calls for increased teacher quality and improved student learning.

CHAPTER FOUR:

ASSESSMENTS AND RESOURCES
FOR SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

Together, Chapters 2 and 3 address the continuum of teacher learning (Feiman-Nemser, 2001) by providing assessment tools and resources that can be used to improve preservice and inservice teacher education respectively. This chapter provides suggestions for integrating efforts to improve teacher preparation and professional development through school-university partnerships.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the joint responsibilities that higher education institutions, schools, and districts have to support the continuum of teacher learning. Next is an overview of school-university partnerships in teacher education. Models of school-university partnerships that are meeting these responsibilities are then described. These models are followed by a description of factors that are important to establishing such partnerships and an audit tool that universities and schools can use to assess the presence of these factors in current or planned partnerships. The chapter concludes with suggested assessments and resources for establishing or improving school-university partnerships.

THE RESPONSIBILITY TO SUPPORT THE CONTINUUM OF TEACHER LEARNING

Feiman-Nemser (2001) described teacher learning as occurring along a continuum from preservice through inservice years. In this view of teacher learning, teacher preparation does not end once teachers are in the classroom but rather continues with the induction of beginning teachers and with professional development for experienced teachers. The Educational Testing Service (2004) supports this view and observes that the pre-employment phase of a teaching career is only a small portion of a normal teaching career. They also call attention to NCLB teacher quality provisions, which not only define a "highly qualified" teacher but also define an "exemplary teacher." Such a teacher meets the "highly qualified" requirements and is recommended as exemplary by administrators based on teachers' efforts to improve the instruction of other teachers. To move teachers from preservice to novice to exemplary requires opportunities for teacher learning at all points along the preservice-inservice continuum (Educational Testing Service). School-university partnerships are a way to support the continuum of teacher learning.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development summarizes the mutual learning that can occur through school-university partnerships:

> The best school-university partnerships are two-way streets — they offer not only deeper practical training for new teachers but also ongoing professional development for seasoned classroom educators. Through

such collaboration, experienced teachers gain guidance on best practices and often become mentors, college instructors, or degree-pursuing graduate students. University education professors gain access to authentic K–12 settings, and schools of education ensure that they graduate well-qualified teachers. (2003, p. 1)

In addition to supporting teacher learning, school-university partnerships can play an important role in teacher education reform. In the fourth annual report on teacher quality from the U.S. Department of Education (2005), partnerships between education stakeholders are described as a strategy for improving teacher preparation. The report cites the following examples of partnership activities that support positive change:

- Strengthening the roles of K–12 educators in the design and implementation of effective teacher education programs

- Increasing collaboration among the faculty of higher education institutions' schools of arts and sciences and education;

- Developing programs that involve broad university and partnership-wide commitment to improving K-12 student learning and achievement;

- Producing teachers with a greater command of academic subjects and the skills to teach by providing strong hands-on classroom experience; and

- Preparing prospective teachers to use technology as a tool for teaching and learning and to work effectively with diverse students. (U. S. Department of Education, 2005, p. 18)

One of the shared characteristics of the four winners of the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation (U. S. Department of Education, 2000) was collaboration with PreK–12 schools (Dean & Lauer, 2003). Specifically, PreK–12 stakeholders influence program evaluation at the four institutions by providing feedback about program components (e.g., content of courses and field experiences, training for cooperating teachers) and program graduates (e.g., candidates' content knowledge, ability to manage a classroom, ability to teach diverse students). Feedback is gathered in formal and informal ways through the institutions' partnerships with PreK–12 schools and districts. Formal ways include regular meetings of the teacher preparation programs with partner schools and focus groups in which principals provide feedback to the programs regarding the performance of teacher candidates and graduates. In addition to formal partnerships, the four programs have strong relationships with principals and cooperating teachers in schools where their candidates are placed for field experiences. PreK–12 practitioners participate on advisory and curriculum committees and some work directly with faculty to develop courses that incorporate PreK–12 standards.

OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

An understanding about the nature of partnerships is important for knowing how to establish and sustain effective school-university partnerships. The purpose of an education partnership is "to form an alliance of resources and expertise between organizations aimed at achieving a mutually desired outcome, one that is not likely to be realized without the involvement of both parties" (Barnett, Berg, Hall, & Camarena, 1999, p. 489). Barnett et al. describe different types of partnerships based on varying levels of interdependence between organizations. In *cooperation*, partner organizations remain independent and agree to work together on a short-term goal such as sponsoring a workshop. In *coordination* the partnership involves specific projects and tasks, but there is infrequent interaction among organization members. A *collaboration* is a type of partnership with a high degree of interdependence between organizations. As a result, collaborations require more commitment of resources, that is, people, time, and money, compared to cooperation and coordination. According to Barnett et al., in collaborations, the partners provide one another mutual support and assistance, share equally in responsibility and authority, and view one another as having resources and strengths that the other does not possess. In addition, collaborations generally involve projects that are more complex and long-term than those in partnerships focused on cooperation or coordination.

School-university partnerships generally describe collaboration as the process by which they will achieve their goals. However, if the resources devoted to the partnership are sufficient only for cooperation or coordination, then it will be difficult to attain the desired outcomes. Similarly, if the partnership does not successfully establish the characteristics of collaboration (e.g., equal authority, mutual support, etc.), then the partnership will experience tensions and problems that interfere with the work it is attempting to accomplish. There are numerous articles in the literature on school-university partnerships that describe the challenges of teacher education collaborations, and many of the challenges cited (e.g., inequities between partners, perceived lack of mutual respect) indicate that the necessary characteristics for collaboration (e.g., sufficient human and financial resources) were not established (Kersh & Masztal, 1998). The advice provided in this chapter is designed to provide guidance concerning the design of school-university partnerships that can result in successful collaborations.

Randi and Zeichner (2004) describe several types of partnerships between higher education and PreK–12 schools that are designed to provide opportunities for teacher learning. For example, subject-area partnerships focus on specific content areas, such as discussion groups to deepen teacher knowledge of social studies. In research partnerships, school teachers and university faculty work together on research projects that address some aspect of teacher practice. For example, teachers might work with higher education researchers to analyze the influence of instruction on children's thinking. Partnerships between individual teachers and university faculty members also provide opportunities for learning. Inservice teachers might teach a course for preservice

teachers or work with a teacher educator to develop new curricula. Finally, a professional development school (PDS) establishes a learning community among teacher educators, preservice students, and inservice teachers (Holmes Group, 1986). Preservice students complete their field experiences under the tutelage of experienced teachers who, in turn, have opportunities to inquire into practice with teacher educators.

PDS in its myriad forms is the most common type of partnership between schools and universities. Whitford and Metcalf-Turner (1999) note that it is difficult to provide a precise definition for PDS because relationships between school and university partners and the substance of their work are customized to fit with local circumstances. As a result, there are many variations in school-university partnerships that describe themselves as PDSs, and there are also many partnerships doing the work of PDSs that are not labeled as PDSs. Teitel (as cited in Metcalf-Turner) reviewed papers on approximately 200 PDSs and found that these partnerships showed "'strong convergence around four goals: improvement of student learning, the preparation of educators, the professional development of educators, and research and inquiry into improving practice'" (p. 265). Whitford and Metcalf-Turner comment that at the heart of PDS arrangements are collaboration and the development of a learning community. In discussing the institutional relationships of the partnership, the authors found two conditions necessary for success of a PDS: (a) the blending of the values and cultures of the higher education institution and the schools, and (b) the valuing of the partnership with respect to teacher education and professional development by both institutions as well as by the individuals who are participating in the partnership.

Those who have studied PDSs describe them as collaborations. In other words, they do not entail merely cooperation or coordination, but rather PDSs support and pursue a common agenda for the common good (Barnett et al., 1999; Whitford & Metcalf-Turner, 1999). The partnerships described as models in this chapter could all be described as doing PDS work, and while they vary in title, characteristics, and contexts, in their most basic forms they are collaborations. As such, they provide examples and guidance for establishing collaborative school-university partnerships.

DESIGNING SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

This section describes six exemplary school-university partnerships that can serve as models for designing such partnerships. The selection of these partnerships was based on the following criteria:

- The partnership has been in existence for three or more years.

- The partnership is a collaboration between one or more higher education institutions and one or more K–12 schools.

- The purpose of the partnership is to improve both preservice and inservice teacher education through improvements in the preparation provided by both partners.

- Collaboration activities include alignment of teacher preparation with the needs of K–12 teaching.

- There is documentation on the partnership's structures and processes.

- There is documentation of the partnerships' accomplishments, preferably data indicating positive influences of the collaboration on both preservice and inservice teacher education and the potential for positive influences on K–12 student achievement.

A search of the ERIC database for the years 2002–2005 was conducted to identify potential model partnerships and also to locate articles that have guidance regarding the design of school-university partnerships. Based on this search and subsequent Internet searches, 42 reports were reviewed for examples and recommendations related to school-university partnerships. There were 23 different partnerships described in this literature, but the majority of the articles did not report outcome data. It is important for the future of school-university partnerships that they document their accomplishments and especially their outcomes related to teaching and student learning. The next section describes six partnerships that have this documentation to varying degrees.

Characteristics of Model School-University Partnerships

To illustrate the characteristics of model school-university partnerships, the first part of this section provides information on six partnerships that met the criteria described previously. The six partnerships differ in many ways, but they are alike in their purpose: pursue the mutual improvement of preservice and inservice teacher preparation. At a fundamental level, each is doing the work of a PDS through a partnership built on collaboration.

Examples. The six model school-university partnerships identified through the literature search described previously include: (1) Long Beach Education Partnership, (2) Benedum Collaborative (West Virginia), (3) Southern Maine Partnership, (4) California State University, Chico: A rural regional partnership, (5) Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning, K-16, and (6) Texas A&M University System. Each example includes a description of the partnership's context, structures and processes, accomplishments, and challenges. The amount of documentation for each of the six partnerships varied considerably so that some of the partnerships are described in more detail than others.

Long Beach Education Partnership. The Long Beach Education Partnership had its origins in the various conflicts emerging throughout the city of Long Beach in the early 1990's. The Naval base was closing, jobs in the aerospace industry were shrinking, and

the demographics of the city were changing rapidly. Academic achievement was falling, and gang warfare was threatening public safety and the tourist industry. In 1994, the mayor called together a task force of diverse stakeholders to examine the issues facing the city and make recommendations for change. Three areas of need emerged: economic development, education, and public safety. While other groups were formed to work on economic and safety needs, educators from the three large institutions within the city – California State University, Long Beach (CSULB); Long Beach City College (LBCC), and the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) – came together to collaborate on education issues. Each of the institutions had a new, visionary leader, and the time was right. Meeting in a retreat setting in 1994, leaders from the three entities formed the Long Beach Education Partnership and agreed to share the cost of a full-time coordinator for the project (Houck, Cohn, & Cohn, 2004).

Context. The LBUSD has 98,000 students, of which 72 percent qualify for free/reduced price lunch. The diverse student population is made up of 45 percent Hispanic students, 20 percent white students, 18 percent African American students and 17 percent Asian/Southeast Asian/Filipino/Pacific Islander students with one percent "other" students (California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, n.d.c.). This partnership is considered an Urban Community Partnership and its vision is to provide a world-class K-18 education system (preschool through Master's degree) that prepares students for success in higher education and the work arena without needing remediation. The stated goals of the Partnership are: (1) to improve student achievement at all levels, and (2) to increase the efficiency of the participating institutions by aligning and coordinating expectations, curricula, assessment, and resources for both students and teachers. Each goal has its own timeline and planned outcomes (Houck et al., 2004; California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, n.d.c).

Structures and Processes. One important aspect of this partnership was its ability to secure adequate funding for its programs. In the beginning they received a grant from the John S. And James L. Knight Foundation for $450,000. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing awarded a $50,000 grant to the College of Education and a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant for 2.4 million was secured by the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. These funds provided a strong financial foundation for the partnership (Houck et al., 2004).

The Seamless Education Committee is the umbrella for Partnership initiatives. K–16 faculty from five subject areas (language arts, mathematics, science, history/social sciences, and foreign languages) meet regularly to address policy and governance issues. The Partnership defines seamless education as "alignment of academic content standards, learning methodology, and assessment from preschool through the master's level; ensuring coherent exit and entry expectations between the educational partners; and rethinking both the preparation and continued professional development of public school and college teachers. The partners have reviewed course outlines, academic

content standards, student assessment programs, and student achievement data" (California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, n.d.a, ¶ 6).

Accomplishments. Although there continue to be ongoing challenges towards meeting the goal of true collaborative data-based decision-making, "the Partnership has contributed to developing standards-based assessments, evaluating teacher preparation programs, assisting in procuring funds from external agencies, and tracking student progress through the three institutions" (Houck et al., 2004, p. 143). Sample positive outcomes of the collaborative work of the Partnership include:

- Two-thirds of the targeted students were reading at or above grade level, district-wide by 2002 as a result of the K–3 Literacy Initiative.

- The number of K–8 future teachers in math/science increased from 10 to 200 within three years.

- Ninety-one percent of middle schools met or exceeded state growth targets on the SAT-9 by 2001.

- The number of students taking algebra increased 33% from 1998 to 2001.

- Teacher retention rates, teacher morale and student achievement have all increase because of efforts to improve district professional development.

- There has been a reduction in the number of students that need remediation courses when they enter the university.

- A study of the High School Outreach and Academic Preparation (HSOAP) program indicated that the gap between high school and college, as measured by the university math and English entrance exams, is closing due to (1) demographic and financial incentives; (2) openness to changing strategies based on data analysis; (3) the school district and university faculty, staff, and administration have a mutual trust and respect for each other.

- A Service Experiences for Revitalizing Education (SERVE) pilot study showed that students preparing to teach benefited from a data-based approach early in preparation and that the college students' experiences with service learning have, in turn, benefited the elementary students. (Houck, et al.)

Challenges. An overarching concern in partnerships between public schools and universities is the different cultures inherent in the institutions. University faculties, for example, tend to operate in a more autonomous and individualistic environment and are typically not used to the levels of collaboration required. Collaboration calls for "conformity in practice" that clashes with academic freedom that higher education

faculty value (Houck et al., 2004, p. 35). University requirements for research and publishing, as well as tenure and promotion requirements, can serve as a disincentive for university faculty to spend time in schools, attend meetings, and so on. In contrast, school personnel tend to be more action-oriented and reactive, with little time or patience for theoretical or abstract ideas. While these kinds of culture differences can create challenges, they can also be viewed as resources. "In Long Beach, the disciplinary focus of university faculty became a cornerstone for Partnership efforts by creating discipline-based collaborative groups of faculty and teachers" (p. 35). The CSULB deans have supported increased recognition of work in public schools as valuable in consideration of awarding tenure and promotion.

Another challenge to university/public school partnership is the somewhat traditional assumption that universities have a great deal to offer public schools, but not the other way around. In Long Beach, it was important to acknowledge that each partner brought key strengths to the partnership. The university can offer fresh ideas and the latest research in the various disciplines; while teachers "bring vital understanding of the characteristics of their students and their classroom context" (Houck et al., 2004, p. 36). University administrators can contribute knowledge of admission requirements; school administrators, a deep understanding of how schools operate. All of this information is essential to effective collaboration with a goal of sustained systemic reform.

In designing the Early Literacy training, it became obvious that there was disconnect between the university's philosophy and the district's obligation to comply with state mandates. This led to dialogue about the needs of practitioners, and the misalignment of the teacher preparation program and the district literacy initiative. Proving to be a turning point for the university teacher education faculty, the result was a redesign of university teacher preparation programs, starting with an initial emphasis on methods courses that focused on best practices in teaching reading (Houck et al., 2004).

Partnering can be awkward. "During the early meetings of the Partnership, the higher education faculty were more like guests at a party thrown by the school district. …The guest role is not an undesirable one; in fact, faculty could provide input and see firsthand the issues, concerns, solutions, and struggles that a progressive school district like LBUSD grapples with each day. Sometimes the roles are reversed and the K-12 partners get a glimpse of concerns critical to higher education. But there has been a meeting of the minds..." (Houck, 2004, p. 53).

Success in K–16 collaboration depends on meeting regularly and having open, honest communication about strengths and challenges. Trust builds from stable relationships. But an important lesson from the Long Beach Partnership is that relationships cannot be solely dependent on the individual personalities of key players. Relationships must be institutionalized so that they can be sustained when there is personnel turnover. New key players must be engaged in the work immediately and well socialized to the efforts of the partnership. It is also critical to "make sure that the right people discuss the key

issues and not let little problems derail from the larger goals. It's important for those in leadership roles who understand that and to persist" (California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, n.d.b, p.12).

Finally, the presence of external threats (such as economic or political issues) can take collaboration and interrelatedness to new levels. Early on, participants in the Partnership understood that only by working together would they have a chance to overcome the challenges they faced. The idea that everyone was on the same side against common "enemies" helped build trust and solidify relationships (Houck et al., 2004).

Benedum Collaborative (West Virginia). In 1986, a combination of political support, key leadership from the university president and the Dean of the College of Human Resources and Education, and external funding enabled West Virginia University to embark on an ambitious effort to improve teacher education. The following year, the university joined the Holmes Group, a consortium of 96 research universities with educator preparation programs dedicated to positively changing the way teachers are educated (Benedum Collaborative, 2005; Swanson, 1995).

Context. The Benedum Project selected the first set of Professional Development Schools (PDS) 1990 and in 1994 a new five-year, dual degree teacher education program known as the Benedum Collaborative Model of Teacher Education was approved. Shortly afterward the Benedum Project officially changed their name to the Benedum Collaborative. Currently there are twenty-eight professional development schools that collaborate with the faculty at West Virginia University with the shared goals of 1) redesigning teacher and educator professionals preparation program so that it is congruent and intellectually sound; 2) establishing professional development schools to bridge the gap between research and practice; and 3) establishing collaborative processes, strategies, structures so that changes last (McCrory & Steel, 2002).

The essential key to success is seen as collaboration between the university and public schools. The Collaborative is a community of professionals, based on mutual trust, for professional knowledge, creativity, and shared experiences. It is intended to produce a new culture that crosses the traditional borders between the university and the public schools. (Gill & Hove, 2000; McCrory & Steel, 2002; Swanson, 1995)

Structures and Processes. A planning grant from the Benedum Foundation in 1988 enabled the university to form a project planning team made up of a diverse group of educators from the university and local public schools (Swanson, 1995). In addition to this grant, $50,000 was set aside by the university for each year "to promote collaboration across campus through various professional development experiences" (p. 171). Groups representing the 28 professional development schools, the university, and cross-sections from public schools and the university govern the Collaborative. There are four "critical friends" groups – the Professional Development School Steering

Committee Chairs, the Professional Development Teacher Education Site Coordinators, the Professional Development School Principals, and the WVU Teacher Education Faculty and Liaisons (Benedum Collaborative, 2004). Each group focuses on those issues, needs, and initiatives that are particular to their work; each selects a group of tri-chairs who lead the group and represent it on the Cross-Site Steering Committee. The Collaborative office works with the group chairs to schedule meetings and handle logistics; each group meets on whatever schedule fits members' needs. The Cross-Site Committee meets three times a year. The Cross-Site Steering Committee is "the only place in the Collaborative where the interest of multiple institutions, multiple roles, and multiple constituencies are brought together for the purposes of democratic participation in collective efforts" (Benedum Collaborative, 2004, p. 3).

Accomplishments. A RAND report to the Collaborative in 2000 found a number of positive outcomes resulting from the work of the Collaborative (Gill & Hove, 2000). The study included data from university student records, three years of test data from the professional development schools, ten years of sate report card data, and data from teacher and student surveys. In addition, site visits were made to all 21 professional development schools, during which principals, teachers, and teacher candidates were interviewed, and classroom observations conducted. A summary of findings included:

- WVU novice teachers were better qualified to enter the university; made better grades at the university, and were highly regarded by staff at the professional development schools.

- Students attending the professional development schools had higher test scores and larger annual math gains than non-PDS students.

- Some professional development schools had succeeded in creating "empowered communities," but there was a wide variance in program participation.

Members of the Benedum Collaborative have created tool kits to share what they have learned with others at Universities and schools interested in creating collaborative partnerships with the goal of increasing student learning. The tool kits generally consist of PowerPoint presentations, handbooks, brochures, and various other resource materials. A member of the Benedum Collaborative delivers the tool kit as part of a professional development series (McCrory & Steel, 2002; Benedum Collaborative, n.d.).

Challenges. After the creation and approval of the five-year teacher education program, there was a great deal of controversy around issues of evaluation and institutionalization, as well as differences between the dean's office and project staff which led to resignations, loss of trust, frustration, and anger. The college saw the need for leadership and shared ownership, and a transition team was established to restructure the project. In 1996, the name was changed to the Benedum Collaborative,

including West Virginia University and 21 professional development schools (Gill & Hove, 2000).

Southern Maine Partnership. The Southern Maine Partnership was founded in 1985 as a collaborative effort among six school district superintendents, the dean of the College of Education, and a University of Southern Maine faculty member. It has grown to include 36 school districts, which include more than one-third of the state's students and teachers as well as two private schools (Swanson, 1995; Southern Maine Partnership, n.d.). The group's dual agenda is the renewal of schools and the reform of teacher education.

Context. A key feature of the Partnership is that its mission and activities have evolved and changed since its inception. It strives to be responsive to the needs of its members, as well as issues that arise, while remaining focused on its core values. While the Partnership began by linking institutions, the connection is now to processes and outcomes that concentrate on the renewal of schools and the development of teachers. The current work of the Partnership is guided by four main objectives: (a) developing tools and training for educators that promote equity and improve teaching, learning, and assessment; (b) enhancing the capacity of schools and districts to promote equitable policies and procedures; (c) developing school leaders capable of promoting equity; and (d) developing local community capacity to promote equity, including creating an opening for place-based education. The strategies used to accomplish these goals include networking; applied assistance; and research, development, and dissemination (Southern Maine Partnership, n.d.).

Structures and Processes. There is a partnership Advisory Council that oversees and guides the work. The advisory council meets regularly as do groups of superintendents, curriculum coordinators and principals. The partnership also sponsors a series of workshops called Dine and Discuss that are facilitated by Partnership staff members and are open to all members. Meeting times and locations are prominently displayed on the Southern Maine Partnership's website. Structures such as Building Steering Committees have increased coherence, and there have been more opportunities for teachers to dialogue with colleagues and exert leadership (Barnes, 2005).

The partnership has multiple funding sources. They collect dues from district members, apply for grants and receive contracts to do professional development work. Funding for various partnership projects came from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, The Davis Family Foundation, the Libra Foundation and the Noyce Foundation to name just a few.

Accomplishments. The Portland Public Schools, the Portland Education Association and the University of Southern Maine worked together to create and implement the Strengthening and Sustaining Teachers (SST) project. Now in its fifth year, the project provides mentors for new teachers. Mentors are chosen through a rigorous selection

process, trained and paired with new teachers for two years. In 2004, the SST project won a partnership award from the National Education Association and Saturn/United Auto Workers. This is a national award that honors mentoring programs created through cooperative efforts of local school districts and teachers' associations (Portland Education Partnership, n.d.).

Challenges. A number of valuable lessons emerged from the five-year project. First, it is essential to have a committee that meets on a regular basis to examine accomplishments, identify and resolve problems, and establish future directions. A formal document or memorandum is needed to spell out goals and ground rules. Designating a coordinator is important to coordinate activities and maintain clear communication with all participants, and "visible leadership" is needed from the leaders of all participating organizations. Two common issues with which the project struggled were the minimal participation of the Arts and Sciences faculty at the university, and the lack of clear official roles for school-level administrators (Barnes, 2005).

California State University, Chico: A Rural Regional Partnership. California State University, Chico collaborates with 47 rural school districts in northeastern California in its "*Finding and Keeping the Best*" program to prepare and retain qualified special education teachers, addressing a critical shortage in the region. Defined as an on-the-job teacher preparation program, it grew out of the university's Special Education Advisory Board, "a group representing each county office and major school district, and including a cross-section of professional roles, community and parent representatives, and university faculty" (Churchill, Jensen, & Cepello, 2001, p. 2). The Board approved the development and implementation of a two-year intern training program, and "formed a regional partnership to improve the quality of education in the region, to alleviate its severe shortage of qualified special education teachers, and to reduce teachers' professional isolation" (p. 2).

Context. Because the participants are spread over a wide, rural geographic area, the university provides Web-based and televised evening courses. The school districts release the interns ten paid days per year to attend one-day a month classes at the university. Highly individualized, the needs of the interns determine the course material and the sequence in which it is taught. State and federal grants support tuition, the mentors, and ongoing evaluation. A recent improvement in the program is the selection of three Distinguished Teachers in Residence. These regional mentor leaders serve as coordinators for intern support – conducting focus groups, providing individual intern classroom support, and acting as liaisons to administrators and mentor teachers. The positive results of the change have included increased support for mentor teachers and interns, and more consistency across the region (Churchill, et al., 2001).

Structures and Processes. The partnership was originally structured so that responsibility, fiscal resources, and personnel would be shared in order to "recruit, select, educate, support, and certify the professional special education teacher"

(Churchill, et al., 2001, p. 2). Decision-making regarding individual interns is an equal process between the university and the school districts, and is fostered by continuous communication. The Advisory Board meets two times per year to ensure that the "energy and spirit of equity that initiated the venture [is] sustained" (p. 2). The program is designed to promote a continuous cycle of "curriculum development, instructional planning, delivery of field supervision, and corresponding evaluation activities" (p. 4).

Accomplishments. The partnership claims five distinctions:

- Decision-making regarding "intern recruitment, admission, support, and certification" is an equal process between the university and participating school district.

- Cohorts of interns attend a summer preservice "boot camp," and form a supportive peer group that is intended to last beyond the program.

- University special education faculty teach courses in the evening via an online distance education system. Interns also attend one full-day cohort class per month.

- An electronic network links cohort interns, university instructors, school administrators, field supervisors, mentor teachers and principals.

- Intern support is designed specifically to increase professional competence and confidence, and to reduce isolation; in essence creating an intern "safety net" (p. 3).

Churchill et al. (2001) reported that the Special Education Graduate Outcomes Study (1994-2000) found a "significant increase in graduates' ability to teach and work with pupils, parents, and other teachers" (p. 4). The program has also resulted in teacher retention rates for special education teachers in rural settings that exceed state and national levels. "Ten years after the initiation of the Partnership, 95% of program graduates are currently employed by local school districts that participated in and contributed to the partnership" (p. 4). Graduates of the program reported benefits including positive peer relationships, increased professional knowledge, and a more accessible certification process.

School administrators reported an improved quality of teaching among program participants, easier accessibility of the certification process, improved support structures for new teachers, better teacher retention, improved special education services for students and their families, an increased teacher interest in continuous professional growth, and an improved relationship between the schools and the university (p. 4).

Challenges. The main lesson that has emerged from the partnership is the importance of relationships across the region, and the need for continuous, honest, and equal communication among all partners. While building and sustaining relationships takes

time and resources, it is the key to success for these kinds of programs. It is important for participants in the partnership as well as legislators and funding organizations to realize that it can take anywhere from three to five years for this partnership to show results (Churchill et. al., 2004).

Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning, K-16. In 1994, the Maryland State Department of Education began the process of developing performance assessments for high school students in four content areas. The chancellor of the University System of Maryland committed to a process of aligning its college admissions requirements with state K-12 performance standards. The Maryland State Department of Education, the University System of Maryland, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission formed the Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning K-16 to accomplish that goal.

Context. According to Shapiro (2003) the Partnership agreed to:

- Enhance student access to post-secondary education, especially for disadvantaged and minority students, by aligning high school expectations with college admissions requirements so that any student who wants to attend college can do so.

- Improve the quantity and quality of teacher candidates (and current teachers) so that every classroom has a qualified teacher.

- Strengthen communication and collaborative decision-making among the three partner institutions (p. 24).

The Partnership has engaged in a variety of activities to achieve its goals. A key strategy is the collaboration of K-12 teachers and higher education faculty to design assessments of K-12 Core Learning Goals for high school graduation, align them with college admission requirements, and identify key competencies needed to succeed on college placement tests. Faculty across two- and four-year institutions are working together to develop clear, consistent expectations for undergraduate education, beginning with English Composition and Mathematics. Another strategy involves extending the institutions' current capacity to share and use K-16 student achievement data. Additionally, the Partnership engages the business community in education reform through participation in the K-16 Leadership Council (Shapiro, 2003; Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning, K-16, 2005).

Structures and Processes. The chairmanship of the Partnership rotates among the heads of the three institutions. A Leadership Council of corporate, community, and education leaders provides support, communication, and advice. A workgroup, consisting of members from the three participating entities, meets regularly to share information, address specific issues, and collaborate on planning.

A number of grants have been successfully obtained to support the Partnership's goals, including:

- A National Science Foundation Grant to study Change and Sustainability in Higher Education.

- A US Department of Education Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant – Education, Mentoring, Coaching, and Cohorts (E=mc2) – to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers for the Baltimore school district by providing content-area coaching and mentoring to practicing teachers and establishing a cooperative teacher education program between Towson University and the community college.

- A National Science Foundation Math and Science Partnership Grant – VIP 16 – to improve science education by creating learning communities of teachers to develop their content knowledge and pedagogy skills.

- A US Department of Education Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant to create Project LINC, designed to enhance the quality of teachers in Prince George's County schools. (Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning, K-16, 2005)

Accomplishments. During the 2002-03 school year, over 1,100 professional development activities were conducted by professional development schools – most focused on literacy, mathematics, mentoring, or technology. "While the data are still preliminary, the outcomes indicate that professional development schools, as a total part of a school's context and instruction program, are having positive effects on students, preservice interns, and inservice teachers" (Maryland State Department of Education, 2004, p. 55). In a study conducted to examine differences in teacher preparation, Neubert and Binko (1998) found that "the PDS internship was more effective than the regular program in preparing teacher candidates to maintain classroom discipline, use technology effectively for instruction, and reflect on their teaching" (p. 46).

In terms of student achievement the results have been more neutral. Cooper and Corbin (2003) found that there were no statistically significant differences in student performance on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) based on whether or not a site was a PDS school or not.

Challenges. A continuing challenge is K-16 alignment. The high expected failure rate on state high school assessments as they are phased in over the next several years is expected to create problems (Shapiro, 2003). Another ongoing issue, common to many university-school partnerships, is the continued lack of involvement of the Arts and Sciences faculty in teacher education programs (Blackwell, 2002). Overall, the Partnership has successfully redesigned teacher education in the state of Maryland, created higher standards for high school graduation, and aligned college entrance

requirements. But its "…successes are numbered most obviously in the processes we establish to work through very real (and frequently frustrating) challenges" (Shapiro, 2003, p. 25).

Texas A&M University System. Texas A&M University participated in an NEA-TEI grant, which was evaluated in 1995-96. At that time, the university was working to integrate theory and practice in 11 schools, three of which were identified as professional development schools, to prepare new teachers and provide professional development for veteran teachers. Research indicated a comprehensive, complex partnership between the university and the three professional development schools, which offer collaboratively taught methods courses during the semester before student teaching occurs.

Context. According to Coble, Edelfelt, and Kettlewell (2004) the Institute for School-University Partnerhips has identified six objectives that the Texas A&M University System accepted in 1999:

- escalating and refining current university-school partnerships;

- increasing the standing of teacher preparation and university-school partnerships within the university system;

- improving the effectiveness and quality of education preparation;

- ensuring strong curriculum alignment among high schools, community colleges, and the A&M universities, and improving transitions from one to another;

- promoting collaboration, research, and development that helps to inform and improve state education policies; and

- implementing a comprehensive, continuous improvement system.

Structures and Processes. The Texas senate provided money for A&M to develop Centers for Professional Development and Technology, enabling the university to expand the number of partner schools, add computers and multimedia, and establish compressed video sites to allow dialogue across the project sites. Professional development schools provide some or all of four activities – preparation of teachers, continuing education for inservice teachers, designing university and school curriculum, and research and evaluation. One elementary school received a grant to provide stipends for 20 teachers to plan, teach, and serve as school/university liaisons (Loving, Wiseman, Cooner, Sterbin, & Seidel, 1997).

The Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture (TLAC) at Texas A&M has an internship program for students that have completed all course work and degree requirements except student teaching. The Bachelor's degree is awarded, and the student then enrolls in the graduate internship program. Participating schools agree to

hire five interns and pay their first year salaries, less $8000 that is used to hire a replacement for the designated site mentor teacher. Mentors are required to have Master's degrees and at least five years of teaching experience, and attend a preparation institute at the university (College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M, n.d.).

Another university-school partnership at Texas A&M focused on technology. The Technology Mentor Fellowship Program (TMFP), funded by a three-year grant, established a consortium of six rural East Texas school districts, one urban district in the central part of the state, and the university to integrate technology into teacher preparation. The program was designed to benefit from the technology expertise of preservice teachers, matching them with K-12 teachers and university faculty to "model technology as an instructional tool in K-12 classrooms and college classrooms" (Denton, 2003, p.1). The 628 undergraduate Technology Fellows used web-based resources to support individual university teacher education faculty involved in teacher preparation, both on campus and school-based, to provide professional development.

As part of the project, pairs consisting of a Technology Fellow and university faculty member developed K-18 learning objects; many of which were incorporated into online learning courses. "Through their direct experience with technology instructional development, both the Technology Fellows and their partners have gained a greater appreciation of what is possible regarding technology applications for their classrooms" (Denton, 2003, p. 1). Another benefit was teacher candidates who have better communication and technology skills, as well as skills in providing technology support.

Accomplishments. The program resulted in new leadership roles for both preservice and mentor teachers, enabled mutually beneficial relationships between school and university faculties that provided insights for both, and increased professional development opportunities. All participants believed that the time and work required were worth the gains – more effective teaching and learning for all.

Challenges. Challenges for the program included funding and staffing issues, effective communication, and the difficulty of evaluation and dissemination, which were seen as critical components that are too frequently overlooked (Loving et al., 1997). "While the growth of technology skills and knowledge by faculty and teaching candidates were the goals of this project, by-products of staff ingenuity in resolving unanticipated challenges in managing and implementing the program resulted in solutions that have dramatically affected this project and are shaping the college's technology future" (Denton, 2003, p.3). Another lesson learned from the project was that "many (but not all) teacher education faculty were willing to engage in technology professional development experiences delivered by a Technology Fellow (undergraduate student) if the professional development activities were tailored to the faculty member's individual needs and project assignments and arranged to fit their time schedule" (Denton, p. 4). A key to the success of the project was the "dyads" of fellows and faculty members who worked

together, creating new communication channels as they established meeting times to work and share. Finally, "as technology knowledge and skills have grown among faculty members, encouraging teaching candidates to integrate technology into their class activities has dramatically increased by these faculty members" (Denton, p. 4).

Key Factors in School–University Partnerships

This K-16 work is messy and complicated. Sometimes it appears that we are wandering in a desert of dry, desiccated policies—all form and no 'substance.' Sometimes the ground under our feet trembles with potential segmental schisms. Sometimes institutions and departments build impenetrable walls around their 'turf,' naively believing education reform has little to do with the lives and work of 'regular' faculty. But ultimately, those of us who have toiled in the K-16 arena for several years have come to realize that every day we are doing work that ultimately benefits the students who need it most (Shapiro, 2003, p. 26).

As the descriptions of the programs and the quote above illustrate, the road to a successful partnership can be filled with rough spots, but the journey is worth taking. A review of the lessons learned by the six model school-university partnerships and other recommendations in the literature on school-university collaborations, revealed several factors that need attention in order to reduce the number of rough spots and make the collaboration journey smoother. These factors, which include (1) organization, (2) vision and values, (3) cultural differences, (4) relationships, (5) leadership, (6) structure, (7) communication, (8) tenure, (9) continuum of learning, (10) standards, (11) evaluation, (12) resources, and (13) policy makers, are described below.

- **Organization**

  There should be a formal organization of the partnership, including a written document that identifies roles and responsibilities. However, the structure of the partnership should remain dynamic and adaptable to changing needs and circumstances over the long term (California Alliance for PreK-18 Partnerships, 2004; Kersh & Masztal, 1998).

- **Vision and Values**

  Mutual benefits to all participating institutions have to be identified, and all must be equally invested in them. The needs and self-interests of all partners must be understood and addressed if the partnership is to succeed and be sustainable in the long term (Epanchin & Colucci, 2002).While it is recognized and acknowledged that this can be a difficult process, given the complex differences between the goals, responsibilities, and systems of higher education and public schools, time should be taken to identify common values and build a shared vision.

The overall mission of the partnership should be clear; short- and long-term goals should be agreed upon and congruent with what people value. According to the California Academic Partnership Program (2005), objectives and goals should be reflective of "geography, institutional array, economic conditions, and cultural and historical context" (p. 3). Conflicting expectations have to be clarified and dealt with and differences respected. "Building shared values around improved teaching and learning in the context of collaborative problem-solving and deprivatized practice is especially challenging" (Firestone & Fisler, 2002, p. 488).

- Cultural Differences

There must be a clear understanding and acknowledgement of the differences between higher education and public school systems – missions, cultures, structures, policies, politics, and so on. Conditions that may interfere with success must be recognized – obstacles must be identified and understood before they can be overcome (Ohana, 2003; Swanson, 1995). It is important to engage in a systematic process of cultural learning so that clear organizational alignment can be established. Efforts should be made to overcome the stereotypes that groups have of each other. School-university interactions are often seen as "top down" knowledge and expertise that is delivered from the university "above" to the schools "below," and this perception must be overcome by both universities and the schools with whom they work.

The differences in institutional cultures should be seen and used as strengths rather than obstacles. At the same time, it is important to understand and respect the boundaries of the separate partner entities. The use of cross-institutional and cross-functional teams can enable differences to be identified and dealt with. Not everything will be easy or smooth. When necessary, admit errors, deal with consequences, and move on (Ohana, 2003; Pugach & Johnson, 2002).

- Relationships

The majority of issues that arise in school-university partnerships relate to the interaction of individuals, and relationships are the key to successful partnerships. Relationship building should begin with non-threatening activities and informal experiences that provide opportunities to build camaraderie and mutual trust. University and district/school-level personnel must see one another as equal partners; understanding that each has something to learn from the other. An attitude of collaboration, inclusion, and mutual respect should permeate professional and personal relationships. There must be recognition and understanding of the differences in

dispositions, attitudes, and philosophies between K-12 and higher education professionals; and the importance of teacher voice must be acknowledged and valued. A formal structure for teacher input is beneficial; however, it is not enough. It is important that teachers see that their input is acted upon and that their voice is valued (Ohana, 2003).

Patience and open minds are beneficial attributes to maintaining relationships. While it is important to value and nurture both professional and personal relationships, partnership roles and responsibilities must be institutionalized so that they can survive inevitable turnover in key positions. New personnel should be brought into the partnership in such a way that they understand the context and are invested in continuing the work (Kersh & Masztal, 1998; Swanson, 1995)

- Leadership

  CEO leadership from each institution must be visible and supportive. Power must be shared equally among the top leaders. Key leadership must be committed, actively involved, and willing to make the decisions necessary for the partnership to work. Leaders must demonstrate willingness to do things differently, get rid of institutional barriers, and when necessary, change the status quo (Peel, Peel, & Baker, 2002; Firestone & Fisler, 2002; Swanson, 1995).

- Structure

  A steering committee is needed to set direction, review the accomplishments of the partnership as they occur, and plan next steps. Designating or hiring a full-time coordinator to manage all aspects of the partnership — both the "big picture" and the day-to-day details — can make an important difference in successful accomplishment of goals and activities. This administrator must understand both "worlds" and cultures (university and district/school) and know who has authority for what. The person must have the full support of all entities, be given the power to make decisions and broker interactions, and be given adequate resources. Partnerships are complex and require multiple levels and types of interactions. Cross-function teams help to access new learning/knowledge among partners, and enhance the stability and longevity of the partnership (Rice, 2002).

- Communication

  There must be a plan for communication, creating an effective network that fosters collegiality and trust. Multiple lines of communication, flowing back and forth, need to be established and maintained. Different forms of verbal and written communication should be used to ensure that all participants are kept thoroughly informed. Communication must be open, honest, regular,

and frequent. Messages must be consistent between university and school; the theoretical and practical reality must match (California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, 2004; Epanchin & Colucci, 2002).

- Tenure

  The university must be committed to establishing alternate paths to promotion and tenure for faculty that spend time working with schools and teachers at the expense of publishing and research. There must be avenues created for Arts and Sciences faculty to play a more active and supportive role in redesigning and supporting effective teacher education programs (Epanchin & Colucci, 2002).

- Continuum of Learning

  Teacher preparation and professional development must be a seamless continuum of teacher "renewal" from preservice through induction to experienced veteran teachers. This can be achieved by ensuring that partnerships have a strategic plan for professional development that continues what was done in teacher preservice programs. Teachers should have an important role in ensuring that professional development meets their needs and those of their students. The focus should always be on teaching and learning, with the outcome of student achievement at the core, emphasizing teacher "quality" rather than teacher "preparation" (Coble, Edelfelt, & Kettlewell, 2004).

- Standards

  Standards and assessments are aligned K-18; there is also alignment to state and federal mandates and initiatives. Aligning curriculum can be challenging; whether the alignment is between high school and university courses/assessments, or between university teacher education and field experiences, there must be willingness to compromise by both the university and the school system. When aligning university course work and preservice teacher field experiences, there must be clear connections between theory and practice in the real world of the workplace (Blackwell, 2002; McDiarmid, Miller, & Zimmerman, 2005).

- Evaluation

  Evaluation must be ongoing; data should be used for continuous improvement (California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, 2004). It is important that the partners figure out how to eliminate technological barriers that may interfere with sharing data, especially success indicators, across systems. It is essential that activities and results be documented in multiple

ways. Formative data is used for continuous and ongoing revision of programs to reflect the emerging needs of the partners; summative evaluation data provides accountability to stakeholders and the larger community, as well as being useful for obtaining further resources, such as grants (Levine, 2004).

- Resources

    Partnerships should be proactive where resources are concerned (California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships, 2004). Real change takes time — for planning, establishment of structures, implementation, evaluation, reflection, and revision. There should be a realistic understanding and significant investment of adequate time, energy, fiscal resources, and human resources. Fiscal commitments must be realistic, flexible, and creative. There should also be attention to incentives and rewards — the "pay offs" must be worth the investment of time, energy, and resources. Resources should be targeted and focused; it is easy to spread them too thin — continual coordination to overall goals is key (Canty, Harriman, & Berkely, 2003; Coble, Edelfelt, & Kettlewell, 2004; Loving, et al., 1997).

- Policymakers

    A successful partnership with joint ownership can create a "political safety net" for participants, allowing them some latitude for reform and access to additional resources. It is important to inform and educate policymakers about the goals and accomplishments of the partnership (Coble et al., 2004).

School-University Partnership Audit

The Partnership Audit is a tool for assessing the extent to which a school-university partnership has addressed the key factors found to be present in other successful partnerships. This tool was derived from examining the six model partnerships previously described as well as by examining other recommendations in the literature on school-university partnerships. Upon examination of the model partnerships it was determined that each provided evidence that they addressed most, if not all, of the items in the audit.

Schools, districts, and universities can use this tool to examine the elements of their current school-university partnership system and to identify areas where their partnership can be improved. Additional information about the audit, its uses, and scoring is provided with the Partnership Audit tool in Appendix F.

OTHER RESOURCES ON DESIGNING SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS

This section describes some resources that can be used in designing school-university partnerships in addition to the model partnerships and key factors described in the previous section. These resources provide guidance on how to address the various factors that affect the success of school-university partnerships, from the tensions that arise due to differences in culture to documentation of the effects of the partnership on student learning.

Contradictions in Collaboration

Perhaps the most pervasive theme in the literature on school-university partnerships is the tension that occurs in these collaborations (Rice, 2002). Contradictions in Collaboration (Johnston, 1997) describes these tensions, their sources in the differences between organizations, and how dialogue between organizations about these tensions can result in learning and growth. School and university PDS participants describe the issues and challenges in collaboration, and case studies of the PDS at two elementary schools are presented. This book can serve as a resource for participants planning partnerships to better understand the reality of collaborations.

Organizational Culture Inventory. Related to issues of collaboration, Sorensen (1998) maintains that understanding the organizational culture of each partner organization is important for planning, implementing, and sustaining collaborations. According to Sorensen,

> The first priority of those engaging in school-university partnerships should be to assess the culture of each organization and carefully articulate agreement on fundamental beliefs, values and the respective roles of each partner. In addition, a systematic plan for the improvement of those skills, essential for successful collaborations should be initiated with the intent of reculturing both organizations so that collaboration and cooperation can be successful. Without underlying consensus of the purpose and function of schooling and a careful self-evaluation of culture, attempts at collaboration will most likely only frustrate those involved. (pp. 14–15)

Sorensen further contends that an agenda for change must come from those who will be doing the fundamental work of the collaboration — the teachers and university faculty — and not just from an agreement between college deans and principals or superintendents. Sorensen reports on a use of the *Organizational Culture Inventory* (Cooke & Lafferty, 1989), a valid and reliable "self-diagnostic instrument that is designed to measure the normative beliefs and shared behavioral expectations held by members of organizations" (p. 16). University and school participants in a partnership completed the inventory, and the results indicated changes needed in each culture to support their

collaboration. For example, in the university profile, independence and autonomy were valued more than collaborative and supporting activities.

The implication is that building a partnership may require cultural change in organizations. This should begin with an assessment of each culture and the identification of the collaborative skills that each need to develop in order to have a successful partnership. In other words, participants in a school-university partnership may need to acquire collaboration skills such as how to work on a team and resolve conflicts before they can accomplish collaborative work.

The Professional Development Schools Handbook. NCATE has developed standards for PDSs and has published several books on how to use the standards to develop, assess, and maintain PDSs. Exhibit 4.1 lists and briefly describes these standards. The descriptions are quoted from *The Professional Development Schools Handbook* (Teitel, 2003), which is a hands-on resource for creating, assessing, and maintaining school-university partnerships. Although the book's emphasis is on PDSs, the guidance is applicable to other collaborations between schools and universities that have as their goal the improvement of student learning.

Exhibit 4.1. Professional Development School Standards

I.	Learning Community. At the heart of the PDS, this Standard represents the teaching and learning activities, philosophies, and environments created in these partnerships.
II.	Accountability and Quality Assurance. This Standard is the assessment of the partnership and its outcomes in ways that address the PDS's accountability to its various stakeholders.
III.	Collaboration. This Standard addresses the partnership's formation and its development of an increasingly interdependent, committed relationship.
IV.	Diversity and Equity. This Standard focuses attention on how the PDS prepares a diverse group of educators to provide opportunities to learn for all students.
V.	Structures, Resources and Roles. This Standard addresses how the PDS organizes itself to support and do its work.

Note: From *The Professional Development Schools Handbook*, by Teitel, 2003, City: Publisher, p. xviii.

Linking School University Collaboration and K–12 Student Outcomes. Teitel (2003) and others who have written about PDSs stress the importance of focusing on student learning because the ultimate goal of school-university partnerships is to improve student outcomes (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). The way that partnerships achieve this goal is through improving teacher quality. By documenting their impacts on student learning, partnerships demonstrate to policymakers and funders that their partnerships add value to teacher education.

Demonstrating links between partnerships and student outcomes is not an easy task, but there are possible ways to approach it. A resource is *Linking School University Collaboration and K–12 Student Outcomes* (Wiseman and Knight, 2003). This book presents nine studies of school-university partnerships' influence on student learning. The partnerships are unique in their characteristics and faced unique challenges in their efforts to collect student data. These nine studies are "research pioneers" (p. 9) in their efforts to link partnership work to PreK–12 student outcomes, much like the winners of the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation (U. S. Department of Education, 2000) were pioneers in their efforts to link their teacher preparation programs to student learning (Dean & Lauer, 2003).

CONCLUSION

To reach the high levels of teacher quality that are needed to ensure all students are successful in reaching challenging academic standards, we must pay attention to teacher learning along the continuum of teaching, from preservice, to novice, to experienced teacher. This task is best accomplished by higher education and K-12 systems working collaboratively.

There are challenges along the collaboration path, but there are examples of programs — large and small from different areas of the country — that have successfully navigated the path and from which others can learn. This chapter presented information about the context, structures and processes, accomplishments, and challenges for each of these school-university partnerships. Drawing from the experiences of these partnerships and other recommendations from the literature on school-university collaborations, this chapter also highlighted key factors that affect the success of school-university partnerships. These factors serve as the framework for a tool that is presented in Appendix F, the Partnership Audit tool. Higher education institutions and K-12 schools can use this tool to assess their readiness to collaborate or the current strength of their collaborative partnership.

Other resources described in the chapter provide guidance on how to initiate and maintain school-university partnerships. By using the information in this chapter, school-university partnerships can increase the likelihood that their collaborative efforts will be able to overcome the barriers that often plague partnerships and bear the desired fruit — improved student learning.

CHAPTER FIVE:

CONCLUSIONS

Educators, policy makers, and education researchers agree that teacher quality is critical to student learning. Although there is lack of agreement about how to measure teacher quality, there is agreement that teacher quality is not always as high as it needs to be to ensure all students are learning to the required levels. Improving teacher quality is a task for higher education as well as K-12 systems because teachers cannot learn all they need to know in their undergraduate teacher preparation programs. While their needs vary at different points in their careers, teachers must be engaged in learning subject matter and pedagogical knowledge from the time they enter a teacher preparation program until they leave teaching.

The Teacher Quality Toolkit presents models of (1) teacher preparation for standards-based education, (2) evaluation systems for teacher preparation, (3) professional development programs, and (4) school-university partnerships. Each of these models provides guidance for others who are striving to improve teacher quality. This toolkit also provides assessment tools and other resources that can assist K-12 systems and higher education institutions in their efforts to address teacher learning along the continuum from preservice teacher to master teacher (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

INTEGRATING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TEACHER QUALITY

Although Chapters 2 and 3 address the separate roles of higher education institutions and districts in transforming teacher preparation and professional development, there is evidence that real change requires the joint participation of stakeholders at both levels. In other words, to make significant improvements in teacher quality, higher education and K-12 should work collaboratively to provide high-quality professional development for preservice, novice, and experienced teachers.

The toolkit assists higher education and K-12 systems in this effort by describing model school-university partnerships. These descriptions, along with a list of key factors that are important for the success of such partnerships, help K-12 systems and higher education institutions understand the promise and pitfalls of collaborative efforts as well as actions they can take to ensure the success of their teacher quality partnerships. To provide additional assistance, the toolkit provides other tools and resources that address ways to establish and maintain effective school university partnerships.

STRENGTHENING COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS
TO IMPROVE TEACHER QUALITY

The six models of school-university partnerships described in the toolkit provide examples of how higher education institutions, districts, and schools can share

responsibility for teacher quality. But none of the models is perfect. As described previously, each faced a number of challenges. In some cases, the partnerships found ways to overcome some of these challenges, but other challenges remain. Reviewing the list of factors that are important for the success of a school-university partnership makes it clear that significant issues arise in the course of finding ways to work together effectively.

One significant challenge that school-university partnerships face is providing evidence that their efforts are paying off in terms of teacher and student learning. Given the other challenges that such partnerships face, having evidence of success is important to bolster support among those who fund the partnership and, for those who are involved in the work of the partnership, to provide encouragement to continue their efforts. Although it is important for partnerships to document their accomplishments, and especially their outcomes related to teaching and student learning, many struggle to do so. More examples of successful strategies and data collection systems for doing this are needed. The same is true for most of the other factors listed in Exhibit 5.1. (See pages 52–56 for explanation of these factors.)

Exhibit 5.1: Factors that Influence the Success of School-University Partnerships

- Organization
- Vision and Values
- Cultural Differences
- Relationships
- Leadership
- Structure
- Communication
- Tenure
- Continuum of learning
- Standards
- Evaluation
- Resources
- Policy makers

To encourage more higher education institutions and K-12 systems to establish partnerships that reap benefits for students and teachers, successful partnerships must share information about the strategies that have worked for them. Others in education — staff in state departments of education, regional educational laboratories, comprehensive centers, intermediate service agencies, and professional organizations,

for example — must include identification of such partnerships as part of their work to improve teacher quality. In addition, education researchers should conduct studies on these partnerships and translate the findings into tools and resources that K-12 systems and higher education institutions can use to initiate or strengthen their partnerships.

We began with a number of premises on which this toolkit is based. Two of these are that improving teacher quality is key to improving student achievement and that teacher quality is the joint responsibility of higher education institutions, districts, and schools. By using the tools in this toolkit, higher education institutions and K-12 systems will be better able to carry out their joint responsibility and to attain the goals of improved teacher quality and student learning.

REFERENCES

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Allen, M. B. (2003). *Eight questions on teacher preparation: What does the research say?* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Barnes, R. (2005). Portland site responses to the SST protocol, 4th draft. Unpublished document.

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barnett, B. G., Hall, G. E., Berg, J. H., & Camarena, M. M. (1999, November). A typology of partnerships for promoting innovation. *Journal of School Leadership*, *9*, 484–510.

Benedum Collaborative. (n.d.). Professional development tool kits. Retrieved September 28, 2005 from http://boe.mono.k12.wv.us/uhs/benedum/brochure.htm

Benedum Collaborative. (2004). Governance in the Benedum Collaborative: Relationships between groups and strategies for shared decision making. Retrieved August 27, 2005 from http://www.hre.wvu.edu/benedum/overview/governance_relationships.pdf

Benedum Collaborative. (2005). Overview. Origins: A need for a change. Retrieved August 30, 2005 from http://www.hre.wvu.edu/benedum/overview/overview_need_for_change.htm

Blackwell, P. J. (2002, April). *Putting the pieces of teacher education together: Lessons learned by the Eisenhower Initial Teacher Professional Development Programs.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

California Academic Partnership Program. (2005). *Developing an alliance for regional collaboration: A vision whose time is now*. Retrieved September 27, 2005, from http://www.calstate.edu/CAPP/publications/ARC_Policy_Report.pdf

California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships. (n.d.a). Long Beach Education Partnership. Retrieved August 29, 2005 from http://www.ced.csulb.edu/california-alliance/partnerships/longbeach.html

California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships. (n.d.b). Long Beach Education Partnership Case Study. Retrieved August 29, 2005 from http://www.ced.csulb.edu/california-alliance/documents/LongBeach-CaseStudy.pdf

California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships. (n.d.c). Long Beach Education Partnership Profile. Retrieved August 29, 2005, from http://www.ced.csulb.edu/california-alliance/documents/LongBeach-Profile.pdf

California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships. (2004). *Raising student achievement through effective education partnerships: Policy & practice.* Long Beach, CA: Author. Retrieved September 27, 2005, from http://www.calstate.edu/CAPP/publications/Alliance_for_Pre_K-18_Partnerships.pdf

Canty, J., Harriman, N., & Berkeley, T. (2003). *Joining together to prepare teachers: Developing professional development schools.* Towson, MD: Towson University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED479893)

Center on Education Policy. (2004). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 2 of the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, DC: Author.

Churchill, L. R., Jensen, M. C., & Cepello, M. (2001, March). *Finding and keeping the best: A rural regional partnership.* Paper presented at the Growing Partnerships for Rural Special Education Conference, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED453033)

Coble, C., Edelfelt, R., & Kettlewell, J. (2004). *Who's in charge here? The changing landscape of teacher preparation in America.* Retrieved October 8, 2004 from http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/54/36/5436.htm

Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Constructing outcomes in teacher education: Policy, practice, and pitfalls. *Education Policy Archives, 9*(11). Retrieved August 17, 2004, from http://olam.ed.asu/epaa/v9n11.html

College of Education and Human Development, Texas A&M. (n.d.). Student teaching website. Retrieved August 18, 2005 from http://www.coe.tamu.edu/studentteaching/internships.html

Cooke, R. A., & Lafferty, J. C. (1989). *Organizational culture inventory*. Plymouth: Human Synergistics.

Cooper, D. H., & Corbin, C. T. (2003). Student achievement in Maryland's professional development schools. In D. L. Wiseman, & S. L. Knight, (Eds.). *Linking school-university collaboration and K-12 student outcomes* (pp.

71–86). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Council for Basic Education. (2004). The Standards-Based Teacher Education Project (STEP)®. Retrieved August 19, 2004, from http://www.c-b-e.org/teachered/step.htm

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Studies of excellence in teacher education.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Dean, C. B., & Lauer, P. A. (2003). *Systematic evaluation for continuous improvement of teacher preparation. Volume 1: Cross-case analysis.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from http://www.mcrel.org/topics/productDetail.asp?productID=181

Denton, J. (2003). *Technology mentor fellowship program: 1999 PT3 grant final report.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M Research Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED477713)

Diez, M. E. (Ed.). (1998). *Changing the practice of teacher education: Standards and assessment as a lever for change.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Elmore, R. F. (2002). *Bridging the gap between standards and achievement: The imperative for professional development in education.* Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.

Epanchin, B. C., & Colucci, K. (2002). The professional development school without walls: A partnership between a university and two school districts. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(6), 349–358.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013–1055.

Firestone, W. A., & Fisler, J. L. (2002). Politics, community, and leadership in a school-university partnership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(4), 449–493.

Fisher, W., & Owens, M. (2001, November). *Getting connected with K-12 teachers.* Paper presented at The National Summit on the Mathematical Education of Teachers, Tysons Corner, VA. Retrieved September 30, 2005, from http://www.cbmsweb.org/NationalSummit/WG_Speakers/Fisher_Owens.pdf

Garvin, P. (Ed.) (2003). *Developing knowledgeable teachers: A framework for standards-based teacher education supported by institutional collaboration.* Washington DC: AACTE Publications.

Gill, B., & Hove, A. (2000, February). *The Benedum Collaborative model of teacher education: A preliminary evaluation.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Education. Retrieved August 10, 2005 from http://www.rand.org/pubs/documented_briefings/2005/RAND_DB303.pdf

Guskey, T. (2003). Analyzing lists of the characteristics of effective professional development to promote visionary leadership. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(637), 4–18.

Hassel, E. (1999). *Learning from the best.* Naperville, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Hassel, B. C., Walter, K., & Hayden, E. (2002). Levers for change: Transforming teacher preparation. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved August 17, 2004, from http://www.mcrel.org/PDF/TeacherPrepRetention/5011TG_Levers_for_Change.pdf

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Houck, J. W., Cohn, K. C., & Cohn, C. A. (Eds.) (2004). *Partnering to lead educational renewal: High-quality teachers, high-quality schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Howey, K. R. & Zimpher, N. L. (1999). Pervasive problems and issues in teacher education. In Griffin, G. A. (Ed.), *The education of teachers* (pp. 279–305). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Huang, S., Yi, Y., & Haycock, K. (2002). *Interpret with caution: The first state Title II reports on the quality of teacher preparation.* Washington, DC: The Education Trust. Retrieved August 14, 2004, from http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/305751B5-7635-4F5E-9BBE-068CF0849150/0/titleII.pdf

Johnston, M. (1997). *Contradictions in collaboration: New thinking on school/university partnerships.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Kersh, M. E., & Masztal, N. B. (1998). An analysis of studies of collaboration between universities and K-12 schools. *The Educational Forum, 62*(3), 218–225.

Lauer, P.A. (2003, April).*Recognition for evaluation of teacher preparation programs: An incentive strategy.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Lauer, P. A., & Dean C. B. (2003). *Systematic evaluation for continuous improvement of teacher preparation. Volume 2: Case studies*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from http://www.mcrel.org/topics/productDetail.asp?productID=181

Lauer, P. A., Martin-Glenn, M., & Dean, C. B. (2002). *Effective teacher preparation for standards-based education* (REL Deliverable # 2002-11). Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Lee, V., & Smith, J. B. (1996). Collective responsibility for learning and its effects on gains in achievement for early secondary school students. *Journal of Education, 104*, 103–147.

Levine, M. (2004). *Going to scale with professional development schools in urban districts.* Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Retrieved August 12, 2005, from http://www.ncate.org/documents/pds/March%2024%20Revision%20and%20Editing.pdf

Louis, K. S., & Marks, H. M. (1998). Does professional community affect the classroom? Teachers' work and student experiences in restructuring schools. *American Journal of Education, 106*, 532–575.

Loving, C., Wiseman, D., Cooner, D., Sterbin, A., & Seidel, S. (1997, March). *The evolution of a research design: Evaluating professional development schools in the NEA Teacher Education Initiative.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED410246)

Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning, K-16. (2005). *University system of Maryland: Creating seamless education in Maryland.* Retrieved August 31, 2005 from http://kevinbruce.usmd.edu/index.php?area_id=1

Maryland State Department of Education. (2004). *Professional development schools in Maryland.* Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved August 27, 2005, from http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/msde

McCrory, K., & Steel, S. (2002, March). *A graduate assistant/veteran teacher supervision model in the Benedum Collaborative.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Professional Development Schools, Orlando, FL.

McDiarmid, G. W., Miller, M., & Zimmerman, H. T. (2005, January). *Strengthening and sustaining teachers project: Seattle site* (Final report). Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (2000). Principles in action: Stories of award-winning professional development [video]. Aurora, CO: Author.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. (2003). *Leadership folio series: Sustaining school improvement.* Aurora, CO: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1997). *Doing what matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* New York: Author.

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education. (1996). *Teachers take charge of their learning: Transforming professional development for student success.* (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: Author.

National Research Council. (2001). *Testing teacher candidates: The role of licensure tests in improving teacher quality.* Washington DC: National Academy Press.

National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Tools for growing the NSDC Standards.* Oxford, OH: Author.

Neubert, G. A., & Binko, J. B. (1998). Professional development schools: The proof is in performance. *Educational Leadership, 55,* 44–46.

Neville, K., & Robinson, C. (2003). T*he delivery, financing, and assessment of professional development in education: Pre-service preparation and in-service training.* Washington, DC: The Finance Project. Retrieved August 8, 2004, from http://www.financeprojectinfo.org/Publications/profdev11-02-03.pdf

Newman, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring.* Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Public Law 107–110. 115 STAT. 1425. Retrieved September 9, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory & Public Broadcasting Service. (1990). *Guidebook Number 8: The meaning of professional development in the*

21st Century. From the Restructuring to promote learning in America's schools series. Naperville, IL: Author.

Ohana, C. (2003). *Partnerships in math education: The power of university-school collaboration*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Peel, H. A., Peel, B. B., & Baker, M. E. (2002). School/university partnerships: A viable model. *International Journal of Educational Management, 16*(7), 319–325.

Portland Education Partnership. (n.d.) The Portland Education Partnership. Retrieved August 29, 2005 from http://www.portlandschools.org/Pages/Instruction/communityarts/Partnershipweb2005/

Pugach, M. C., & Johnson, L. J. (2002). *Collaborative practitioners, collaborative schools* (2nd ed.). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

Randi, R. N., & Zeichner, K. M. (2004). New visions of teacher professional development. In M. A. Smylie & D. Miretzky (Eds.), *Developing the teacher workforce* (pp. 180–227). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rice, J. K. (2002). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Sanders W. L. (1998). Value-added assessment. *The School Administrator, 55*(11), 24–27.

Sanders W. L., & Rivers, J. C. (1996). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement.* Research Progress Report. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Scannell, D. P. (1999). *Models of teacher education.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Shapiro, N. (2003). The Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning: A state system perspective on K-16. *Peer Review, 5*(2), 24–26.

Sorenson, D. (1998, October). *School-university partnerships: Collaboration among autonomous cultures.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, St. Louis, MO.

Southeast Center for Teaching Quality. (2004). *Unfulfilled promise: Ensuring high quality teachers for our nation's students.* Retrieved August 18, 2004, from http://www.teachingquality.org/resources/pdfs/NCLB_PublishedReport.pdf

Southern Maine Partnership. (n.d.). *About the partnership.* Retrieved August 28, 2005, from http://www.usm.maine.edu/smp/about/index.htm

Sparks, D., & Hirsh, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Swanson, J. (1995, September). *Systemic reform in the professionalism of educators. Volume II: Case studies. Studies of education reform* (Contract Number RR1172009). Andover, MA: NETWORK, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397557)

Tell, C., Bodone, F. M., & Addie, K. L. (1999, April). *Teaching in a standards-based system: How teachers' voices can influence policy, preparation, and professional development.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED432540)

Teitel, L. (2003). *The professional development schools handbook: Starting, sustaining, and assessing partnerships that improve student learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

U.S. Department of Education Professional Development Team. (1995). *Mission and principles of professional development.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved August 17, 2004, from www.ed.gov/inits/TeachersWeb/mission.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *The National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation: Application.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved August 17, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/inits/teachers/teacherprep/teacherprep.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2000, November). *Eliminating the barriers to improving teaching.* Washington, DC: Author.

Wasley, P. (1999). Teaching worth celebrating. *Educational Leadership, 56*(8), 8–13.

WestEd. (2000). *Teachers who learn, kids who achieve.* San Francisco: Author.

WestEd. (2002). *Improving districts: Systems that support learning.* San Francisco: Author.

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001, February). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps and recommendations* (Document R-01-3). Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Wiseman, D. L., & Knight, S. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Linking school-university collaboration and K-12 student outcomes*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Youngs, P. (1999). *District and state influences on professional development and school capacity.* Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Zepeda, S. J. (1999). *Staff development: Practices that promote leadership in learning communities.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

APPENDIX A:

TEACHER PREPARATION
FOR STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION SURVEY

BACKGROUND

Lauer, Martin-Glenn, and Dean (2002) researched the components and processes of effective teacher preparation for standards-based education. Their study examined four teacher education programs that received national recognition for effective teacher preparation, based in part on evidence that the programs' graduates have positive impacts on the learning of students. The study identified how the four programs prepare graduates to deliver instruction that is based on K–12 standards. As part of the study, Lauer et al. (2002) surveyed a convenience sample of 34 recent teacher education graduates from three of the four programs. The extent of graduates' learning about standards-based instruction from teacher preparation was positively correlated with graduates' perceptions of their initial preparedness and current confidence to implement standards. The graduate survey developed for the study is reported here as the Teacher Preparation for Standards-based Education (TPSBE) Survey

DEVELOPMENT

For purposes of the TPSBE Survey, *standards-based education* was defined as education based on goals for K–12 student learning that incorporate a) broad descriptions of knowledge and skills that students should acquire for a given content area, and b) specific descriptions of student performance that indicate mastery of a given content area (McLaughlin & Shepard, 1995).

The components of standards-based teaching were based on a report by Tell, Bodone, and Addie (1999). They described the work of co-development teams of teachers and higher education faculty in Oregon in developing standards-based instruction and assessment in six subject areas. The teams concluded that teaching to standards requires the following:

- Identification of what the standard requires
- Planning for instruction based on students' prior knowledge and individual differences
- Assessment and determination of student proficiency
- Verification of judgments about standards and student proficiency with colleagues
- Reflection on student evidence to make improvements in instruction

Survey items were constructed to address teacher education graduates' preparation in the knowledge needed for standards-based teaching (Tell et al., 1999; Ball & Cohen, 1999), their current confidence in implementing standards and to inquire about other variables that might relate to this knowledge, such as years of experience. Thus, the TPSBE Survey asks teacher education graduates about the following:

- Background and experience

- Preparation in content knowledge

- Preparation in pedagogy

- Incorporation of K–12 standards in teacher preparation coursework

- Incorporation of K–12 standards in teacher preparation field or clinical experiences

- Preparation in the knowledge of how to implement the components of standards-based instruction

- Perceptions of preparedness to implement standards in the first year of teaching

- Use of standards in current instruction

- Sources of learning about implementing standards-based instruction

- Feelings of current confidence in implementing standards

The TPSBE Survey was pilot tested with 19 K–12 teachers who completed the survey, provided feedback about the clarity of the questions, and suggested additional survey items. The graduate survey was modified to reflect the pilot test results and then administered to 34 recent teacher education graduates for Lauer et al.'s (2002) study of effective teacher preparation for standards-based education. Following that study, the survey underwent additional review. Survey items were examined for alignment with national standards documents that describe standards-based teaching (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1991) and with expert opinions related to standards-based instruction (e.g., Wang & Odell, 2002). These opinions included comments from McREL researchers with experience in survey design and from McREL practitioners with experience in standards-based instruction.

USES

The TPSBE Survey was designed to obtain the perceptions of recent graduates (one to three years since graduation) about their preparation for standards-based teaching. Its initial use was for describing the perceptions of graduates from three nationally recognized teacher preparation programs. Lauer et al. (2002) triangulated survey results with findings from interviews of persons involved in preparing teacher candidates in each program and with information from program documents. The overall findings were used to provide guidance for designing effective teacher preparation for standards-based education.

Although originally designed for research purposes, there are three possible uses of the TPSBE Survey to improve teacher education and teaching practices.

1. Teacher preparation programs can use the survey to evaluate their graduates' perceptions of preparedness to teach in standards-based classrooms. The results can help identify areas for program improvement.

2. Schools and districts can use the survey to identify the professional development needs of beginning teachers related to standards-based instruction. A related use is as a needs assessment for teacher mentoring.

- Teacher preparation programs and districts can use the survey to identify the preparation needs of beginning teachers in the local schools in which the programs' recent graduates are teaching.

The TPSBE Survey should not be used to screen applicants or to evaluate teachers or teacher candidates. In addition, survey users are urged to use the following implementation guidelines:

- Protect respondents' identities. Do not ask respondents to provide their names or other identifying information on the survey.

- Inform the respondents about the purpose of the survey, how the results will be summarized and used, and who will see the results. Then obtain respondents' consents to participate in the survey.

- Protect confidentiality of results. Do not report results in ways that might identify individuals. Do not report separately the results for groups with fewer than 10 individuals. Depending on how the survey is being used, distribution of any survey results might be inappropriate.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

Results from the TPSBE Survey provide information on graduates' perceptions related to the components of standards-based education indicated in Exhibit A.1.

Exhibit A.1. Teacher Preparation for Standards-Based Education Survey Questions and Components

TPSBE Survey Question	Components of Standards-Based Education
6	Preservice preparation in content courses
7	Preservice sources of learning about standards
9	Preservice preparation in pedagogical topics
10	Preservice preparation in instructional strategies

| 11A | Extent of preservice learning about how to implement standards

(*alpha* = .89)* |
|---|---|
| 11B | Extent of preparation to implement standards in the first year of teaching (*alpha* = .88)* |
| 15 | Preservice and inservice sources of learning about standards |
| 17 | Extent of current confidence to implement standards

(*alpha* = .82)* |

* Chronbach's alpha; indicates the internal consistency of these survey items in Lauer, Martin-Glenn, and Dean, (2002)

To score the survey:

Calculate the mean of the responses to each survey item.

Calculate the mean of the responses for the survey items under questions 11A, 11B, and 17. These questions are constructs that measure graduates' perceived learning, preparation, and current confidence to implement standards-based instruction. (Do not calculate the means of the responses for the items under other questions because only questions 11A, 11B, and 17 were designed to measure constructs.)

Calculate mean responses to the survey items based on different groups (e.g., alternative preparation route), program characteristics (e.g., type of field experience) or characteristics of respondents' current teaching position (e.g., degree to which curriculum is aligned with standards). However, do not *report* separately the results for groups with fewer than 10 individuals.

Questions on the TPSBE Survey address the knowledge and skills needed to teach in standards-based classrooms. The degree of graduates' perceived preparation in this knowledge and skills is an indication of the adequacy of the teacher preparation program from which they graduated. Teacher preparation programs can use these data to identify areas for program improvement.

REFERENCES

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond, & G.

Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (pp. 3–32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lauer, P. A., Martin-Glenn, M., & Dean, C. B. (2002). *Effective teacher preparation for standards-based education* (REL Deliverable # 2002-11). Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1991). *Professional standards for teaching mathematics.* Reston, VA: Author.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Shepard, L. A. (1995). *Improving education through standards-based reform*. Stanford, CA: The National Academy of Education.

Tell, C., Bodone, F. M., & Addie, K. L. (1999, April). *Teaching in a standards-based system: How teachers' voices can influence policy, preparation, and professional development.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED432540)

Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research, 72*(3), 481–546

.

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION SURVEY

Part I: Background and Experience

This information will be used only for aggregated or group analyses.

1. Please indicate which of the following degree(s) you hold.

Please note graduation year, major(s), and institution name and state for each box checked.

Post-Secondary Degree	Check all that apply	Year Graduated	Major (s)	Institution Name & State
a. Bachelor's Degree	#	_____	_____	_____
b. 2nd Bachelor's Degree	#	_____	_____	_____
c. Master's Degree	#	_____	_____	_____
d. Educational Specialist	#	_____	_____	_____
e. Doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.)	#	_____	_____	_____
f. Other (please explain)	#	_____	_____	_____

_____

2. List all your current teaching certifications, licenses/endorsements, and the dates obtained:

3. Did you receive certification through an alternative teacher preparation program?

> **YES ____   NO____**

> **If yes, please answer the following questions.**

a. What was the highest degree you held at the time of entering the alternative program?

      None _____

      Bachelors _____

      Masters _____

      Doctorate ____

b. How many courses in teacher preparation course work did you complete before you began

    teaching or student teaching? _____

c. Did you student teach prior to becoming the teacher of record?

      YES ____   **NO ___**

4. **Counting this year, how many years have you been teaching:**

   a. **In total?**   **_____**

   b. **In your current school?**   **_____**

5. **What grade level(s) do you currently teach?**
   _____

    a. **Is this a grade in which there is an annual state assessment?**   **YES____ NO____**

      If yes, which subjects are assessed?
      _____

    b. **What subject(s) do you currently teach (if applicable)?**
      _____

    c.   **____I am not currently teaching. Please explain:**
      _____

*For the following questions, **standards-based education** refers to education based on goals for PK–12 student learning that incorporate a) broad descriptions of knowledge and skills that students should acquire for a given content area, and b) specific descriptions of student performance that indicate mastery of a given content area. **Standards** refer to state or district or national standards.*

Part II: Preservice

Preservice refers to the formal training period before becoming a practicing, paid teacher.

6. Please indicate for each subject area the approximate number of *courses you completed before*

obtaining your *initial* teacher certification (include methods courses in your answers):

	None	1–2	3–5	More than 5
a. Language Arts	#	#	#	#
b. Mathematics	#	#	#	#
c. Social Studies	#	#	#	#
d. Science	#	#	#	#
e. Music	#	#	#	#
f. Art	#	#	#	#
g. Physical Education	#	#	#	#
h. Special Education	#	#	#	#

i. Interdisciplinary subject courses
(e.g., language arts/social studies)
List subjects here and indicate number of courses in the boxes to the right.

	None	1–2	3–5	More than 5
_____	#	#	#	#
_____	#	#	#	#
_____	#	#	#	#
_____	#	#	#	#

7. In considering your *initial teacher preparation* learning experiences, please indicate the extent to which you learned about PK–12 standards (state/district/national) for students:

In my preservice teacher education, PK–12 standards were taught in:	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Not Applicable
a. Educational foundations courses.	#	#	#	#	#
b. General methods classes.	#	#	#	#	#
c. Subject area methods classes (e.g., Teaching Mathematics).	#	#	#	#	#
d. General subject area content classes (e.g., Concepts in Mathematics).	#	#	#	#	#
e. Practicum or clinical field experience before	#	#	#	#	#
f. student teaching.					
g. Student teaching.	#	#	#	#	#

	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Not Applicable
8. To what extent did you complete your preservice education with the same group or cohort of persons?	#	#	#	#	#

9. In considering your *initial teacher preparation* courses in the following topics, please indicate the extent to which they were addressed in any of your initial teacher preparation coursework? *Note—If you took one or more courses specifically in this topic, mark "Great Extent".*

My preservice teacher education covered:	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
a. Classroom management including discipline or behavior management.	#	#	#	#
b. Educational psychology.	#	#	#	#
c. Learning theories.	#	#	#	#
d. Human development.	#	#	#	#
e. Multi-cultural education.	#	#	#	#
My preservice teacher education covered:	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent

	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
f. Inclusion strategies for special education students.	#	#	#	#
g. Student work samples.	#	#	#	#
h. Classroom assessment.	#	#	#	#
i. Instructional strategies.	#	#	#	#
j. Bilingual education.	#	#	#	#
k. Rubrics for scoring student work.	#	#	#	#
l. Differentiating instruction according to student m. learning needs.	#	#	#	#
n. Test preparation strategies.	#	#	#	#
o. Integrated or thematic units.	#	#	#	#
p. Interpreting standardized tests.	#	#	#	#

10. Please indicate the extent to which your preservice teacher education covered instructional strategies for:

	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
Teaching low-achieving students.	#	#	#	#
Teaching limited English proficient students.	#	#	#	#
Teaching students from different cultural/ethnic backgrounds.	#	#	#	#
Engaging students in designing their own learning environment.	#	#	#	#
Encouraging collaboration among students.	#	#	#	#
Challenging students to accept and share responsibility for their own learning.	#	#	#	#
Guiding students in self-assessment.	#	#	#	#
Guiding students in developing conceptual understanding, thinking and reasoning skills.	#	#	#	#
Engaging all students in learning.	#	#	#	#

Part III: Making the Transition from Preservice to Inservice

Preservice refers to the formal training period before becoming a practicing, paid teacher. Inservice refers to the period of time during which you are a practicing, paid teacher.

11. Each of the following items has two parts. In Part A, please indicate the extent to which you *learned* about standards-based education during preservice. In Part B, please indicate how *prepared* you were during your first year of teaching.

	A. In *preservice*, I learned how to…				B. In my *first year of teaching*, I was prepared to…			
	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
Organize instruction around the goals of a lesson.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Plan instruction based on differences in students' *prior* knowledge.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Plan instruction based on students' *individual differences* in learning (e.g., due to culture, ability, learning styles, etc.).	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Assess a student's level of progress toward the goals of a lesson using a variety of methods.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Adapt my instruction during the lesson based on a student's level of progress toward the goals of a lesson.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Work collaboratively with other teachers in lesson planning.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Work collaboratively with other teachers in analyzing student test scores.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Identify what a student must know and be able to do in order to meet a standard.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Choose curriculum and instructional materials based on their alignment with standards.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Assess students for proficiency on standards.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Organize grading around standards.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Verify my judgments about student proficiency with other teachers.	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#

12. During your *first year of teaching,* was there anything you wish you would have known more about that would have helped you teach in a standards-based classroom?

Part IV. Current Teaching Position

13. To what extent is your current teaching context *similar* to the context of your student teaching (or internship)?

	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Not Applicable
My current teaching context is similar to the context of my student teaching (or internship).	#	#	#	#	#

14. To what extent do you believe the curriculum you currently teach reflects each of the following?

The curriculum that I currently teach reflects	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Not Applicable
a. Content standards.	#	#	#	#	#
b. Curriculum frameworks.	#	#	#	#	#
c. Student assessments.	#	#	#	#	#
d. Performance standards.	#	#	#	#	#

15. To what extent did you learn how to implement standards from the following sources?

	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
Initial teacher preparation coursework.	#	#	#	#
Initial teacher preparation clinical experiences.	#	#	#	#
Teacher induction program (e.g., mentoring).	#	#	#	#
School staff development.	#	#	#	#
District staff development.	#	#	#	#
Conferences of professional associations.	#	#	#	#
Continuing education classes.	#	#	#	#
Collaboration with other teachers at my school.	#	#	#	#
Trial and error.	#	#	#	#
Other (please specify and rate): _____	#	#	#	#

16. From the list of sources in question 14, list which two were the *most* helpful for you to learn how to implement standards. Please explain why they were helpful.

    a.

    b.

17. To what extent do the following statements accurately describe your confidence level in implementing standards?

	Not At All	Small Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
a. I feel confident that I have the necessary skills to successfully implement standards in the classroom.	#	#	#	#
b. I feel confident that I have the necessary skills to develop instructional activities to help students meet or exceed the standard(s) I am targeting.	#	#	#	#
c. I feel confident that I have the necessary academic knowledge of the subject matter to help students meet or exceed the standard(s) I am targeting.	#	#	#	#
d. I feel confident that I have the necessary skills to develop assessment activities to judge whether students meet or exceed the standard(s) I am targeting.	#	#	#	#

Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX B:

TEACHER PREPARATION EVALUATION SYSTEM AUDIT

DEVELOPMENT

In 2000, the U.S. Department of Education developed the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation as a means of promoting excellence in teaching and teacher preparation. The awards program was designed to identify teacher preparation programs that could provide evidence of their effectiveness. Subsequently, the U.S. Department of Education contracted with five of the regional educational laboratories to conduct a study of the recipients of the award. The findings of this study are documented in two reports — one on the case studies of the four award-winning teacher preparation programs (Lauer & Dean, 2003) and one on the cross-case analysis (Dean & Lauer, 2003).

The following overall research question focused the study: *What are the structures and processes of systematic evaluation that supports effective teacher preparation?* In addition to the overall research question, there were six guiding questions that were designed to elicit details about the structures and processes of the evaluation system at each institution studied. The findings for the six questions were used to design the Teacher Preparation Evaluation System (TPES) Audit.

USES

The TPES Audit is based on the characteristics of the evaluation systems used by the four winners of the 2000 awards program. The impetus for studying the evaluation systems of the four award-winning institutions was their ability to document their effectiveness for the awards program application. However, evaluation of teacher preparation can serve many purposes such as generating data and providing information for accountability reporting, accreditation reviews, program improvement, and marketing to potential pre-service students.

Teacher preparation programs can use the TPES Audit to compare the characteristics of their evaluation systems with those of model programs that have developed systematic evaluation for effective teacher preparation. Some uses of the TPES Audit include the following:

1. Administrators of teacher preparation programs can complete and use the audit to judge whether they have established the necessary structures and processes to systematically evaluate program outcomes.

2. Teacher education faculty and administrators can complete the audit and use the overall results for discussions about changes needed to conduct systematic evaluation.

3. Audit results can be shared with institutional leaders as a way to justify the establishment of new structure and processes (and associated expenses) for systematic evaluation.

The TPES Audit is self-report instrument for higher education and teacher preparation administrators and teacher preparation faculty. The following guidelines should be implemented:

- Protect respondents' identities. Do not ask respondents to provide their names or other identifying information on the survey.

- Inform the respondents about the purpose of the audit, how the results will be summarized and used, and who will see the results. Then obtain respondents' consents to participate in the audit.

- Protect confidentiality of results. Do not report results in ways that might identify individuals. Do not report separately the results for groups with fewer than 10 individuals. Depending on how the audit is being used, distribution of TPES Audit results might be inappropriate.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

To score the TPES Audit, count the number of checkmarks for each of the six questions. The number of checkmarks indicates the degree to which respondents perceive that the evaluation system used by the teacher preparation program has characteristics aligned with model programs. The characteristics without checkmarks indicate possible changes needed for better evaluation. The percentage of respondents who check or do not check a particular characteristic indicates the amount of agreement about program evaluation. The latter is a source for identifying gaps in knowledge about what the teacher preparation program does to evaluate its effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Dean, C. B., & Lauer, P.A. (2003). *Systematic evaluation for continuous improvement of teacher education: Cross-case analysis.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from http://www.mcrel.org/topics/productDetail.asp?productID=181

Lauer, P. A., & Dean, C. B. (2003). S*ystematic evaluation for continuous improvement of teacher education: Case studies.* Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved September 8, 2004, from http://www.mcrel.org/topics/productDetail.asp?productID=181

U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *The National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation: Application.* Washington DC: Author. Retrieved August 17, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/inits/teachers/teacherprep/teacherprep.pdf

M<small>C</small>REL T<small>EACHER</small> P<small>REPARATION</small> E<small>VALUATION</small> S<small>YSTEM</small> A<small>UDIT</small>

Rate the teacher preparation program on each of the following criteria related to evaluation. Check the criteria that are presently an aspect of the program.

1. How are individuals, groups, and the components of the teacher preparation program evaluated?

In the following question, candidate refers to the preservice student who is enrolled in the teacher education program. The field supervisor is the person who the university employs to supervise field placements of candidates. The cooperating teacher is the teacher of the classroom where candidates do their student teaching.

___ Performance assessments of *candidates* (e.g., portfolios)

___ Standardized tests of *candidates*

___ Grade point averages of *candidates*

___ Samples of work from *candidates' P–12 students*

___ Surveys of program *graduates*

___ Surveys of *principal*s of schools in which graduates are employed

___ Achievement data for *graduates' P–12 students*

___ Feedback from *candidates* on university supervisors

___ Feedback from *candidates* on faculty members

___ Feedback from *candidates* about the quality of teacher preparation curriculum and field   experiences

___ Feedback from program *graduates* about the quality of teacher preparation curriculum and   field experiences

___ Feedback from *cooperating teachers* the about quality of teacher preparation curriculum and   field experiences

___ Feedback from *field supervisors* about the quality of teacher preparation curriculum and   field experiences

___ Focus groups of current and potential school *employers* about the quality of the teacher   preparation program

2. How does the teacher preparation program align evaluation with program standards and goals?

___ Program goals are aligned with national teaching standards (e.g., Interstate New Teacher   Assessment and Support Consortium).

___ Program goals are aligned with state teaching standards.

___ Program goals are aligned with national content standards (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics).

___ Program goals provide the framework for evaluation activities.

___ Evaluation data are examined with respect to program goals.

3. How does the teacher preparation program develop and sustain systematic evaluation?

___ Internal and external catalysts (e.g., events, people, policies) lead to program change.

___ Faculty work together within and across university departments.

___ The program employs a system change model that uses data to identify areas for improvement.

___ The program has created data collection instruments and procedures.

___ Institution leaders provide support for evaluation of teacher preparation.

___ Stakeholders (e.g., principals) provide input to evaluation.

4. How do P–12 stakeholders influence evaluation of the teacher preparation program?

P–12 stakeholders:

___ Provide formal and informal feedback about program components and program graduates

___ Participate in research collaborations with university faculty

___ Participate in teacher-in-residence programs (i.e., P–12 faculty teach in the university)

___ Help with assessing teacher candidate portfolios

___ Contribute to teacher preparation curriculum development

5. How do external influences affect evaluation of the teacher preparation program?

___ State policies on teacher preparation are sources for program revision.

___ State policies on teacher preparation are sources for program evaluation activities.

___ The program is proactive in aligning teacher preparation with new state regulations.

___ National policies on Title 2 reporting requirements are a source for evaluation activities.

___ Accreditation organizations (e.g., NCATE) are a source for evaluation activities.

___ The U. S. Department of Education's emphasis on the achievement of graduates' P–12 students   is an impetus to collect that data.

6. What are the characteristics of the program culture that supports data collection and its use for evaluation of the teacher preparation?

___ An attitude that data are essential and it is safe to examine the results of one's work

___ Training in using data for evaluation

___ Time to discuss and analyze data

___ Incentives that encourage involvement and build commitment to evaluation (e.g., consideration for promotion and tenure)

___ Collaboration within and across departments (e.g., education and liberal arts and sciences)

Teacher Quality Toolkit: 2nd Edition

APPENDIX C:

RUBRIC AND EXAMPLES
FOR EVALUATING THE EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS
OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

DEVELOPMENT

In 2000, the U.S. Department of Education developed the National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation as a means of promoting excellence in teaching and teacher preparation. The awards program was designed to identify teacher preparation programs that could provide evidence of their effectiveness. Program applicants for the award were required to provide three types of evidence to demonstrate their effectiveness:

Formative: Evidence that the program gathers and uses data to make adjustments to the various stages of the program (e.g., admissions, course development, field experiences, assessment of knowledge and skills)

Summative: Evidence of the effectiveness of the overall program in helping graduates acquire the knowledge and skills needed to improve all students' learning (e.g., content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, and skills to examine beliefs about learners and teaching as a profession)

Confirming: Evidence of the effectiveness of program graduates in K–12 settings

In addition, the evidence had to meet criteria of rigor, sufficiency, and consistency. Rigor was determined by the validity and reliability of the evidence. Sufficiency was determined by the adequacy and the extent of the data used for evidence. Consistency was based on the links between various aspects of the program and the three types of evidence.

USES

To help applicants judge the adequacy of their data, the awards program application provided a rubric for evaluating evidence of program effectiveness, which is reproduced in Exhibit C.1. Teacher preparation programs can use this rubric to help guide the design of data collection activities. To help applicants judge the credibility of their evidence across multiple sources, the application provided examples that reflect different levels of credibility, which are reproduced in Exhibit C.2. Teacher preparation programs can use these examples to identify the type of data that they should collect for evaluation.

REFERENCE

U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *The National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation: Application.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved August 17, 2004, from http://www.ed.gov/inits/teachers/teacherprep/teacherprep.pdf

Exhibit C.1. Rubric for Evaluating the Evidence of Effectiveness of Teacher Preparation Programs

	RIGOR	SUFFICIENCY	CONSISTENCY
4	The evidence is highly credible. The data are valid and indicators are free of bias. Reliability is supported by multi-year data from several sources.	There are extensive data that support claims of effectiveness. The evidence includes data from multiple sources with multiple indicators.	Components of the program are consistent with the vision of the program. Program components are monitored to determine if they are being instituted as designed. Evidence supports an intended, logical link between program components and program success. The consistencies support the credibility of the evidence.
3	The evidence is credible. Validity has been addressed for most of the data. There may be some questions of bias. Reliability is supported by two or more years of data from at least one data source.	There are adequate data to support the claims of effectiveness. There are multiple sources of evidence and multiple indicators for at least one source.	There are minor inconsistencies between the vision of the program and program components. Some components of the program may not be monitored or there may be some inconsistencies between the evidence provided and the identified successful components of the program. The inconsistencies do not weaken the credibility of the evidence.
2	The evidence has limited credibility. The rigor is compromised by issues of bias or validity/reliability. There are no multi-year data from any source.	There are limited data to support the claims of effectiveness. The data are collected from only one or two sources. There are no multiple indicators for the data source(s).	There are several inconsistencies between the vision of the program and program components. There are significant inconsistencies between the evidence provided and the identified successful components of the program. The inconsistencies raise questions about the credibility of the evidence.
1	The evidence has little or no credibility. The rigor is significantly compromised by issues of bias, or there is not enough information to determine rigor. The	There are not enough data to support claims of effectiveness. There is only a single source of data.	There are numerous inconsistencies between the vision of the program and its components. The evidence provided is not linked to the components of the program that have been identified as

					contributing to the program's success. The inconsistencies raise significant questions about the credibility of the evidence.
	data lack validity/reliability. There are no multi-year data.				

Source: U.S. Department of Education. (2000). *The National Awards Program for Effective Teacher Preparation: Application*. Washington, DC: Author.

Exhibit C.2. Examples of Credibility of Evidence of Effectiveness across Teacher Preparation Data Sources

	Data Source				
	Teacher Preparation Faculty	**Preservice Teachers' Work**	**Preservice Students & Program Graduates**	**Supervisory or Mentor Teacher**	**K–12 Student Results**
Most Credible	Faculty systematic sampling and rating of K–12 student work in preservice teachers' classes using a valid and reliable rating tool	Ratings by an external panel, with no knowledge about the identity of the preservice teacher's institution, of a systematic portfolio sample reflecting learning	Data collected on all participants in all stages of the program	Results from valid and reliable observation instrument rated by a trained observer	Performance assessment results or results from a test developed by an "expert" (experienced teacher or commercial test developer), reflecting student gains on a topic that beginning teacher taught, evidence of preparedness for next or related courses, increases in higher-level course enrollment
	Faculty systematic observation of preservice teachers' classroom instruction	Presentation of K–12 student work organized as evidence of preservice teachers' influence on K–12 student	Data collected on all graduates. Data include teacher reflections	Systematic ratings on a random sample, including mentor teacher assessment of K–12 student learning	Beginning teacher-created test, given pre and post instruction, reflecting student learning, teacher or student

		learning			reflection logs or journals indicating increased student engagement in learning
	Faculty review and rating of preservice teachers' practice teaching	Portfolios with section specified to address K–12 student learning	Data collected on selected participants in various stages of the program	Systematic ratings on practicing teachers or beginning teachers, indicating whether K–12 students have learned	Beginning teacher rated samples of K–12 student work demonstrating learning
Least Credible	Narrative report of preservice teachers' learning in a teacher preparation class	Preservice teachers' portfolios - no systematized ratings	Data collected from selected graduates	Informal reports indicating that K–12 students learned from practicing teacher or beginning teacher	Selected K–12 student comments about the beginning teacher from an evaluation page

APPENDIX D:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AUDIT

Teacher Quality Toolkit: 2nd Edition

DEVELOPMENT

In 1996, the U.S. Department of Education developed the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development as a means of promoting excellence in professional development. The awards program was designed to identify district- and school-level professional development programs that effectively addressed the U.S. Department of Education's principles of professional development. Subsequently, the U.S. Department of Education contracted with several of the regional educational laboratories to develop the process and rubrics for reviewing applications for the award. These rubrics were used to design the McREL Professional Development Program (PDP) Audit.

USES

The McREL PDP Audit is based on the practices of the winners of the National Awards Program for Model Professional Development during the period 1996-2000. Districts can use the PDP Audit to compare the characteristics of their professional development program with those of model programs that have developed effective professional development programs. Some uses of the PDP Audit include the following:

- District and school administrators, staff developers, or professional development committees can complete and use the audit to judge whether they have established the necessary structures and processes to support effective professional development

- District and school administrators, staff developers, or professional development committees can complete the audit and use the overall results for discussions about changes needed to develop an effective professional development program.

- Audit results can be shared with school board members or the community as a way to justify the establishment of new structure and processes (and associated expenses) for professional development.

The PDP Audit is a self-report instrument for district staff. The following guidelines should be implemented:

- Protect respondents' identities. Do not ask respondents to provide their names or other identifying information on the survey.

- Inform the respondents about the purpose of the audit, how the results will be summarized and used, and who will see the results.

Then obtain respondents' consents to participate in the audit.

- Protect confidentiality of results. Do not report results in ways that might identify individuals. Do not report separately the results for groups with fewer than 10 individuals. Depending on how the audit is being used, distribution of PDP Audit results might be inappropriate.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

To score the PDP Audit, count the number of checkmarks for each of the five clusters. The number of checkmarks indicates the degree to which respondents perceive that the professional development program has characteristics aligned with model programs. The characteristics without checkmarks indicate possible changes needed for more effective professional development. The percentage of respondents who check or do not check a particular characteristic indicates the amount of agreement about the professional development program. The latter is a source for identifying gaps in knowledge about the components of the professional development program.

McREL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AUDIT

Rate the district's or school's professional development program on each of the following criteria related to high-quality professional development. Check the criteria that are presently an aspect of the program.

1.   Program Vision and Goals

_____   a. The district has adopted a set of standards for professional development.

_____   b. The district's professional development goals are aligned with the district's improvement

      plan.

_____   c. There are explicit expectations that teachers participate in frequent professional development

      each year.

_____   d. Staff members in all schools have access to professional development appropriate to their

      responsibilities.

_____   e. There are multiple ways for teachers at different levels of expertise to acquire and refine their

      knowledge and skills.

_____   f. Specific and appropriate support (e.g., mentoring, coaching, training) is provided for teachers

      who are new to teaching.

_____   g. Specific and appropriate support (e.g., mentoring, coaching, training) is provided for teachers

      who are new to their positions.

_____   h. Specific and appropriate support (e.g., mentoring, coaching, training) is provided for teachers

      who are experiencing difficulties in their teaching.

_____   i. There is regular professional development for principals that focuses on ways they can support

      teacher learning and effective instruction.

2.   Program Planning

_____   a. There are formal committees and procedures for planning professional development, which

      include representatives of all groups participating in professional development.

_____   b. School faculties have support to arrange appropriate professional development activities that

address their identified needs.

_____ c. Professional development planning incorporates research and best practices on professional

development.

_____ d. Professional development planning incorporates research and best practices related to the

change process.

_____ e. There is district support or guidance to help school staff develop their professional

development plans.

_____ f. There is district support or guidance to help individual educators pursue individual

professional growth goals.

_____ g. The district uses multiple sources/formats of student performance data from across K-12 to

plan professional development.

_____ h. The district provides schools with the necessary/appropriate data to plan professional

development.

_____ i. Individual educators complete annual professional development or growth plans that are based

on district, school, grade/department, and personal growth goals.

3.   Program Design

_____ a. Opportunities are provided for sharing best practices among staff from various schools in the

district.

_____ b. There are multiple ways for teachers at different levels of expertise to acquire and refine new

knowledge and skills.

_____ c. Professional development activities address the research base behind instructional strategies.

_____ d. Professional development includes elements essential to teaching to high standards (e.g.,

assessment, standards-based unit design)

_____ e. Professional development activities are focused on acquisition of new knowledge and skills

about subject content that students are expected to learn.

_____ f. Professional development activities are focused on acquisition of new knowledge and skills

about instructional strategies that research and experience have shown are effective.

_____ g. Professional development activities include an emphasis on how technology can be used as an

instructional tool.

_____ h. Professional development activities help teachers examine their beliefs and attitudes about

teaching and learning.

_____ i. The professional development program provides opportunities that help teachers learn from

one another (e.g., study groups, action research groups, grade level teams, mentoring,

peer coaching).

_____ j. There are multiple ways for teachers at different levels of expertise to acquire and refine new

knowledge and skills.

_____ k. Teachers have multiple opportunities over an extended period of time to learn how to apply

the content of professional development.

4. **Program Resources**

_____ a. Structures such as professional libraries and materials centers exist to support professional

development.

_____ b. The coordination of professional development is a designated job responsibility for one or

more individuals at the district level.

_____ c. The school day/year is structured to allow time for teachers to participate in professional

development activities.

_____ d. There is systematic and frequent communication (e.g., newsletters, emails) designed to help

the district community understand how professional development connects to the overall district plan.

5. **Program Evaluation**

_____ a. The district and/or school uses multiple sources/formats of student performance data from

across K-12 to evaluate professional development.

_____ b. Professional development is evaluated in relation to changes in teaching and learning that

were expected to result from the professional development activities.

_____ c. The district provides schools with the necessary/appropriate data to evaluate the impact of

professional development activities.

_____ d. There are institutionalized ways to celebrate professional growth at all levels of the system.

APPENDIX E:

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITY CHECKLIST

DEVELOPMENT

The Professional Learning Community Checklist draws from work that was conducted as part of McREL's study of high-performing, high-needs schools (HPHN). The study is a multi-year (2001-2005), multi-site comparison study contrasting factors in HPHN schools with those in low-performing, high needs (LPHN) schools. The study, which consists of a main study and five component studies, focuses on three major aspects of school improvement: organizational capacity, professional learning opportunities for teachers, and classroom practices. Items for the checklist are drawn from work by Newman and Wehlage (1995), Lee and Smith (1996), Louis and Marks (1998), and Charlotte Advocates for Education (2004).

USES

Schools can use the Professional Learning Community Checklist to compare the characteristics of their culture to the culture of schools that have a professional learning community. Some uses of the Professional Learning Community Checklist include the following:

- Members of the school leadership team or professional development committee can complete and use the checklist to judge whether they have established the structures and processes necessary to support a professional learning community.

- Members of the school leadership team or professional development committee can complete the checklist and use the overall results for discussions about changes needed to establish or strengthen the school's professional learning community.

Results can be shared with school and district leaders and all school staff as a way to justify the establishment of new structure and processes (and associated expenses) to strengthen the school's professional learning community.

The Professional Learning Community Checklist is self-report instrument for teachers, teacher leaders, school leadership teams, and school-level professional development committees. The following guidelines should be implemented:

- Protect respondents' identities. Do not ask respondents to provide their names or other identifying information on the checklist.

- Inform the respondents about the purpose of the checklist, how the results will be summarized and used, and who will see the results. Then obtain respondents' consents to participate in completing the

checklist.

- Protect confidentiality of results. Do not report results in ways that might identify individuals. Do not report separately the results for groups with fewer than 10 individuals. Depending on how the checklist is being used, distribution of Professional Learning Community Checklist results might be inappropriate.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

To score the Professional Learning Community Checklist, count the number of checkmarks for each of the four sections of the checklist. The number of checkmarks indicates the degree to which respondents perceive that the school has a professional learning community. The statements without checkmarks indicate possible changes needed to strengthen professional learning community in a school. The percentage of respondents who check or do not check a particular statement indicates the amount of agreement about the school's professional learning community. The latter is a possible source for identifying gaps in knowledge about what a professional learning community is and how to establish and maintain one.

REFERENCES

Charlotte Advocates for Education. (2004, February). *Role of principal leadership in increasing teacher retention: Creating a supportive environment.* Retrieved March 2, 2004, from http://www.advocatesfored.org/publications/Principal%20Final%20Report.pdf.

Lee, V., & Smith, J. B. (1996). Collective responsibility for learning and its effects on gains in achievement for early secondary school students. Journal of Education, 104, 103-147.

Louis, K. S., & Marks, H. M. (1998). Does professional community affect the classroom? Teachers' work and student experiences in restructuring schools. *American Journal of Education, 106*, 532-575.

Newman, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

McREL PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITY CHECKLIST

Rate the school's professional learning community on each of the following characteristics of professional learning communities. Check the characteristics that are present in the school.

1.   Shared Sense of Purpose and Focus on Student Learning

_____ a. There is broad agreement among the school's staff about what the school's mission should be.

_____ b. Goals and priorities for this school are clear.

_____ c. The teachers and administrators are in close agreement about school improvement efforts.

_____ d. A focused school vision for student learning is shared by most of the staff in the school.

_____ e. Teachers focus on what and how students are learning rather than on how they are teaching.

_____ f. The acquisition of higher-order thinking skills (reasoning, problem solving, critical thinking) is a learning goal that most teachers in this school have for their students.

_____ g. Teachers feel responsible for the students they teach but not for other students in the school.

_____ h. Teachers are expected to maintain discipline in the entire school, not just in their classroom.

2.   Collaborative Activity and Deprivatized Practice

_____ a. Teachers meet with one another to discuss student problems and arrange appropriate help.

_____ b. Teachers meet with one another to discuss specific teaching practices.

_____ c. Teachers work with one another or the principal to analyze and address student test results.

_____ d. Teachers meet with one another to discuss lesson planning, curriculum development, or other collaborative work related to instruction.

_____ e. Teachers receive useful suggestions from other teachers about teaching techniques, practices, or student activities.

_____ f. Teachers visit each others' classrooms to observe and discuss each others' teaching.

_____ g. Teachers observe the academic performance of their colleagues' students or review the grades or test scores of colleagues' students.

_____ h. Teachers receive meaningful feedback on their performance from supervisors or peers.

_____ i. Teachers visit one another's classrooms to observe and discuss their teaching.

3. Staff Support and Cooperation

_____ a. Staff members are recognized for a job well done.
_____ b. Teachers feel comfortable voicing their concerns in this school.
_____ c. The principal consults staff before making decisions affecting them.
_____ d. Administrators know the problems faced by staff.
_____ e. Teachers at this school are continually learning.
_____ f. There is a formal support system at this school for beginning teachers.
_____ g. Administrators facilitate teachers working together.
_____ h. The principal ensures that teachers have the necessary materials to support high quality instruction.
_____ i. Teachers are aware of what the principal believes regarding teaching and learning.
_____ j. There are teacher leadership positions at this school (e.g., team leader, district representative)

4. Shared Decision Making

_____ a. Teachers participate in making most of the important educational decisions in this school.
_____ b. Teachers have control over establishing the curriculum.
_____ c. Teachers have control over teaching techniques.
_____ d. Teachers have influence over discipline policy.
_____ e. Teachers have influence over inservice programs.
_____ f. Teachers have influence over how the school budget will be spent.
_____ g. Teachers have influence over hiring new full-time teachers.
_____ h. Teachers have influence over evaluating teachers.

APPENDIX F:

PARTNERSHIP AUDIT

DEVELOPMENT

The Partnership Audit was developed by integrating work on standards for professional development schools (Teitel, 2003), challenges faced by partnerships (Johnston, 1997), and different types of partnerships and the characteristics unique to each one (Barnett, Berg, Hall, & Camarena, 1999). The elements described in six model school-university partnerships, which were identified through a literature search and described in Chapter 4 of this toolkit, were also incorporated to create a more comprehensive tool.

USES

The McREL Partnership Audit is based on information from the six model partnerships as well as literature describing the elements of successful collaborations in school-university partnerships. Both higher education institutions and school districts can use the Partnership Audit to compare the characteristics of their school-university partnerships with those elements determined to be necessary to creating and maintaining effective collaborative partnerships. Higher education institutions and school districts can also assess the presence of these elements in planned partnerships. Some uses of the Partnership Audit include the following:

- University faculty and administrators, district and school administrators, as well as teachers can complete and use the audit to judge whether they have established the necessary structures and processes to support effective partnerships.

- University faculty and administrators, district and school administrators, as well as teachers can complete the audit and use the overall results for discussions about changes needed to develop an effective partnership.

- Audit results can be shared with policymakers or the community as a way to justify the establishment of new structure and processes (and associated expenses) for partnerships.

- Universities and school districts can complete and use the audit to assess the presence of these factors in planned partnerships and make adjustments as necessary.

The Partnership Audit is a self-report instrument for members of the partnership. The following guidelines should be implemented:

- Protect respondents' identities. Do not ask respondents to provide their names or other identifying information on the survey.

- Inform the respondents about the purpose of the audit, how the results will be summarized and used, and who will see the results. Then obtain respondents' consents to participate in the audit.

- Protect confidentiality of results. Do not report results in ways that might identify individuals. Do not report separately the results for groups with fewer than 10 individuals. Depending on how the audit is being used, distribution of Partnership Audit results might be inappropriate.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

To score the Partnership Audit, count the number of checkmarks for each of the nine sections. The number of checkmarks indicates the degree to which respondents perceive that the partnership has characteristics aligned with model partnerships. The characteristics without checkmarks indicate possible changes needed for more effective partnerships. The percentage of respondents who check or do not check a particular characteristic indicates the amount of agreement about the partnership. The latter is a source for identifying gaps in knowledge about the key factors of school-university partnerships.

REFERENCES

Barnett, B. G., Hall, G. E., Berg, J. H., & Camarena, M. M. (1999, November). A typology of partnerships for promoting innovation. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*, 484–510.

Benedum Collaborative. (2005). Overview. Origins: A need for a change. Retrieved August 30, 2005 from http://www.hre.wvu.edu/benedum/overview/overview_need_for_change.htm

California Alliance for Pre K-18 Partnerships. (2004). *Raising student achievement through effective education partnerships: Policy & practice.* Long Beach, CA: Author. Retrieved September 27, 2005, from http://www.calstate.edu/CAPP/publications/Alliance_for_Pre_K-18_Partnerships.pdf

Churchill, L. R., Jensen, M. C., & Cepello, M. (2001, March). *Finding and keeping the best: A rural regional partnership.* Paper presented at the Growing Partnerships for Rural Special Education Conference, San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED453033)

Gill, B., & Hove, A. (2000, February). *The Benedum Collaborative model of teacher education: A preliminary evaluation*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Education. Retrieved August 10, 2005 from http://www.rand.org/pubs/documented_briefings/2005/RAND_DB303.pdf

Johnston, M. (1997). *Contradictions in collaboration: New thinking on school/university partnerships*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kersh, M. E., & Masztal, N. B. (1998). An analysis of studies of collaboration between universities and K-12 schools. *The Educational Forum, 62*(3), 218–225.

Levine, M. (2004). *Going to scale with professional development schools in urban districts.* Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Retrieved August 12, 2005, from http://www.ncate.org/documents/pds/March%2024%20Revision%20and%20Editing.pdf

Maryland State Department of Education. (2004). *Professional development schools in Maryland.* Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved August 27, 2005, from http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/msde

Pugach, M. C., & Johnson, L. J. (2002). *Collaborative practitioners, collaborative schools* (2nd ed.). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Company.

Shapiro, N. (2003). The Maryland Partnership for Teaching and Learning: A state system perspective on K-16. *Peer Review, 5*(2), 24–26.

MCREL PARTNERSHIP AUDIT

Rate the partnership on each of the following criteria related to effective school-university partnerships. Check the criteria that are presently an aspect of the partnership.

1.   Organization, Vision and Values

_____   a. The partnership has a written document that identifies the roles and responsibilities for both partners.

_____   b. The partnership is dynamic and adaptable to changing needs and circumstances over the long term.

_____   c. The overall mission of the partnership is clear to all involved in the partnership.

_____   d. All partners have a shared vision for the partnership.

_____   e. Mutual benefits for each partner have been identified and agreed upon.

_____   f. Common values have been identified for each partner.

_____   g. Short term goals have been identified, are clear and have been agreed upon by all partners.

_____   h. Long term goals have been identified, are clear and have been agreed upon by all partners.

2.   Cultural Differences and Relationship Building

_____   a. All partners have acknowledged the differences between the organizational cultures in higher education and public schools.

_____   b. Potential obstacles that could be caused by these differences have been identified and are understood by all partners.

_____   c. Cross-institutional and cross-functional teams have been created to address the differences in cultures of the different partners.

_____   d Activities intended to build relationships, camaraderie, and mutual trust are in place.

_____   e There is a formal structure in place for teacher input.

_____   f Teachers know that their input is valued and will be acted upon.

_____   g Partnership roles and responsibilities have been institutionalized – ensuring that they will remain consistent in case of staff turnover.

3.   Leadership

_____   a. There is visible and supportive leadership from both partners.

_____ b. Power is equally shared among top leaders.

_____ c. Leaders from both partners demonstrate willingness to do things differently in order to ensure an effective partnership.

_____ d. Leaders are committed, actively involved, and willing to make decisions.

4.   Structure

_____ a. A steering committee is in place that sets direction for the partnership as well as reviews accomplishments as they occur and plans next steps.

_____ b. There is a full time coordinator who manages all aspects of the partnership.

_____ c. The coordinator has the full support of all partners, has the power to make decisions and has adequate resources.

_____ d. Cross-function teams are in place, and they have regular meetings.

5.   Communication

_____ a. A written communication plan is in place.

_____ b. The communication plan fosters collegiality and trust.

_____ c. Participants from all partners are kept up-to-date and informed of partnership activities.

_____ d. Communication is open, honest, regular and frequent.

_____ e Partners inform and educate policymakers about goals and accomplishments of the partnership.

6.   Promotion of the Continuum of Learning

_____ a. The higher education partner has a plan in place for faculty working with schools and teachers that provides an alternative path to promotion and tenure as opposed to the research and publish path.

_____ b There is a strategic plan for professional development that continues the teacher learning that was started in teacher's preservice training.

_____ c Teacher "quality" is emphasized, rather than teacher "preparation".

7.   Standards

_____ a. University course work is aligned with preservice teacher field experiences.

_____ b. There are clear connections between theory and practice in coursework and the workplace.

8.   Evaluation

_____ a. There is an ongoing evaluation plan that looks at goals and accomplishments of the partnership.

_____ b. The plan includes use of both formative and summative evaluation data.

_____ c. Programs are continually revised based on evaluation results.

_____ d. All partners are provided with the necessary/appropriate data to evaluate the impact of the partnership.

9.   Resources

_____ a. The partnership is proactive where resources are concerned.

_____ b. There is a resource allocation plan that addresses time, energy, fiscal, and human resources.

_____ c. Resources are targeted and focused.