

**BRIDGING THE THEORY-PRACTICE GAP IN AN URBAN TEACHER RESIDENCY:  
TWO INTERVENTIONS AND A CAUTIONARY NOTE**

**Wendy Gardiner**  
*National Louis University*

**Diane Salmon**  
*National Louis University*

**ABSTRACT**

In 2001, National Louis University and the Academy for Urban School Leadership partnered to create the country's first Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) program. Ten years later, with the assistance of Teacher Quality Partnership funding, the program quadrupled in size. As the UTR expanded, an increasing theory-practice gap became apparent, reflecting a perennial problem in teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner, 2010). A leadership team was formed to address the growing gap and several smaller scale interventions were implemented to no real avail. Subsequently, grant funding was allocated toward two interventions designed to increase university faculty engagement in schools. This paper describes and analyzes those interventions: 1) faculty liaisons as an alternative to traditional supervision, and 2) faculty research residencies to situate university faculty in high need schools for the dual purpose of engaged research and curricular revision. Questions pertaining to post-grant sustainability are also raised.

**Introduction**

In 2001, National Louis University (NLU) and the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) partnered to create the country's first urban teacher residency (UTR) program. At its inception, the UTR comprised one culturally and linguistically diverse "training academy," a small pool of university faculty who met on-site at training academies to deliver coursework, and 32 teacher candidates (called "residents"). In 2011, the UTR comprised six elementary and three secondary training academies, university faculty spanning six departments who held classes on campus, and 112 residents. By 2011, university faculty rarely spent time in training academies, where residents spent four days per week.

As our UTR expanded, we observed—and residents' program exit data confirmed—an increasing disconnect between their university coursework and their experiences in their training academies, reflecting a perennial problem in teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Zeichner, 2010). Additionally, university faculty increasingly reported a lack of knowledge about the teaching practices enacted in the training academies—a frequently occurring problem, even in the context of school-university partnerships (Bullough & Kauchak, 1997; Zeichner, 2010). Problematically, this gap not only inhibits residents' learning but also fails to capitalize on the field-intensive program.

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the impact of two separate interventions involving university faculty teaching in the UTR program. These interventions were designed to bridge the theory-practice gap and inform other developing or expanding UTRs. The interventions include: 1) faculty liaisons as an alternative to traditional supervision, and 2) faculty research residencies to situate university faculty in high need schools for the dual purpose of engaged research and curricular revision. The following research question guided the analysis of this study: In what ways, if any, does faculty participation in the liaison or research

residency role impact faculty members' understanding of and ability to increase school-university coherence?

### **Urban Teacher Residencies**

Urban Teacher Residencies (UTRs) are a relatively recent teacher preparation innovation designed to improve teaching and learning in high needs schools. UTRs involve collaboration between school districts, universities, and non-profit organizations (Berry et al., 2008). UTRs recruit socially motivated candidates who want to teach in urban schools; these programs integrate theory and practice through a one-year "residency" with mentor teachers at "training academies" while residents take graduate level coursework leading to a master's degree and certification. UTRs also help graduates secure teaching positions in the partnering district's high need schools and provide induction support to program graduates (Berry et al., 2008).

This comprehensive approach is intended to address issues pertaining to urban teacher preparation, and teacher attrition and its impact on students' experiences (Berry et al., 2008; Solomon, 2009). Research indicates that UTRs demonstrate higher levels of new teacher retention in hard to staff schools (Berry et al., 2008) and show promise as a reform intervention (Berry et al., 2008; Gardiner & Kamm, 2010; Gatlin, 2009). However, reflecting research on Professional Development Schools indicating uneven implementation and uneven results (Teitel, 1999), careful attention to the design and implementation of UTRs is critical if they are to be a viable reform intervention.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Proponents of field-intensive learning, such as UTRs, explicate the necessity of establishing stronger connections between theory and practice (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Hammerness et al, 2005; Wang et al., 2010) and recommend a more situated approach to teacher learning in which university course content is specifically linked to and embedded in the actual tasks and activities of teaching (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Lampert, 2010). Such an approach calls for a fundamental reconceptualization in how schools and universities collaborate (Darling-Hammond, 2010) and how teacher education coursework is designed and delivered (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Lampert, 2010).

In his critique of the disconnect between campus-based and school-based components of teacher education, Zeichner (2010) states that new roles and relationships need to be established in order connect course and field experiences and improve teacher candidate learning. In accordance with this stance, Ball and Forzani (2010) state that an essential task of teaching is determining where learners encounter difficulties. In the context of teacher education, situating university faculty in the classrooms where teacher candidates are learning to teach can provide clarity about what practices are implemented, how they are implemented, and where teacher candidates succeed and struggle. Optimally, such insights can be applied to establish a stronger connection between theory and practice, and more supported learning experiences.

Yet, despite the press for greater full time faculty involvement in field-based components of teacher education to help bridge the pervasive theory-practice gap, research indicates fulltime university faculty maintain low involvement in school-based teacher education (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Zeichner, 2010). A number of factors serve to inhibit faculty's willingness and ability to invest in field-based teacher education, including the fact that field-

based work is perceived as low status (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Cucena et al., 2011; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005) and the reality that university structures typically privilege publications and tend to support faculty involvement in the field when this activity focuses on scholarship (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

## Methods

### Background & Context

The UTR structure on which we focused for our study was a one-year program entailing a clinical placement (residency) with an experienced mentor teacher in a training academy and university coursework leading to a master's degree and certification. Between June and August residents took intensive summer coursework at the university, Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 3:30 pm. From late August through June, residents were in classrooms with their mentors, Monday through Thursday, and took coursework at the university on Friday. Upon program completion, the UTR helped residents secure teaching positions in the district's high needs schools.

In 2009, the UTR had been in existence for eight years, quadrupled the number of residents and mentors since its inception, added five new training academies, and retained no original university faculty. Also in 2009, the Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) grant was awarded and provided funding for the UTR. The authors of this manuscript began attending newly established monthly leadership meetings and also taught courses in the UTR program.

The leadership meetings were established to improve the coherence between the school and university portions and improve resident learning. In this manner, monthly leadership meetings were intended to identify and prioritize needs and problem solve. Participants in the leadership meetings included four university faculty who taught in the program, the NLU-AUSL liaison, the TQP grant manager, and the managing director and director of teacher education for AUSL. Membership remained constant. Once a quarter, the dean or dean's designee attended the leadership meetings. Issues raised and discussed included the sequencing of coursework, structural organization of the UTR model, recruiting university and school-based faculty to teach in the program, ensuring that those who taught in the program understood the field intensive model and the program's curricular design, finding ways to increase coherence between university coursework and field experiences, and improving university supervision, which was reported to be inconsistent in quality.

The leadership team developed and facilitated a range of interventions between 2009-2011. These interventions appeared to add some value but did not fundamentally address the theory-practice divide evidenced in residents' exit data. For example, a two-hour onboarding session for those new to teaching in the UTR was created to provide a program overview. Half-day faculty visits to training academies were established and led by the NLU-AUSL liaison for university faculty. Supervisor sessions were held to bring supervisors, teaching faculty, and mentor-resident coaches (each training academy had an AUSL employed mentor-resident coach to support resident and mentor development) together to develop a shared understanding of the program, residents' supervisory needs, and shared expectations for supporting residents' development. For one year, there were joint AUSL and NLU personnel meetings to develop school-based professional development sessions for mentor teachers. While these steps appeared to contribute to some improved coherence, they were insufficient in leading to substantive

change and difficult to sustain because of the complex logistics they entailed.

Seeking to effect more substantive change to improve the coherence between the school-university experiences, members of the leadership team identified and sought to address two key issues: the quality of supervision and university faculty's disengagement from school settings. To this end, the members organized into small teams to create the faculty liaison model as an alternative to traditional supervision and to create faculty research residencies to engage faculty in school sites for the purpose of conducting research in order to redesign university coursework. The first author was on both teams, and the second author was on the faculty research residency team. Both interventions will be described more fully in the "Results" section. Additionally, both interventions were funded through the Department of Education grants. The Teacher Quality Partnership grant funded the faculty liaison model and the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education funded the faculty research residency model.

### **Data Sources and Analysis**

Two data sets were gathered, one pertaining to the faculty liaison model (2011-12) and one pertaining to the faculty research residency project (2010-2014). For the faculty liaison model, data included resident ( $n = 19$ ) and mentor ( $n = 17$ ) surveys at the end of the program focusing on the benefits, limitations, and impact of the model. Structured interviews (Seidman, 1998) were also conducted with faculty liaisons who were full-time university faculty teaching in the UTR program ( $n = 4$ ) and mentor-resident coaches (MRC) who worked at training academies to support mentor and resident development ( $n = 6$ ). Interviews sought to understand the nature of the work, participants' perspectives on the liaison model, and recommendations for sustaining, modifying, or eliminating the model. Surveys and the interview protocol for the faculty liaison study are found in Appendix A.

For the faculty research residencies, data included participating faculty's documents (e.g., revised syllabi, assignments, and other materials demonstrating course changes), structured interviews (Seidman, 2013), and a pre- and post-residency surveys from faculty who engaged in research residencies ( $n = 13$ ). The interview protocol and the survey for the faculty research residency study are found in Appendix B.

Each data set, liaison model, and faculty research residency model was analyzed separately. Data analysis occurred through comparative analysis (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Repeatedly reading and discussing data established open codes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) such as "boundary crossing," "communicate expectations," and "competing pressures" for faculty liaison data, and "new tool," "theory to practice challenges," "understanding impact," and "context insights" for faculty research residency data. Through ongoing comparative analysis, we continued to reread and discuss data, looking for conceptual and experiential similarities and differences, in order to refine, revise, and synthesize codes into interpretive themes (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Miles & Huberman, 1994) such as "A More Holistic Lens to 'Push Residents' Growth'" and "Understanding Problems of Enactment." Finally, we engaged in comparative analysis across models to garner insights into if and how faculty participation in the two models—liaison or research residency—impacted their understanding of and ability to increase school-university coherence.

## Results

### Faculty Liaison

The Faculty Liaison (FL) model was informed by Beck and Kosnik's (2002) "professors in the practicum" model. In an effort to better link school and university experiences, Beck and Kosnik implemented an alternative supervision model in which full-time faculty supervised, but did not evaluate, practicum students. In their school-based role, university faculty communicated university expectations, connected coursework and field experiences, and provided instructional feedback. Results indicated that the model strengthened university and school-based personnel's commitment to the partnership and improved teacher candidates' experiences in university coursework and field placements. University faculty noted that the model placed high demands on time and that their academic community did not legitimize their in-school work. Beck and Kosnick contend the benefits outweigh the limitations, but note that such limitations may hinder subsequent implementation and transferability to other teacher education programs.

FLs were full time university faculty teaching in the UTR program. FLs were assigned to schools rather than individual teacher residents. On average, FLs worked with five to eight residents. FL expectations were to observe, provide feedback, evaluate resident performance, and help connect coursework and classroom practice. Expectations were to spend, on average, two half days in the school per month fall through spring. FLs also met monthly to problem solve and refine and develop the model. FLs received the equivalent of one course release per training academy for their work.

### A More Holistic Lens to "Push Residents' Growth"

Mentors, residents, and MRCs appreciated that FLs knew both university and classroom expectations. In this manner, liaisons were able to "push residents' growth" in ways that would not be possible if liaisons were not situated in both university and training academy classrooms. Mentors and MRCs described confusion in past years about course expectations, indicating a limited capacity to support the university experience at the training academies. As one MRC indicated, liaisons "brought clarity and information so that the resident can be developed more holistically." Each liaison stated that she made it a point to discuss coursework. Reflecting her colleagues' statements, one liaison said:

The MRC and mentors know that the residents are taking courses, but they don't know what they are or the effect on the knowledge and practice base of the residents...I share syllabi at the beginning of the terms so mentors can plan ahead for what residents will learn and need to do.

Mentors concurred, indicating that liaisons helped them understand the sequence of courses, the content taught, and plan ahead for residents' school-based assignments. Mentors appreciated the advanced knowledge, stating that in years past residents would let them know they needed to implement a project, and mentors would have to adjust already busy schedules to accommodate course expectations. Mentors stated this knowledge helped them be able to plan more proactively and effectively support residents' university coursework in the classroom.

Liaisons stated that sustained time in the classrooms helped them build knowledge they

did not previously possess about the practices implemented at training academies and the degree of success residents had translating course content into practice. If a particular practice was not implemented in a classroom because of grade level, content area, or other reasons, liaisons coordinated with MRCs and/or mentors or modified their coursework to help ensure residents had a fuller range of experiences. Additionally, liaisons noted that observing residents' successes and challenges provided them with insights into the problems of enactment residents encountered that they had not previously obtained. As a result, liaisons stated that they drew upon these insights to reteach or provide additional in-class practice opportunities, to model or bring in videos to illustrate particular concepts or practices, and to discuss the nuances that could lead to stronger implementation.

### **Connecting Courses and Context: “A More Coherent Experience”**

Data indicates that the liaison role helped residents see the connections between courses and classrooms, providing, as one mentor indicated, “a more coherent experience.” Each liaison stated that helping residents see the connections between their coursework and residency classroom was a critical aspect of the role. Reflecting her colleagues' statements, one liaison further noted, “I help residents see how the coursework they are taking can be implemented into their work in the classroom, particularly when they are not seeing the connections on their own.” Residents' survey data consistently revealed that they valued having a professor in their classroom. Residents stated that liaisons helped them “have a meta-view of the program” and provided feedback and insights on how to implement or adapt practices to be effective in their particular context. However, some residents indicated a theory-practice disconnect in some courses in which professors were not in training academies.

Liaisons explained that time spent in classrooms improved their university teaching. Each liaison discussed ways in which s/he specifically modified assignments and scaffolded course content to better connect the assignment to residents' context. Specifically, liaisons drew upon their experiences in training academies to clarify and augment course content by collecting samples of student work to analyze and discuss in class, capturing videos and/or photographs to represent and concretize concepts, and developing case studies for residents to discuss and analyze in class. Liaisons said that while they used video and student work samples in past classes, they believed that residents appeared to be more engaged with and by examples that were drawn from their actual context. Furthermore, liaisons stated that by regularly observing residents' teaching, they were better able to responsively adjust university coursework, such as providing additional practice opportunities and/or readings and discussions when residents struggled to implement certain practices.

### **Developing “A More Expansive Role”**

The liaison role was developed and funded to not only support residents' practice via observation and feedback, but to also communicate university expectations and connect experiences. In addition, each liaison found that they developed relationships with mentors and MRCs that led them to contribute their disciplinary knowledge to the training academies. Mentors and MRCs corroborated and stated that they appreciated liaisons' “content knowledge and expertise.”

To illustrate, one liaison worked weekly with struggling readers in a third grade

classroom while another helped the MRC inventory and analyze the school's science materials and curriculum. Each liaison stated that they located research and other professional materials for MRCs and mentors to help them respond to problems of practice. Liaisons stated that an important aspect of the FL model was their ongoing presence in a school, which allowed them to develop relationships and have a more "engaged" and expansive role than what they experienced as traditional supervisors. Each liaison stated that contributing their expertise in the schools made the role more interesting and fulfilling. As one MRC stated, "The liaison has a better sense of the school as a whole, where the needs are, and where we can push not just this one resident, but the whole building."

Two tenure track liaisons also discussed the importance of connecting research to the role if they were to comfortably continue in it. One discussed the need for "a more expansive role" explaining, "Tenure track faculty need to do research...If not, it's going to be hard to get people to commit [to being liaisons]. We've started developing the relationships. My hope is next year, I'll be able to engage in research that is meaningful to the school and to me."

### **Faculty Research Residencies**

In the Faculty Research Residency (FRR) project, university faculty were situated in UTR training academies to engage in a research project in their discipline and apply the contextual knowledge gained from this in-depth experience to inform teacher preparation course redesign. FRR projects spanned a year. The FFR project was funded through the Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) grant.

The FRR model was informed by and applied practice-based theory (Ball & Forzani, 2010; Grossman et al., 2009; Lambert, 2010). A shift to a practice-based design in teacher learning requires that teacher educators deepen their participation within schools and 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).

The FRR cycle began with a call for proposals in which individual faculty or faculty teams identified a course or set of courses they wished to improve using practice-based principles and developed a research proposal to be conducted in UTR training academies. The leadership team (comprised of UTR and university personnel) reviewed proposals and interviewed and selected faculty participants whose proposals showed promise of significant curricular change and were a good fit for UTR classrooms. The leadership team also helped to match faculty with mentors in training academies as needed (e.g. faculty studying assessment were matched with mentors who demonstrated exemplary use of assessment to inform instruction).

During the research residency year, faculty attended monthly seminars to read literature pertaining to practice-based theory and collaborate around their research and course redesign. At the end of the residency year, faculty presented research findings and course redesign to the leadership team, UTR participants, the College of Education, and to other academic audiences. The grant funded course reduction for faculty and honorariums for UTR participants (typically classroom teachers). Examples of faculty projects included studying assessment principles,

standards-based grading, science inquiry, and literacy practices (e.g. implementation of word study and guided reading in high needs settings).

### **Understanding problems of enactment**

Situating faculty in training academies revealed where enactment challenges occurred, the contextual factors that contributed to those challenges, and provided insights into how course content could be scaffolded to support resident learning. In one example, a faculty member studying standards-based grading was matched with a training academy that had recently adopted that practice. What he found was that mentors were struggling to implement standards based grading practices. Through observations and interviews, the faculty member was able to identify the challenges mentors faced and revise his course to specifically address these issues of enactment. Without exception, faculty members discussed how being in classrooms helped them see, and later change, their courses to respond to the myriad of challenges that residents face when enacting student-centered practices. One faculty resident exploring inquiry science explained, “Seeing the challenges teachers face in incorporating inquiry approaches: it was sobering! The more I get out and work with teachers, the more of these realities I can bring in [to my courses].”

### **Applying a Practice-Based Theory**

Theoretically driven higher education coursework often represents teaching using abstractions of concepts that are hard for novice teachers to translate into effective practice (Grossman et al., 2009; Hammerness et al., 2005). By immersing themselves into training academy classrooms, faculty were able to collect and create a range of artifacts that helped concretize the theory and practices in their university courses such as case studies, student work, and video exemplars. Faculty consistently stated that the course revisions improved resident learning in that residents appeared to better understand and more effectively enact the practices they taught.

To illustrate, the faculty member studying standards-based grading brought in more readings to address knowledge gaps and used student work collected in training academies to provide opportunities for residents to collaboratively discuss and practice standards based grading in his university classes. A literacy methods instructor captured videos of exemplary guided reading and word study practices at training academies, as well as interviews with mentors explaining the thinking that goes into planning and executing successful lessons. These videos were shown in the university classes where the faculty member and residents discussed visible and invisible aspects of practice.

Later, residents would video their own word study and guided reading lessons and bring them to class to share and analyze. Additionally, the science inquiry team developed and tested an observation protocol to help residents identify the many steps and processes that go into developing and executing successful inquiry lessons. Document analysis and interviews indicate that faculty revised their courses based on insights derived from high needs settings. One faculty member explained:

My syllabus is 100% different...We used to give them so many different things and overwhelm them - and it's helping them be less overwhelmed. We've moved to “less is



more”...No more doing something once. That’s not enough. Really going out into the schools and trying these practices out in multiple iterations - doing it, seeing how you did, then changing it as a result.

### **Discussion**

The interventions described were designed to engage faculty in high needs, high poverty training academies in order to bridge the theory-practice gap and improve teacher education in the residency program. Situating university faculty in training academies as liaisons and research residents appeared to deepen their understanding of school contexts and the demands of schooling. In turn, faculty applied these insights to address theory-practice gaps and create a more coherent experience between university and school-based experiences.

As such, both interventions reflect Wegner’s (1998) notions of boundary spanning, providing the context to build new relationships and develop insights that can subsequently be applied to create new and/or revise existing tools, artifacts, and documents. In the case of the liaison and research residency models, university faculty’s presence in training academy classrooms helped them develop insights into and responses to challenges of enactment. Liaisons developed relationships with mentors and MRCs that helped bridge school-university experiences. Liaisons and research residents drew upon experiences in training academy to contextualize their content; create new artifacts such as case studies and video exemplars; revise/update artifacts such as gathering authentic student work from training academies to augment and contextualize coursework; revise documents such as syllabi and course assignments; and develop new tools such as observational protocols.

Importantly, both interventions supported faculty presence in schools with the goal of improving the residency experience and residents’ learning. To begin, faculty work in schools was compensated as teaching via course release. Additionally, faculty knowledge building was supported through monthly, collaborative meetings. While typical university structures tend to dissuade faculty from engaging in schools for purposes beyond research (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Zeichner, 2010), both interventions sought to support and engage faculty in school-based portions of teacher education.

Teacher education research aiming to bridge the pervasive theory-practice gap calls for the design and implementation of new roles and structures that increase university faculty engagement with and in field settings (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Cucena et al., 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2010; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2010; Zeichner, 2010). The faculty liaison and research residency models are promising roles and role structures for teacher education faculty. With both interventions, university faculty deepened their understanding of high needs schools and refined higher education courses in response to their increased understanding of local school needs and contexts.

Teacher education has moved toward more field intensive models. The success of these models is dependent, in part, on a strong intersection of theory and practice that helps resolve problems of enactment. While partnerships may start off with strong theory-practice connections, such coherence is challenging to sustain (Goodlad, 2004).

Creating, implementing, and sustaining faculty engagement in field-based portions of teacher education is imperative if we are to address the perennial theory-practice gap. Clearly, when structures are created and implemented, faculty are willing and able to invest in field-based teacher education. The question is sustainability.

What will happen to our UTR and other grant supported programs when the funding ends? Will the innovative structures developed in such programs be sustained? Or will we look back upon the movement toward field intensive teacher education as a movement that demonstrated, but did not sustain, its promise?

### 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.
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Professors and the practicum: Involvement of university faculty in preservice practicum supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 6-19.
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., Curtis, R., Hernandez, M., Wurtzel, J., & Snyder, J. (2008). *Creating and sustaining urban teacher residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare and retain effective teachers in high-needs districts*. The Aspen Institute/Centern for Teaching Quality. Retrieved from: [http://www.eric.ed.gov:80/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content\\_storage\\_01/0000019b/80/3e/b8/0e.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov:80/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/3e/b8/0e.pdf)
- 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed)*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Cucenca, A., Schmeichel, M., Butler, B., Dinkelman, T., & Nichols, J. (2011). Creating a “third space” in student teaching: Implications for the university supervisor as outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(7), 1068-1077.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, (61)1-2, 35-47.
- Gardiner, W. & Kamm, C. (2010). Urban teacher residencies: Collaborating to reconceptualize urban teacher preparation. In J. Slater & R. Ravid (Eds.), *Collaboration in Education*. (pp. 191-198). New York: Routledge.
- Gatlin, D. (2009). A pluralistic approach to the revitalization of teacher education. *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 469-477.
- Goodlad, J. I. (2004). *A place called school (20<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111, 2055-2100.
- Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 21-34.
- 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* (pp. 358-389). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from

- <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3d&tabid=715>
- Seidman, I. E. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Teitel, 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.
- 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.

## Appendix A

### Resident Survey

1. How often did your liaison visit?
2. What other communication did you have (phone, email, etc.)? How often?
3. What did you typically do when you met?
4. What were the most important roles and/or tasks of the liaison?
5. Were there roles or tasks you felt were unnecessary?
6. Did your liaison impact your development as a resident? If so, how and in what ways? If not, why not?
7. Are there other ways the liaison could have supported your development?
8. What were the benefits of working with your liaison?
9. What were the drawbacks?
10. To what extent did you feel that your liaisons' advice & expectations were aligned to those of the training academy?
11. What qualities do you think are most important in a liaison?
12. If we bring in new liaisons next year, what advice or suggestions do you have in terms of supporting your learning and development?

### Mentor Survey

1. Have you worked with a traditional supervisor? If so, please respond to the following:
  - a. In what ways do you see the role of the liaison being similar and/or different from a traditional supervisor's role?
  - b. What are the benefits of the liaison role in comparison to the traditional supervisor?
  - c. What are the drawbacks?
2. What are the most important roles and/or tasks of the liaison?
3. Were there unnecessary roles or tasks?
4. Has the liaison done anything to support you as a mentor?
5. Does the liaison's work with residents supporting their learning and practice? If so, how and in what ways? If not, why not?
6. Were there any challenges (expected and/or unexpected) as they pertain to the faculty liaison role?
7. Would you recommend maintaining the liaison role next year? Why/why not?
8. Do you suggest any changes for the role?

### **Faculty Liaison Interview Protocol**

1. What drew you to become a liaison?
2. Have you been a traditional supervisor?
  - a. In what ways do you see the role of the liaison being similar or different from that of supervisor?
3. How would you define the role of the faculty liaison?
4. What are the most important roles and/or tasks of the liaison?
5. Were there unnecessary roles or tasks?
6. Were there roles or tasks that you felt were particularly valuable?
7. Are there roles you didn't have but would consider valuable?
8. Describe a typical visit to a training academy.
9. Approximately how much time per week did you spend on this role (average)? Was the time allotted adequate to do the tasks required?
10. Describe some of the work you do outside of your visits.
11. In what ways do you feel your work with residents supported their learning and practice? If so, how and in what ways? If not, why not? Is that similar to or different from your prior supervisory work?
12. In what ways do you work with MRCs? Is that similar to or different from your prior supervisory work?
13. In what ways did you work with mentors? Is that similar to or different from your prior supervisory work?
14. What, if any, unexpected roles or tasks did you undertake?
15. Were there any challenges (expected and/or unexpected) as they pertain to the FL role?  
Prompt if needed
16. Has being a liaison impacted the coursework you teach at NLU?
17. Were you able to bring your own areas of expertise to your work as a liaison? If so, what? If not, why not?
18. What have been your most important insights about being a liaison in a training academy?
19. What advice would you give to others who are interested in becoming a faculty liaison?
20. Would you recommend maintaining the liaison role next year? Why/why not?
21. Do you recommend changes to the role?
22. Would you want to be a FL again next year? Why or why not? What would you similarly and differently?

### **MRC Interview Protocol**

1. Did you work with a supervisor previously as an MRC?
  - a. In what ways do you see the role of the liaison being similar or different from the supervisor?
  - b. Ask about benefits and drawbacks to the role
2. How often do you meet with the liaison for your site?
3. What other communication do you have (phone, email) and how often?
4. What do you typically do when you meet?
5. What are the most important roles and/or tasks of the liaison?
6. Were there unnecessary roles or tasks?
7. Has the liaison done anything to support you as an MRC? If MRC worked with supervisors, ask: Is that similar to or different from your work with supervisors?
8. Can you describe how the liaison at your site worked with residents?

9. Can you describe how the liaison at your site worked with mentors?
10. If MRC worked with supervisors in the past ask: Do you think the liaison added value to residents' learning in ways beyond what a supervisor would?
11. Would you recommend maintaining the liaison role next year? Why/why not?
12. Do you recommend changes to the role?
13. If we move forward with new liaisons next year, what advice or suggestions do you have in terms of supporting your role and a mentor and residents' learning?

## **Appendix B**

### **Faculty Research Residency Post-Residency Interview Protocol**

#### **Curricular impact**

1. As a result of this residency specifically, to what extent have you changed the way you instruct your undergraduate or graduate students to be effective teachers in a HNS setting?
  - To a great extent
  - To some extent
  - To a very little extent
  - To no extent

What evidence would you site as examples of this change?

2. What "next steps" do you intend for this research/project?
3. If you could capture your most significant "lesson learned" from this residency, what would it be? OR Please describe your key summary findings from the project:

#### **Quality of the experience, residency structure and design**

4. To what extent did your project differ from your original design or intention?
  - To a great extent
  - To some extent
  - To a very little extent
  - To no extent

Please describe:

5. What were the most significant challenges you faced throughout this project?

Could the project leadership team have solved this/these challenge(s) in any way? (In what way can future residents learn from these challenges?) Please describe.

6. To what extent did the monthly seminars contribute to your professional growth and development?
  - To a great extent
  - To some extent
  - To a very little extent

To no extent

*If great/some:*

How did the monthly seminars contribute to your learning experience in this residency?

*If none or little:*

Why were the monthly seminars ineffective in contributing to your professional growth and development? How could they be structured or enacted to be more effective?

7. What advice do you have for the next round of faculty residents?
8. What feedback do you have for the Project Leadership Team in selecting future residents?

### **Pre- and Post Survey**

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion
I have a thorough understanding of the CPS turnaround school model					
I have a good understanding of student learning in a high-need, low-performing school					
After this residency, my professional research interests will continue to be focused on the high-need, low-performing school setting					
I have a good idea of how this residency impacted my own teaching practice					
I feel like I am in touch with what is happening in a high-need, low-performing school					
I have a good idea of how my residency will now inform a practice-base theory of teacher learning					