

Faculty Research Residencies: A Response to the Problem of Enactment

Wendy Gardiner & Diane Salmon

National Louis University

Abstract

Current reform efforts seek to redesign teacher education in alignment with a practice-based theory, a fundamental reconceptualization of higher education demanding a tighter alignment with K-12 school practices. The Faculty Research Residency Model—a Department of Education Funds for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) grant supported project—draws upon practice-based theory and leverages existing school-university partnerships to create opportunities for faculty to research practices in high need urban schools to inform university course redesign. This study describes the faculty research residency model, reports on year one results of the project, describes implications for refining the model, and provides recommendations to inform others seeking to improve university coursework through school-university partnerships.

Teacher education has come under fire for not preparing teacher candidates to enact rigorous and robust instruction, particularly to students of color or those living in poverty (Blanchett, 2006; Grant & Gillette, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2005). Referred to as “the problem of enactment,” teacher candidates are frequently unable to translate theories of effective teaching and learning into practice—and thereby fail to promote rigorous and robust student learning (Hammerness et al., 2005). Currently, there is an effort to combat the problem of enactment by recommending a practice-based theory of teacher learning (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Lambert, 2010) that calls for a fundamental reconceptualization of how teacher education coursework is designed and delivered.

To address problems of enactment occurring within our school-university partnership settings and improve the caliber of university curriculum and coursework using a practice-based approach, we designed the Faculty Research Residency (FRR) project. The FRR Project spans 2011–13 and is funded by a three-year Department of Education grant. The project was designed to improve teacher education, strengthen existing school partnerships, and create new ways for university faculty to learn in, with, and from the classroom or school context. In the FRR Project, university faculty are situated in high-need, urban schools to: 1) engage in a research project in their discipline to better understand and/or impact student learning; and 2) use the contextual knowledge gained from this in-depth experience to inform teacher preparation course redesign to more effectively prepare teacher candidates, which in turns supports our partnering network schools. University faculty also met in monthly seminars to discuss research on practice-based theory and collaborate on research and course redesign.

This descriptive narrative reports on data reflecting the first year of the grant. The purpose of this study was to understand how faculty experienced and perceived the FRR project. In particular, we wanted to understand if the FRR project facilitated faculty research in high-need schools and contributed to curricular redesign utilizing a practice-based approach. This narrative describes the FRR

project and provides lessons learned from year one to inform subsequent grant cycles and increase the likelihood that the grant will improve teaching and learning. This narrative is also intended to describe a model and collaborative process for engaging faculty in high-need schools to improve university coursework and respond to the pervasive problems of enactment that beginning teachers' experience.

Conceptual Framework

Practice-Based Theory

A practice-based theory for teacher learning demands a situated approach in which theory (which is typically generalized) is specifically linked to and embedded in the actual tasks and activities of teaching (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Hammerness et al., 2005; Lambert, 2010). A shift to a practice-based design in teacher learning requires that teacher educators deepen their participation within schools to redesign university learning to explicitly explore the nexus of theory and practice (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Wang et al., 2010). The outcome of tighter integration between theory and practice is better prepared teacher candidates who are more likely to overcome the challenges of "enactment" in complex classroom environments and ultimately improve student learning (Hammerness et al., 2005). Grossman and colleagues (2009) provide a framework that is assistive in thinking about redesigning coursework and restructuring teaching to reflect a practice-based theory. Drawn from a study of how beginning professionals best learn the core practices of their chosen profession, Grossman and colleagues identified three key and interrelated concepts to guide university teaching: representations, decomposition, and approximation of practice.

Representations of practice are utilized to examine and analyze the visible and invisible aspects of a practice and help novices develop a more concrete and robust understanding of a given practice. Representations for teacher education often include case studies, examples of student work, lesson and unit plans, video, observation, and modeling a practice. When using representations of practice, an important role of the instructor is to help reveal the nuances that a novice would not observe, such as teacher thinking and decision making.

Decomposition involves breaking down a complex practice into the constituent parts. Decomposition is used to isolate, identify, and then practice the different components of a core practice. Decomposition provides a process for scaffolding the development of a complex practice. Then, the practice is "recomposed" from component parts back to the whole. Examples of decomposed practice include focusing on specific elements of lesson plans such as practicing and analyzing lesson openings and closing; or identifying and practicing different aspects of a read aloud such as reading with expression or asking engaging questions. Over time, the fully integrated, or "recomposed," practice should become a routine.

Approximations provide opportunities to enact a complex teaching practice outside of the K-12 classroom context. Practice opportunities in the university setting allow novices to implement a specific practice, such as guided reading, from start to finish without the added challenge of managing and responding to events that occur in a classroom of children, while also receiving targeted feedback on their performance. As such, approximations can help a novice feel more secure and steady in implementation prior to enacting a practice with a group or classroom of children.

For teacher educators to apply a practice-based approach, they need to understand how the practices they teach are enacted in the field settings in which their teacher candidates are placed and understand the challenges of enactment. By developing a more contextualized and nuanced

understanding, faculty are more likely to select and create the representations, decompositions, and approximations of practice that are more likely to improve teacher candidates' learning and foster transfer. Yet, structural and cultural factors tend to inhibit faculty's capacity to improve upon their coursework.

Barriers to Change

University faculty tend to have minimal K–12 experience (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005). As such, faculty are inclined to be disciplinary experts without substantive contextual understanding, particularly in high-need schools. To this end, faculty tend to be left to their own devices to design and implement coursework for candidates to apply in settings faculty may know little about. In addition, colleges of education tend to not support faculty engagement in schools unless it pertains to research, and thereby penalize faculty from investing time in the field in the service of their coursework (Darling-Hammond, 2010). These experiential and institutional barriers mean that faculty are typically unable to help teacher candidates see how culture and context intersect with and influence the application of theory into practice.

Additionally, university structures tend to privilege individual performance rather than collaboration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005). Collaboration can support a community of practice in which members brainstorm issues and capitalize on one another's intellectual and experiential resources (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Yet, in the university setting, faculty members typically individually interpret and implement their courses. While some professional development schools (PDS) exemplify collaboration between and among school and university faculty, such deep levels of collaboration are the exception, not the norm (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997; Teitel, 1999; Zeichner, 2010). Instead, university faculty and school-based faculty seldom know about one another's practices (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997; Zeichner, 2010).

Context and Background

The project was designed for and implemented in a private comprehensive institution of higher education with a large college of education (approximately 3,000 graduates annually). The college offers bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees. While strong teaching is the primary emphasis at our institution, research expectations for tenure and promotion have increased in recent years.

At our university, we have many ongoing collaborative relationships in which faculty spend extensive time in the field. However, reflective of research (Darling-Hammond et al., 2005), these relationships tend to be individualized and guided by faculty's own research agenda—which is typically not tied to their coursework. Also, promotion and tenure requirements specifically indicate that faculty must articulate ways in which they further their professional learning and improve upon their teaching. Yet, insofar, there are no systematic means to support faculty in achieving these expectations.

Furthermore, in year one of the grant, we had 120 educational faculty spread across five campuses and over 40 programs. As such, our institution typically reflects a culture of individualism without structures to support collaboration, a reality persistently indicated in educational research (Britzman, 2003; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005).

Over the last four years, we have worked closely with the leadership teams for our college's urban partnerships and urban teacher residencies. A recurrent concern indicated in teacher candidates' exit

data is that while faculty are quite knowledgeable about their discipline, they often have limited detailed knowledge of the demands urban schools place upon teachers and how these impact the translation of theory and research into local practices. Consequently, we designed the FRR project to help faculty achieve promotion and tenure expectations, with the goal of improving teacher candidate learning through improved coursework.

Faculty Research Residency Model

The FRR project is funded by the Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE). It is a three-year grant awarded in the fall of 2010 and funded at \$250,000 per year. Most of the grant is allocated to releasing faculty from normal teaching duties to participate in research residencies leading to course redesign. Each year reflects a grant cycle that includes faculty recruitment, selection, participation in research residencies, and dissemination of results. For this project, the research residencies were conducted in one of two partnership networks.

The process of recruiting and selecting faculty residents began in November of 2010 when a request for proposals was sent out to faculty in the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences. The proposal requirements were to 1) provide a detailed statement of the problem faculty were seeking to investigate, grounded in a thorough literature review; 2) state how research in high-need settings will contribute to course redesign; 3) describe data collection methods; 4) indicate grade level and/or content area desired to conduct research; and 5) provide a timeline for research and course redesign. Proposals typically ranged from six to eight pages.

An advisory committee was selected in the summer of 2010 when the grant was written. The advisory committee's role was to select and facilitate faculty residents' placements in schools and to provide feedback and guidance throughout the grant. The advisory committee included deans from the College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences, partner school network school leadership, university faculty who work with partnering schools, and the principle investigators of the grant (the co-authors of this paper). In December, the advisory committee met to determine proposal acceptance and facilitate placements into partnering schools. Each committee member independently scored proposals using a checklist. Acceptance was determined by the quality of the proposal, the potential for a good match between researcher and school setting, and the anticipated impact the study would have to enhance teacher preparation and reflect the needs and context of partnering schools. When faculty residents were selected to participate in the grant, network school leaders recommended schools settings for placement and paved the way for research access.

Faculty acceptance was announced in January 2011. Faculty residencies began in February and ended in November of 2011 and included monthly seminars. To support faculty engagement in research and course redesign, each faculty member was awarded between 3–6 semester hours of release time. To support school-based personnel involvement, up to \$1,000 per project was awarded (i.e., honorariums for classroom teachers).

Seminars met monthly from February through November and were 90 minutes in length. The seminar structure was intended to build a community of learners from across disciplines and departments to support course redesign and research. Between February and May, articles pertaining to practice-based theory (PBT) of teacher learning were emailed to faculty residents and discussed at the beginning of the next seminar. Then, faculty residents connected the reading to their course redesign and insights they derived from time spent in the field. Faculty residents also identified

emerging issues, themes, or tensions between PBT, research, and practices in high-need schools. Each seminar included time for research residents to discuss the successes and challenges encountered in their research projects, brainstorm ideas, gain feedback from colleagues, and identify additional supports needed.

At the end of the grant cycle, faculty residents presented their research findings and the impact of the residency on their course redesign to the advisory committee. Faculty residents were also expected to share their results with school-based participants and to the College of Education at a faculty meeting.

2010–2011 Faculty Research Residents

Participants for the initial cycle included six faculty residents (the total number funded for 2011). Two were female, and four were male. Two were associate professors, and four were assistant professors. One faculty participant was African American, and five were Caucasian. Participants represented four different departments: two from secondary education, two from educational psychology, one from educational leadership, and one from counseling and human services.

The participants' projects were reflective of their disciplinary backgrounds. The educational psychology project focused on the quality of mentoring relationships from a communication lens. The secondary education projects both focused on distinct core practices: one studied the impact of using a "decomposed" lesson plan format, while the other investigated how teachers reconciled grading and standards-based assessment. The counseling project sought to streamline the content covered in university coursework to respond to career and college counseling program needs in high-poverty, high-need high schools. The educational leadership project investigated which theories (addressed in a sequence of courses) school practitioners found most useful in their work and if gaps were evident.

Research Residency Data Collection and Analysis

This study reports on the first grant cycle spanning January through December 2010. Data sources included faculty interviews at the completion of the residency; participant observation and field notes taken during advisory board meetings and monthly seminars; monthly faculty surveys; and document review (residency proposals, pre- and post-syllabi; seminar and advisory committee meeting agendas). Data analysis was ongoing, inductive, and occurred through comparative analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Data were coded through open and then axial coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Ongoing comparisons served to refine, revise, and synthesize conceptual codes into larger patterns of meaning from which themes were derived (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The FRR Process and Outcomes

"Politics of Access"

Although faculty residencies occurred within pre-existing partnerships, access to entry and trust needed to be negotiated. Faculty consistently maintained that while the grant provided initial access, trust and role negotiation needed to be addressed intentionally and "with sensitivity." Indeed, faculty indicated two of the projects would not have occurred due to lack of access and connections.

Even though network leadership approved each project and communicated approval, two of the projects did not secure entry into schools until April (projects were accepted in January). It is interesting to note that the three faculty undertaking these projects had no prior experience in or

connection to the network schools in which they were placed. While seeking to enter the schools to interview teachers, faculty scheduled multiple meetings with principals and other school leaders to discuss projects and timeframes before they could begin working with teachers. As one faculty resident noted, "We are forging the relationships first, getting accepted before we can start making our plans work." To that end, it appears that even though approval was granted at the school network leadership level, access at the school level also needed to be obtained. Importantly, even though gaining access was challenging, as one faculty resident stated, "[Without the residency project] I would never have been invited in." A resident on another project similarly stated, "This opened new doors for me."

Faculty who had previously taught coursework for teacher candidates in one of the two network schools represented the other three projects. In these three projects, participants included former students. These faculty residents indicated that prior teaching relationships eased initial access into the school, but they needed to renegotiate roles, as one faculty resident stated, from "teaching faculty to researcher." According to one resident who supervised student teachers at the school in which he was conducting research, "The politics of access are evident here in the first few weeks. It's clear that much time is being spent on relationship building in the schools." To this end, most residents credited the advisory board with helping bridge that first level of access, gaining entry, but they needed to work diligently to build the trust to be able to implement research with participant buy-in and re-create relationships based on changing roles.

Seminars: Support and Mutual Accountability

Faculty in Cycle 1 of the grant were awarded between 3–4 semester hours that they used to buy out teaching time. The decision was based on an estimate of the project's time requirements based on the faculty proposals. The course release was intended to provide time and support for research and course redesign, which included participation in monthly seminars. Seminars were structured to build knowledge of practice-based theory (PBT) and apply PBT to their redesign; report on progress; give and receive feedback on research and course redesign; discuss residency experiences; and identify and discuss needs and challenges. Faculty members' needs and challenges informed subsequent seminars, and data indicated that faculty appreciated that seminars were responsive to their needs and provided a combination of support and "necessary" accountability.

The monthly seminars were intended to nurture a community of practice to support one another's research and redesign efforts. Faculty stated that one of the most significant (and unexpected) benefits of the grant was the collaborative community that developed among faculty by virtue of the monthly seminars. Most faculty did not know one another prior to the residency. Reflective of his colleagues' statements, a faculty member explained, "The collaboration was the most integral part of the whole experience for me." Working together is something that another faculty member stated: "We never have time to do." And another resident explained the value of working together: "There is a lot of expertise here." Similarly, a resident elaborated, "I have never really gleaned how essential this type of conversation and time is if we are to act in any way as transformative teachers and leaders."

Prior to each seminar session, residents received an article pertaining to PBT via email. During seminars, residents discussed the articles and linked them to research and redesign experiences. Faculty indicated discussions contributed to a more nuanced and collective understanding of PBT and a shared framework for collaboratively supporting course redesign. One resident explained, "The residency feeds back into program revisions. We currently have a disparate approach to PBT. Working

together helps us build a critical mass to understand PBT.” Reflective of collaborative learning theories (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), faculty drew upon one another’s experiences and expertise and supported one another’s thinking as they sought to implement their research and redesign their courses. In concert with research indicating the individualistic nature of education (Britzman, 2003; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005), faculty interviews and surveys indicate that they strongly valued the regular opportunities to collaborate to improve their individual and collective work.

In one seminar, a faculty member raised a concern. He stated that while he appreciated the opportunity he had to focus on course redesign, he was concerned that change was limited to those in the room and not likely to cross-pollinate within or beyond departments. Subsequently, several faculty residents distributed seminar readings to their department chairs and school partners. In turn, we found that discussions of PBT and course redesign began to filter through three of the departments represented by faculty residents. This discussion does not mean widespread change will occur, but it is a positive step.

Monthly faculty resident surveys and notes from seminars also indicated that each faculty member needed a different form of support to enact and maximize their research and redesign ideas. As such, helping faculty translate their proposal into action that would substantively impact course redesign required us, as project directors, to be responsive and provide individualized mentoring. For example, the educational psychology faculty explored communication in mentoring. While they had deep knowledge of communication, they needed to build their knowledge around induction mentoring and guidance to locate relevant literature. Some faculty needed support enacting their research, particularly around developing a credible plan for data collection and analysis. One faculty member framed his need for research mentoring by stating, “Research is the stepchild for many faculty.” Another faculty member noted, “I didn’t need help in my research skills, but I would have appreciated more mentoring on PBT.”

Each faculty resident stated that the integrated research and course redesign work would not have been conducted without the support of the grant. Yet, even with the release time allocated by the grant equivalent to one to two courses, all stated that finding time and space for research and course redesign was a challenge. Additionally, each seminar included time to share progress on research and course redesign, problem solve, and give and receive feedback. Yet, faculty still indicated that finding adequate time was challenging.

At the end of the grant, faculty residents were expected to disseminate results to the advisory board, the College of Education, and school-based research participants. Faculty indicated that the seminar structure and the end of the grant presentation expectations provided a necessary level of support and personal accountability that was valued and helped them translate their ideas into curricular change. As one faculty resident stated, “Without the pressure to present and prepare my work for the seminars, I would never have gotten this done.” Similarly, another faculty resident reflected at the end of the grant interview, “This forced me to do it—the deadlines and expectations—otherwise it might not have happened.”

Data at the end of Cycle 1 indicated that faculty residents were initially uncertain that seminars were a good use of their time. However, by the end of the grant cycle, faculty residents changed their perspective. They indicated seminars were a valuable aspect of the grant. Specifically, faculty residents explained that seminars were a worthwhile use of limited time because seminars were collaborative, responsive, and provided a structure for accomplishing their goals.

Curricular Change: Understanding Practices in Context

Faculty residents identified core practices to investigate such as standards-based grading, lesson planning with a focus on student thinking and engagement, communicating with mentors, and implementing a model of school counseling. Each faculty resident stated that their residency experience allowed them the time and space to improve their courses and create better synergy with and alignment to high-poverty contexts. Review of redesigned syllabi and final interviews indicate that at the end of the grant cycle faculty found ways to more effectively connect theory to practice, contextualize coursework, and integrate representations and approximations of practice (see Grossman et al., 2009).

The faculty participants found that they were able to witness the challenges of enactment and apply their findings in course or program redesign. Table 1 contains a summary of main project outcomes in terms of course redesign.

Table 1
Faculty Research Residency Project Outcomes

Discipline/ Department	Practice-based Research Focus	Course Change and Connection to Practice Base Theory
Educational Psychology (a collaborative project)	Communication in mentoring	Communication module to build and practice skills toward more effective communication with mentors and self-advocacy; <i>representing situations in case study contexts and providing approximations of practice to rehearse mentor-mentee conversations that research identified were contentious in nature prior to actual engagement with mentors</i>
Secondary Education	Lesson planning protocol-responding to problem that preservice teachers are not focusing enough on students when they plan (focus on selves)	Revised lesson plan protocol that identified and broke down planning and implementation processes that student teachers struggled to enact (such as managing transitions); <i>decompose lesson planning components to concretely represent abstract concepts</i>
Secondary Education	Grading and standards-based assessment, responding uneven, inconsistent implementation of standards-based grading	- Revised outcomes - Collection of student work samples to discuss assessment and grading practices - Focus on specific tools they are likely to encounter; <i>representing student work to evaluate in class and providing approximations of practice to enact standards-based grading with greater consistency and fidelity</i>

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Discipline/ Department	Practice-based Research Focus	Course Change and Connection to Practice Base Theory
Educational Leadership	Educational theory relevant to practice; sought to understand what theories are more or less salient in high-need settings and where gaps exist	- Identification of salient theories that most guide educational leaders in high-poverty settings - Expanded course resources to better reflect contextual needs; <i>representing contextual needs in coursework that appeared to be culturally and contextually neutral</i>
School Counseling	Career counseling, too many competing priorities and lack of contextualization lead to a “breadth over depth” approach to coursework	Expanded field component to address areas of need identified in research but previously lacking in course design and to provide in-class approximations of practice; inclusion of mock job fair to more broadly represent actual job needs in high need settings; <i>providing approximations of practice</i>

The faculty resident who studied the implementation of standards-based grades was told that practice was being implemented in the high school classrooms where he was placed. Instead, observations and interviews indicated that grades were implemented in individual and idiosyncratic ways. This reality shifted the nuances of his research to delve into barriers and entry steps to implementation. In the end, he embedded a focus on grading practices and used student work collected in the residency to provide approximations of practice in his university classroom, where teacher candidates could unpack their views of grades, discuss case studies on grading practices, and use samples of student work to provide feedback geared toward increased improvement.

Interviews and observations conducted by faculty residents studying mentoring identified barriers to mentoring as a way to increase retention and improve instruction. They found that mentees were unsure of how to advocate for their needs and goals to more experienced colleagues who may have agendas that did not match that of the mentee. To this end, faculty integrated their expertise in collaborative communication in counseling with their new insights into mentoring barriers to design course modules to build effective communication and self-advocacy skills with mentors. The modules were case studies that reflected representations of practice drawn from actual experiences that required students to “approximate” or respond to prompts in a lower-stakes, class-based environment, as opposed to enacting such conversations for the first time as teacher of record with a mentor who holds seniority.

The faculty member studying the impact of a lesson plan protocol found that student teachers were expected to implement the protocol, but in actuality were not. Based on his observations that student teachers planned for content but struggled with effective execution, the faculty member further “decomposed” (or broke down) the lesson plan process into scaffolded steps. He also spent more focused time on planning for transitions and process aspects to lessons such as wait time and regaining students’ attention. This revision provided a space for students to discuss and attend to the less visible aspects of teaching that impact a lesson’s execution.

When the faculty member who explored career and college counseling needs and priorities in high schools reviewed the existing program syllabi, she found that there were a multitude of goals and outcomes that did not convey priority. By interviewing counselors and observing in schools, she was able to identify priorities, or areas of need for high-poverty settings that had been underemphasized in more contextually general courses. To this end, she revised the field component to provide counseling students with practice opportunities for areas of need identified in research but previously lacking or underemphasized. She also created a mock job fair for graduate students to have practice opportunities to represent their knowledge.

The final research resident followed his former educational leadership students into the field to find out which theories were most salient to their practice and what needs were not met in the program. The program was undergoing revision, and his goal was to share data with the educational leadership department. Interviews and observations helped to identify priorities and gaps in the educational leadership program that were subsequently used to inform readings and goals. Resultant changes included the inclusion of a wider selection of readings and the development of course goals that specifically reflected the needs of high-poverty contexts. In this manner, he sought to have greater contextual representation in coursework that had previously appeared culturally neutral or did not provide instructors with enough resources to choose from in responding to their graduate students' contexts.

Document review and interviews indicate that research in high-need schools helped faculty develop more contextualized courses. They believed the curricular changes would contribute to more effective teaching in the urban school partnerships that they taught in and would lead to better learning outcomes for their future students.

Discussion

This study sought to understand if participation in research residencies contributed to a faculty's capacity to redesign coursework in alignment with a PBT of teacher learning. Results indicate that without the grant faculty residents would not have had the combination of time, opportunity, and support to enact research and course redesign. First, the load allocation reduced teaching time while providing time and opportunity to focus on research to inform course redesign. The involvement of partner school network leaders put a stamp of approval that granted participants' access to entry.

Next, school-based research and the seminar structure provided opportunity to redesign coursework in alignment with a PBT. Immersion into high-poverty, high-need settings provided a more contextualized understanding of high-need schools that helped faculty identify instructional gaps and specific challenges their students had in implementing the practices. Data derived from time in high-need partner schools helped faculty residents determine instructional priorities and tailor coursework to be more contextually responsive. Seminar readings and discussions pertaining to PBT provided a lens for redesign.

Seminars and grant outcomes provided structures for support and accountability. Common readings provided a shared framework for giving and receiving feedback. Monthly seminars provided ongoing opportunities to discuss and refine research and redesign efforts. Seminar discussions also revealed needs and concerns to be addressed in subsequent sessions or with individual faculty. As such, the seminar structure provided opportunities to gather and use formative data to help research residents accomplish their goals. Grant outcomes included demonstrating evidence of course redesign

and disseminating findings to advisory board members, College of Education faculty, and research participants. It appears that the public nature of reporting progress and findings in seminars and reporting final results to multiple constituents provided both incentive and accountability that faculty indicated they “needed.”

What follows are the insights derived from Cycle 1 that will inform the next grant cycle. These insights pertain to the seminar structure, scalable impact, and sustainability. Seminars were intended to support a community of faculty using scholarship to improve university coursework. Yet, we were somewhat surprised to see how much faculty residents valued time to collaborate. To that end, we will continue with monthly face-to-face seminars with shared readings and time to collaborate on research and course redesign. Over the course of three years, we hope that new cycles of faculty residents contribute to a critical mass that starts to change the norms of interaction from a culture of individualism to a more collaborative culture (Britzman, 2003; Darling-Hammond, et al., 2005). We will also continue the practice of sharing formative and summative results in seminars and to multiple constituents. In seminars, we believe this process provides ongoing support, collaborative engagement, and accountability. Dissemination to multiple audiences also fosters accountability, increases the potential for greater engagement around PBT, and provides a framework for applying field-based research to inform course redesign—all of which contribute to sustainability.

The idea of scalable impact informs our next step in terms of recruiting and selecting proposals. For Cycle 1 of the grant, we sent out a call for proposals that focused on individual research and individual classes. As described, one faculty resident expressed concern regarding the overall impact of revising individual courses. For Cycle 2, we intend to send a call for two types of proposals: individual and collaborative. The individual proposal structure will remain the same. The collaborative proposals will recruit faculty who teach two or more courses in the same program that reflect different disciplines (i.e., Science Methods and Cognition and Instruction). In this manner, faculty residents will be expected to revise their courses but do so in tandem to increase cross-course coherence. We see this as a way to go beyond improving the individual course to moving more strategically toward program improvement and cross-departmental collaboration.

In regards to sustainability, we recognize the importance of the advisory board. It was clear that advisory board members, who represented network schools, were instrumental in opening doors for initial access. Additionally, the investment by the deans ensured that faculty were granted release time. Deans’ investment also sent the message that both teaching and research are valuable, in particular research that feeds back into course and program improvement. We do note that network leaders’ acceptance of research proposals did not automatically grant full access to teachers or classrooms at the school level. Network leaders made recommendations as to which people and schools would be a good fit for a particular research project, but the individual participants (and their principals) needed to agree, and trust needed to be built. To this end, it may be prudent to build space and time in seminars to coach residents on building trust and gaining access to potentially unfamiliar high-need settings. In addition, it would be beneficial to expand our advisory board to include more school-based personnel to facilitate entry in individual schools and classrooms.

Results from year one of this grant indicate that it has potential to impact the curriculum and culture in our College of Education. Yet, more study is needed. The intent is that by year three, we will have a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the structures and processes that contribute to faculty engagement in the field and with one another for the purpose of improving

coursework and responding to the problem of enactment. By designing, field-testing, and refining the faculty research residency model, we hope to provide a replicable model that responds to the complexity and contextual nature of teaching and learning, predicated on norms of collaboration.

References

- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2010). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497–511.
- Blanchett, W. (2006). Disproportionate representation of African American students in special education: Acknowledging the role of White privilege and racism. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 24–28.
- Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bullough, R., & Kauchak, D. (1997). Partnerships between higher education and secondary schools: Some problems. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 23*(3), 215–233.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 35–47.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Pacheco, A., Michelli, N., LePage, P., Hammermas, K. & Youngs, P. (2005). Implementing curriculum renewal in teacher education: Managing organizational and policy change. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Grant, C., & Gillette, M. (2006). A candid talk to teacher educators about effectively preparing teachers who can teach everyone's children. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 292–299.
- Glesne, C. (2005). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grossman, P., Compton, G., Ingra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-discipline perspective. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2055–2100.
- Hammerness, K., Darling-Hammond, L., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- John-Steiner, V. (2000). *Creative collaboration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Is the team all right? Diversity and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 229–234.
- Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 21–34.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tietel, L. (1999). Looking toward the future by understanding the past: The historical context of professional development schools. *Peabody Journal of education, 74*(3&4), 6-20.
- Wang, J, Spalding, E., Odell, S. Klecka, C., & Lin, E. (2010). Bold ideas for improving teacher education: What we see, hear, and think. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 3–15.

- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99.

