

Working Together to Strengthen the School Community: The Restructuring of a University–School Partnership

Donna R. Sanderson

Abstract

This article highlights how an existing university–school partnership between a university and a kindergarten center was restructured in an attempt to bring academic and practitioner knowledge together in a more synergistic way in support of preservice teacher learning. In an effort to more closely connect a campus-based course that had a small field component with a newer, richer, more time-intensive field experience in a preservice teacher education program, a different epistemological model was envisioned with three major changes to enhance and strengthen the overall partnership: (1) the number of preservice teacher candidates doubled, as did their amount of classroom observation/teaching time; (2) school-based teacher experts were utilized to share their specific areas of knowledge with preservice teacher candidates; and (3) the university professor/partnership liaison provided intensive staff development workshops on topics selected by the classroom teachers themselves to make certain they were viewed as meaningful, interesting, and highly relevant to their daily classroom work. This article explains how this restructured partnership was envisioned and brought to fruition by detailing the goals behind the community partnership, the strengths of the program from both sides of the partnership, the obstacles that were overcome, and testimonials directly from the classroom teachers and the university’s teacher candidates.

Key Words: preservice teacher candidates, university–school partnerships, community, stakeholder collaboration, professional development, teaching

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to describe how an existing university–school partnership was restructured in an effort to bring academic and practitioner knowledge together in a more synergistic way in support of preservice teacher learning as well as classroom teacher development. It shifts the epistemology of preservice teacher preparation from a place where academic knowledge in the university is seen as the primary source of knowledge about teaching to a situation where academic knowledge and the knowledge of expert P–12 teachers are treated with equal respect. This article highlights the unique qualities of the new partnership in its infancy stages, describes some of the early obstacles it had to overcome, and finally shares some early qualitative feedback.

University–School Partnerships: Where Have They Been?

Within the last 20 years, professional development schools—innovative institutions formed through partnerships between professional education programs and P–12 schools—have emerged and become, for many, the *sine qua non* of teacher preparation and professional development (Brindley, Lessen, & Field, 2008/2009). These university–school partnerships and community collaborations have also been among the most frequently recommended approaches to educational reform (Clark, 1988; Kersh & Maszta, 1998). One reason is that universities and schools provide each other with resources and benefits in both research and practice (Stump, Lovitt, & Perry, 1993) and need each other to reach their common and respective goals (DeBevoise, 1986; Goodlad, 1988; Lasley, Matczynski, & Williams, 1992). A university–school partnership represents a planned effort to establish a formal, mutually beneficial, interinstitutional relationship (Goodlad, 1988). The purpose of the partnership is to create a process and an accompanying structure that allows partners to draw on one another's complementary strengths to advance their interests (Goodlad, 1988) for the simultaneous renewal of both parties (Goodlad, 1990). While university partnerships are not new to the world of teacher education and much obvious strength exists in this model of collaboration, the kindergarten center's building administrator and I, as university professor/partnership liaison, believed ours had room for improvement.

University–School Partnerships: Where Are They Going?

A perennial problem in traditional university-sponsored teacher education programs has been the lack of connection between university-based teacher education courses and field experiences (Zeichner, 2010). Although most university-based teacher education programs now include multiple field

experiences over the length of the program and often situate field experiences in some type of school–university partnership (e.g., professional development schools, partner schools), the disconnect between what students are taught in campus courses and their opportunities for learning to enact these practices in their school placements is often very great (Bullough et al., 1997, 1999; Zeichner, 2007). Darling-Hammond (2009) referred to the lack of connection between what is learned on campus and field experiences as the “Achilles heel” of teacher education.

Research has clearly shown that field experiences are important occasions for teacher learning, rather than merely time for teacher candidates to demonstrate or apply things previously learned (Zeichner, 1996). Rosaen and Florio-Ruane (2008) discussed how assumptions about the purposes of field experience in teacher education limit their value as teacher learning experiences, and they offered ideas for rethinking field experiences as more productive learning environments. Cochran-Smith and Lytle’s (2009) ideas about using teaching practice as a site for inquiry are an example of changing the paradigm for thinking about the role of field experiences in educating teachers.

Over the years, teacher educators have tried a variety of approaches to strengthen the connection between campus and field-based teacher education, and some have even argued that clinical experiences should be the central focus of preservice teacher education from which everything else in a program emanates (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Turney, Eltis, Towler, & Wright, 1985). These strategies have included creating campus-based laboratory schools on university campuses where particular teaching approaches can be demonstrated and practiced under the guidance of university faculty and staff (Fraser, 2007).

A New Direction

Focusing more on the interplay between academic knowledge that is learned at the university and the practitioner knowledge that is demonstrated by the cooperating teacher in the early education classroom, the partnership committee (further described below) made three major changes in an attempt to strengthen our restructured partnership. We decided to (1) increase the number of preservice teacher candidates and the number of hours they spent in the field-based classrooms, (2) have school-based teacher “experts” assist in teaching the preservice teacher candidates their specific areas of content knowledge during the theory part of the course, and (3) have the university professor provide intensive staff development workshops for the cooperating teachers that focus on topics of their choice that are meaningful, interesting, and highly relevant to their daily work.

The building administrator requested that we increase the number of preservice teachers and the number of hours they would spend in the classrooms in an effort to give the teachers and young students more help in the classrooms. It is widely known that most preservice students perceive their school-based work as the most important part of their teacher education program (Britzman, 1986). Often, what ends up surprising the university students is the reality of how demanding the classroom can truly be. Becoming a teacher is a complex process, and beginning teachers are typically drawn to teaching because they “love working with children,” but the reality often shocks them. Research states that many beginning teachers are overwhelmed with work, begin to doubt their place in the profession, and may question whether their teacher preparation program prepared them well to meet the challenges they face (Beach & Pearson, 1998; Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993; Dollase, 1992; Dudley-Marling, 1997; Goodwin, 2012; Knowles, Cole, & Presswood, 1994). As a way to try to better prepare our preservice teacher candidates for these challenges while simultaneously providing more support to the classroom teachers and kindergarten students, we decided to increase the number of preservice teachers and the time they spent in the classroom for everyone’s benefit.

Next, we enlisted the building specialists—the reading specialist and the English as a Second Language (ESL) specialist—to share their explicit knowledge with the preservice teachers as a way to help the candidates become more confident and competent in their ability to effectively teach the many different students in their field-based classrooms. Because many of the kindergarteners received either extra reading help, special education services, or had a different first language, we believed having the specialists share their specific knowledge would be beneficial to the university students. Moseley, Ramsey, and Ruff (2004) suggests that content specific, school-based experts can afford preservice teachers with a strong knowledge base when working with students. Because elementary teachers are considered content generalists, we decided to capitalize on these building specialists and have them meet with and conduct presentations to the university students.

Finally, as a way to try to increase faculty motivation, we surveyed the teachers asking what topics were truly of interest to them and would help them in their day-to-day teaching practices. Our thought was that a shift in perspective might bolster their attitudes about staff development and make it more appealing and effective. Overall, these changes were made to strengthen the learning of the West Chester University (WCU) preservice teachers, as well as the young students of the K-Center (a kindergarten center) and to provide support and assistance to the cooperating teachers of the K-Center.

The Partnership

The Participants

The K-Center is an early childhood, public school that specializes in the teaching of kindergarten. The school has 16 classroom teachers, and for this partnership we enlisted the help of all 16 of them, as they all willingly chose to be cooperating teachers for WCU teacher candidates. This school was specifically selected to be part of this university–school partnership based on their long-standing relationship with the university. For many years the school has hosted preservice students in the beginning of our teacher preparation program, as well as preservice students who are in their last semester of student teaching. The building administrator is highly cooperative and a key partner in making this partnership successful, plus the classroom teachers are familiar with our program and have worked as cooperating teachers with university students before and looked forward to their assistance in the classroom.

During this restructured partnership we doubled the number of WCU preservice students that attended the K-Center for field work. This course is typically taken by sophomore level students, and it is the first campus-based course in the sequence offered in the Department of Elementary Education with a field component. Because this course is relatively early in the university students' program and it is the first course in which they go into the early childhood classrooms at all, it has the potential to be critically important as candidates make informed choices within their preparation program. In the past, one section of this course, or approximately 23 university students, would complete 30 hours of field observation at the K-Center throughout a semester. As per the request of the building principal, we doubled the number of course sections to two, for a total of 43 preservice students completing their fieldwork at the K-Center. The specific breakdown was as follows: 21 students completed their fieldwork on Monday and Wednesday mornings from 8:30 a.m.–11:00 a.m., and 22 students completed their fieldwork on Tuesday and Thursday mornings during the same time blocks. This was the pattern that we followed for 12 weeks of the semester so that each WCU preservice teacher candidate ended up completing a total of 60 hours of fieldwork, compared to 30 hours in the old partnership model.

Our WCU teacher candidates were matched up with cooperating teachers based on their personalities. We took time in the beginning of the semester for the candidates to fill out a questionnaire related to their personal likes, hobbies, interests, background experiences, and thoughts on teaching. Cooperating teachers read the questionnaire results and, with the help of the university liaison, were each matched up with a preservice teacher candidate.

The committee and I then had to decide how to measure the preservice teachers' outcomes. We discussed the most effective ways to track and record their personal learning and growth throughout the semester. We decided to have the teacher candidates conduct some goal setting at the beginning of the semester and journal throughout their weeks in the field. At designated times during the semester, the university liaison and the cooperating teacher would conference with the preservice teacher and discuss the journal entries. This was an opportunity to dialogue about what the preservice teacher had observed in the classroom regarding content, teaching methods, behavior, and so on, and an opportunity for the liaison and cooperating teacher to offer suggestions and ways to improve the candidate's practice in the classroom. Additionally, at the end of the semester, all of the preservice candidates (broken into their two sections) gathered together for an opportunity to participate in a guided, critical, oral reflection around their experiences.

The Field Placement Site

The K-Center is a specialized school in a large school district that serves approximately 600 kindergarten students in one building. Students are bused from across the entire district. The district borders a large, urban city in the Eastern U.S. and is viewed as a semiurban school district with much diversity and a high transiency rate. The K-Center's mission is "to provide a nurturing, safe, and fun environment that will introduce children to the exciting world of learning. In fostering individuality, creativity, and imagination, children in the K-Center will develop life-long friends and a life-long love of learning."

The K-Center first opened its doors in September 1997. It was created to meet the unique academic and social needs of children entering school for the first time and is specifically geared toward the instruction of kindergarten students. It is considered a highly diverse school in that students who attend come from a variety of different socioeconomic backgrounds. It is also both racially and linguistically diverse with over 40 nationalities and languages spoken in the school's particular attendance area. Likewise, the school and district population is very transient as well, with many children moving both in and out of the school at a very high rate.

Partnership Change

Collaboratively Reframing Our Goals

For years, the K-Center teachers had been wonderful role models and warmly opened up their rooms and shared their young students with the West Chester teacher candidates. Yet, we were ready to expand and strengthen this

partnership by shifting to a new model. A committee made up of a WCU professor from the Department of Elementary Education (who acted as the university liaison for the project), the building principal of the K-Center, the reading specialist, and a classroom teacher met to determine the mutual goals of the reformed partnership and to create both a process and a structure that would bring all parties' strengths to the forefront. Subsequently, a needs analysis was conducted so that both institutions had a clear understanding of what the other stakeholder's needs were and what they could offer in return. The model of collaborative practice in the kindergarten classrooms centered on three main goals: (1) for WCU to provide more preservice teacher candidates with more intensive opportunities to work directly with kindergarten students and classroom teachers, (2) to provide K-Center classroom teachers with more help and assistance in the classroom since they were experiencing higher than normal class size and had recently implemented a new literacy assessment program, and (3) to provide intensive literacy and math skills training to small groups of kindergarten students to assist their learning.

Over the next three months, the committee discussions focused around questions related to not only the structure and execution of the changing partnership, but also the rationale as to why we were making certain structural decisions and whether they were serving to benefit the stakeholders in the partnership. Decisions were made regarding how many classroom teachers and university students would participate in the partnership, how classroom teachers would be chosen, how we would match preservice teachers to cooperating teachers, how many hours the university students would spend in the classrooms, how data would be tracked and monitored, and how we would measure the preservice teachers' outcomes. We discussed ways in which the university liaison could benefit the staff at the K-Center and, in return, how building specialist at the K-Center could benefit the university teacher candidates. Overall, these committee "think tank" meetings served to create a model for how this restructured partnership would function, and it was agreed that at the end of the school year this committee would gather again to reflect on and respond to how the process proceeded and to make recommendations for the future.

Specific Changes in the Kindergarten Classrooms

As mentioned earlier, two of the largest changes made were the increase in the number of preservice teacher candidates who would complete their fieldwork at the K-Center and the amount of time they would spend in the kindergarten classrooms. The school was only accustomed to receiving helping hands from about 23 students each semester; now they were being infused with 43. This significant change was a response to a direct request from the K-Center

building principal. Likewise, the time the university preservice teacher candidates spent in the classroom as compared to candidates in previous semesters increased dramatically. The decision to double field hours from 30 to 60 hours in the classroom was made so that the preservice teacher candidates could be in the classroom on a more consistent basis, giving them both more hands-on teaching time and opportunities to make connections with the students.

The K-Center classrooms are a rich and vibrant field placement site for WCU teacher candidates and provide a fabulous opportunity for them to experience the linkage between academic standards, curriculum, and assessment, all while working with an extremely diverse population of students. The teacher candidates were afforded the unique opportunity to observe classroom teachers in highly active kindergarten classrooms while utilizing a hands-on approach to helping the young students. This change in hours logged in the field was intentional and helped to meet the needs of the classroom teachers by providing them with more hours of assistance and also helped meet the needs of the kindergarten students so they experienced more one-on-one or small group instructional time with a teacher. Yet, not only did the increase in field hours benefit the university teacher candidates by simply letting them be present for more hours, they were able to teach intense literacy skills to small groups of students in a format called Power Block.

Another huge change at that time was in the area of curriculum at the K-Center. Classroom teachers had recently been trained to implement two new literacy assessment programs, and a new daily structure had emerged just at the time this new pilot partnership was beginning. The school had recently adopted the DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) Benchmark Assessments to measure kindergarten students' skills in the areas of phonological awareness and the alphabetic principle. DIBELS were designed to help educators in the early identification of students most at-risk for reading failure (Hawken, 2004). How students fared with these skills determined what small groups, or tiers, they were placed in, and all groups received differentiated instruction based on their DIBELS scores and the phonological continuum. Likewise, the district adopted the Response to Intervention (RtI) process that emphasizes how well students respond to changes in instruction. The RtI process is a multistep approach to providing services and interventions to struggling learners at an increasing level of intensity (Klotz & Canter, 2007). As classroom teachers were learning and implementing these new assessment methods, the realization that extra help was needed and could be provided by the university students seemed to come at a perfect time.

In an effort to increase student literacy, West Chester preservice teacher candidates provided intensive, small group literacy instruction in the area

of phonological awareness and the alphabetic principle. University students modeled after and shadowed their cooperating teachers and proved to be a significant source of help during Power Block, a special time when intensive literacy skills were taught in small groups. These specific skills and strategies the children were taught were in direct relation to the mandatory state standards that kindergarten children in the state are required to meet. Additionally, due to the extended amount of time the WCU teacher candidates spent in the classroom, they were also able to effectively assist with math instruction in the classroom. The candidates worked with small groups of learners and helped to individualize instruction based on mathematical concepts and students' unique needs. Under the direct guidance of the 16 classroom teachers who participated in this partnership, these preservice teacher candidates provided extra support, encouragement, and assistance to the youngest learners in the district.

Specific Changes to This Partnership as a Whole

This particular partnership is unique in that it offered three new and exciting components not typically seen in other university–school partnerships which helped to bring these two institutions together as reciprocal community partners. First, we structurally reworked where the class portion of the Theory & Field Experience course would take place when the classroom “theory” part of the course is taught; second, we brainstormed new ways that the K-Center building specialists could support the university learning; and lastly, we devised ways that the university professor/project liaison could enhance the K-Center teachers' professional development.

The manipulation of the schedule dictating where class was held was instrumental in affording the university students more time to be in the kindergarten classrooms with the youngsters. With the help of the building principal reworking the building schedule at the K-Center, the university professor/project liaison was able to hold class in the library of the K-Center instead of on the college campus. This afforded the students extra time to spend in the kindergarten classrooms leading small group lessons with students. This small change of location yielded massive benefits to the kindergarten students, the classroom teachers, and the university teacher candidates.

Another unique quality of this partnership was the strong linkage between the building specialists at the K-Center and their ability to directly teach the university teacher candidates during their class portion of the course in the library. During the “theory” part of this Theory & Field Experience course, at separate times, the building reading specialist and the ESL teacher came to the school library where the university students were being taught and served as guest speakers. They lectured on their roles as specialists in the building and

explained how they supported the classroom teachers and students and how children are screened to receive special services in the areas of extra reading assistance or ESL assistance. They provided digital slide presentations to explain the new assessment programs the district adopted and how children are put into tiers depending on their specific level of need. Having these building specialists directly teach the university students their craft was very advantageous to the university teacher candidates and helped them more clearly understand the overall role the reading specialist and ESL teachers hold on the school faculty.

Another unique quality of the partnership was the specialization of teacher in-service topics planned for the classroom teachers. Early in the school year, classroom teachers completed a survey of open-ended questions asking them what topics they were most interested in exploring during in-service meetings. In an effort to make the in-service topics truly relevant to their teaching, certain educational topics were teased out from the teacher's feedback via the survey. Since this school is located on the edge of a major metropolitan city, the teachers were interested in professional development topics centering on: meeting the needs of diverse learners, teaching the urban learner, brain research, and urban culture. Looking closely at teachers' professional development opportunities and trying to customize in-service topics to specifically match teacher needs was deemed highly advantageous to the classroom teachers. As a result, three in-service meetings, each one hour long, were conducted as a component of this partnership.

Navigating Obstacles

Although the committee worked extremely well together as we restructured this partnership and stayed cognizant of all stakeholders needs, some obstacles became apparent. It was agreed that the one major hurdle we needed to contend with was the highly structured nature of the district's reading program. Little room was given for flexibility, as the instructional methods and assessments were viewed as very lock-step by the classroom teachers. This was an issue the building principal grappled with at the administrative level as he created the master schedule, and it was also an issue the classroom teachers met head first as they sometimes struggled with keeping pace with the highly structured and specifically ordered lessons to be taught and assessed. Overall, the classroom teachers and university students did feel some pressure with little wiggle room in the rigid teaching schedule, but everyone involved did manage to adapt, and no significant problems ensued.

Another obstacle, which was viewed to be much smaller, was the long commute to and from the K-Center from the university campus. Due to the new restructuring of the course, students were now driving to the K-Center twice a

week instead of once since they were spending more hours in the classrooms. Students felt the pinch at the gas pump and were also spending more hours on the road. Carpooling helped this situation, and university students mentioned that when they would ride with their classmates, they ended up informally sharing ideas and strategies related to methods they were using to teach their small groups of students during Power Block. Although initially the driving distance was deemed a negative, by the end of the semester teaching students commented that they viewed this sharing time during their car rides as an unexpected benefit.

Collecting Group and Individual Feedback

Near the end of the first semester of the restructured partnership, qualitative data in the form of an open-ended written statement was collected from all 16 classroom teachers as well as all 43 university students. Overall, many of the K-Center teachers expressed their appreciation for the “extra hands” in the classroom and the “extra time” the WCU preservice teacher candidates spent at the school. Mrs. Smith (a pseudonym, as are all names used) wrote,

It has been a tremendous help having your Field and Theory students spend more time in my classroom. My kindergarten students have benefited greatly....I have recently begun testing for upcoming report card conferences. I am amazed at the progress my students have made since September. I truly believe the extra help your students have been able to provide on a consistent basis is one of the reasons for this progress.

Similarly, K-Center teacher Mr. Black expressed his views on the partnership,

The Theory & Field students are essential in contributing to the progress of our kindergarten students here at the Kindergarten Center. I would like to reiterate my gratitude for their time and effort in helping to move our students to a higher level of development.

The school did receive considerable benefits from the infusion of the many prospective teachers who helped in the classrooms. All of this helping did not seem to get in the way or detract from the hoped-for learning, as all written comments that were collected and informal conversations held surrounding the help in the classrooms were consistently highly positive.

Aside from the extra help the teachers received, they mentioned the high level of interaction the WCU teacher candidates had with the kindergarten-ers. Many teachers noticed the deep personal relationships that the candidates started to develop with the young learners. They witnessed the personal connections that were made, the individual learning that occurred, and the bonds that were strengthened by having the university students in the classroom on a consistent basis.

WCU teacher candidates picked up on these personal connections they started making with the students and shared their unique perspectives. One student wrote,

The best part about the partnership is it allowed us to build personal relationships with the students. We became part of their weekly routine and were able to feel influential in the classroom. We weren't sitting around taking notes the whole time from a corner; we were constantly hands-on, getting the real teaching experience. The amount of time we put in at the Kindergarten Center gave us a better understanding of what it is really like to be a teacher well before the last stretch of our schooling here at West Chester.

Another student commented,

The number one thing I learned from my field experience was to get to know each child as intimately as possible. The more you know about a child, the better you can relate to him or her, and consequently instruct them based on both their strengths and weaknesses.

Although the importance of rapport is not new in discussions of teacher effectiveness (e.g., Johnston, Invernizzi, & Juel, 1998; Roller, 1998), my observations of these preservice teacher candidates suggest that personal relationships are important for teachers as well as students, as illustrated in the teacher candidates' comments above. Educators who have examined the roles of relationships in families and in schools have discovered that the increased level of comfort, trust, and closeness that occur when learners relate personally with their teachers seem to enhance learning and motivation for the learner (Fox, 1993).

Additionally, one of the greatest strengths of this restructured university-school partnership could be the fact that it is a real experience, with real children, in a real school. Within this model of field-based, experiential work, candidates do not learn how to teach by simply reading a textbook, watching videos, analyzing case studies, or referring to teaching scenarios in the "what if this happened" format. One student so eloquently phrased it this way,

I find it difficult to pick out a single best part of this experience because the entire experience, especially the relationships formed with the students and your co-op, is irreplaceable. This experience is a real glimpse at the thrills and the ugly stuff of what teaching is really all about...The biggest strength of this partnership from my perspective is the fact that it is so rewarding and positive for both groups. This partnership is not at the expense of another, and by no means does it short change the other group. This partnership, rather, positively affects many young children's lives.

We also gathered feedback orally from the cooperating teachers as opposed to just individual written feedback. At the end of the semester, at a faculty meeting, teachers were given the opportunity to discuss and reflect on how they mentored their university students and what they felt were the highlights of the partnership. From this discussion, we feel as if we are beginning to move towards embedding methods instruction and professional development in this carefully structured field experience, and it is paired with opportunities for guided, critical reflection around those experiences. We found our group reflection to be highly successful in this newly restructured partnership and seek to maintain it into the future. Zeichner believes group reflection with which teachers “support and sustain each other” (1996, p. 205) is important to consider when setting up learning and reflection experiences for preservice teacher candidates and their mentoring teachers. Likewise, Worthy and Patterson (2001) believe critical reflection should help learners to move forward both in their thinking and practice. We believe we are on the right road to forging a stronger partnership that will help the cooperating classroom teachers, preservice teacher candidates, as well as the young kindergartners.

Celebrating Our Successes

The end of the semester was bittersweet in that the university students prepared to leave their field site, but we still made time to celebrate our successes. During the last mornings the university students spent in the classrooms, they had a chance to say their formal goodbyes to the students they came to know so well all fall. Many classroom teachers had their kindergartners make the university students a heartfelt card or gave them another small memento to remember their time at the K-Center. Some classrooms had a small “thank you” celebration as a way to formally close out the time the university student was with the class of kindergartners, and on occasion it was overheard that some university students planned on informally visiting their kindergarten classes while they were on winter break from university classes and the K-Center was still in session.

Plans to continue and grow this revamped university–school partnership are currently underway. We strongly believe that this new model that we have created is adaptable enough to be scaled up for all elementary education students at WCU, as we have seen the benefits even over the brief time this new model has been in effect. We have begun to wonder if the infusion of more university students produced any changes or improvements in curriculum and instruction at the K-Center. These types of meaty questions will need to be answered in future research as we move forward with this new partnership model. With the dedication and passion the West Chester University preservice teacher

candidates and K-Center faculty showed during the first semester of implementation, this innovative project is sure to reach new heights.

References

- Ball, D., & Forzani, F. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 497–511.
- Beach, R., & Pearson, D. (1998). Changes in preservice teachers' perceptions of conflicts and tensions. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(3), 337–351.
- Brindley, R., Lessen, E., & Field, B. E. (2008/2009). Toward a common understanding: Identifying the essentials of a professional development school. *Childhood Education, 85*(2), 71–74.
- Britzman, D. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(4), 442–456.
- Bullough, R., Birrell, J., Clark, C., Erickson, L., Earle, R., & Campbell, J. (1999). Paradise unrealized: Teacher educators and the costs and benefits of school–university partnerships. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50*, 381–390.
- Bullough, R., Hobbs, S., Kauchak, D., Crow, N., & Stokes, D. (1997). Long-term PDS development in research universities and the clinicalization of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48*, 85–93.
- Clark, R. W. (1988). School–university relationships: An interpretive review. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School–university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 32–65). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (2009). *Inquiry as a stance: Practitioner research in the next generation*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cohn, M., & Kottkamp, R. (1993). *Teachers: The missing voice in education*. Albany, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009, February). *Teacher education and the American future*. Charles W. Hunt Lecture, presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.
- DeBevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 9–12.
- Dollase, R. (1992). *Voices of beginning teachers: Visions and realities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dudley-Marling, C. (1997). *Living with uncertainty: The messy reality of classroom practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fox, M. (1993). *Radical reflections: Passionate opinions on teaching, learning, and living*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace.
- Fraser, J. W. (2007). *Preparing America's teachers: A history*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School–university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School–university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 3–31). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodwin, B. (2012, May). Research says new teachers face three common challenges. *Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 69*(8), 84–85.

- Hawken, L. S. (2004). Using DIBELS to improve reading outcomes. *The Utah Special Educator*, 22–23.
- Johnston, F., Invernizzi, M., & Juel, C. (1998). *Book buddies*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Kersh, M. E., & Masztal, N. B. (1998). An analysis of studies of collaboration between universities and K–12 schools. *Educational Forum*, 62, 218–225.
- Klotz, M. B., & Canter, A. (2007). *Response to Intervention (RtI): A primer for parents*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Knowles, J. G., Cole, A., & Presswood, C. (1994). *Through preservice teachers' eyes: Exploring field experiences through narrative and inquiry*. New York, NY: Merrill.
- Lasley, T. J., Matczynski, T. J., & Williams, J. A. (1992). Collaborative and non-collaborative partnership structures in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43, 257–261.
- Moseley, C., Ramsey, S. J., & Ruff, K. (2004). Science buddies: An authentic context for developing preservice teachers' understandings of learning, teaching, and scientific inquiry. *Journal of Elementary Science Education*, 16(2), 1–18.
- Roller, C. (1998). *So... What's a tutor to do?* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Rosaen, C., & Florio-Ruane, S. (2008). The metaphors by which we teach: Experience, metaphor, and culture in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Nemes, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (3rd ed., pp. 706–731). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Stump, C. S., Lovitt, T. C., & Perry, L. (1993). School–university collaboration: A year-long effort. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 28, 151–158.
- Turney, C., Eltis, K., Towler, J., & Wright, R. (1985). *A new basis for teacher education: The practicum curriculum*. Sydney, Australia: University of Sydney Press.
- Worthy, J., & Patterson, E. (2001). “I can't wait to see Carlos!": Preservice teachers, situated learning, and personal relationships with students. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(2), 303–344.
- Zeichner, K. (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences for prospective teachers. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215–234). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K. (2007). Professional development schools in a culture of evidence and accountability. *School–University Partnerships*, 1(1), 9–17.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1–2), 89–99. doi:10.1177/0022487109347671

Donna R. Sanderson is an associate professor at West Chester University in the Department of Early and Middle Grades Education. Dr. Sanderson teaches many different field-based courses and supervises both practicum students as well as student teachers. Her research interests are in the areas of early childhood education, community service, and community partnerships between universities and child care/elementary-level schools. Correspondence concerning this article may be addressed to Donna R. Sanderson, Ed.D, Department of Early & Middle Grades Education, 110 Recitation Hall, West Chester University, West Chester, PA 19383, or email dsanderson@wcupa.edu

