Professors Go to Camp: Teaching a University Course in a Professional Development School Summer Camp

Kimberly R. Logan, The University of Georgia
Jennifer Hauver, Randolph-Macon College
Sebastian Burkholdt, The University of Georgia

ABSTRACT: In June 2016, a state university partnered with a local school district to integrate college of education summer courses with a community camp for K-8 students. We reflect upon the benefits and challenges found within this partnership; how the course/camp integration informed our evolving views as teacher educators; and how the camp clinical experience compared with more traditional clinical formats found within teacher education programs.

NAPDS "essentials": 1, 2, 5, 8

In June 2016, we engaged in a partnership between a college of education and a local school district that integrated university summer courses with a community summer camp. The camp was offered at no charge for K-8 students enrolled in the school district and provided sessions designed to enrich students' summer experience, as well as provide university students with experience working with local youth. Hauver was the instructor and designer of a college of education course that explored different views and pedagogies surrounding the teaching of history; she also spearheaded the middle school camp curriculum on historical investigation that overlapped with the course. Logan (a part-time faculty member) and Burkholdt (a doctoral student) assisted with the course and helped design and implement the camp sessions. The university course met for five 5-hour sessions prior to the beginning of the camp; subsequent meetings were held at the camp location—a local middle school. Once camp began, the university students worked with the middle school students enrolled in the camp investigating the histories of local well-known families. The campers analyzed primary and secondary documents, met with local historians, visited local historical sites—all in an effort to answer the inquiry question: *How should these families be remembered for their contributions to local history?*

With this reflective paper, we seek to broaden the conversation surrounding university/school partnerships by sharing our experiences planning and implementing the course and camp. Specifically, we focus on:

- The successes and challenges found within the university/school partnership.
- How the camp clinical experience compared with more traditional clinical models in teacher education (i.e., student teaching and practicum experiences).
- What we learned as teacher educators about the value of different teaching conditions and contexts.

Conversations within Teacher Education

"Good" Teacher Education

This discussion is grounded in conversations and arguments about meaningful teacher education that emphasize bridging theory and practice (Gordon, 2007; Sandwell, 2007) and that value collaborations between universities and local schools (Ravid & Handler, 2001; Slater, 1996). In other words, our vision of "good" teacher education argues for beneficial partnerships between universities and schools, and we share a constructivist approach to learning, believing that "teaching should promote experiences that require students to become active, scholarly participators in the learning process" (Gordon, 2007, p. xiii); this process includes and assumes meaningful clinical experiences for pre-service teachers. We also value program coherence and the integration of college coursework with the clinical component of teacher training; these considerations are part of how we envision effective teacher education.

We acknowledge, however, that determining what constitutes quality teacher education is complex and contested (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Goodlad, 1998; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008). According to Kennedy (2008), "One problem is that, as a society, we hold different ideals for good teaching...it should not be surprising that there are different notions about the kind of education that would produce a good teacher" (p. 1199). These differing commitments are reflected in the varied ways teacher education programs incorporate the clinical component within their coursework, and the value of clinical experiences remains a contested topic within the field.

Clinical Experiences and Teacher Preparation

In 2010, a Blue Ribbon Panel commissioned by The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

called for teacher education to be "turned upside down" by moving away from academic preparation and coursework "loosely linked to school-based experiences" to programs "fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses" (Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning, 2010, p. ii). The panel argued for teacher education programs to be "centered on clinical practice" (p. ii), and for many within the field of teacher education, the increase of clinical experiences is an important part of educational reform.

Challenges of clinical work. However, merely adding field experiences to teacher education programs does not resolve the numerous challenges surrounding this work. Some of the contested issues include: what constitutes an effective clinical context (e.g., professional development schools, service-learning, alternative schools, etc.) (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Mikulec & Herrmann, 2016); what pre-service teacher feedback and assessment should entail (Darling-Hammond, 2014); who, or what type of faculty, should be involved in clinical supervision (Beck & Kosnick, 2002); the number of program hours that should be required for pre-service teachers in school settings (Darling-Hammond, 2014; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008); the type of connections needed between clinical assignments and teacher education coursework (Cowan & Berlinghoff, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2014; Zeichner & Conklin, 2008); and what "successful" university/school partnerships demonstrate (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2014; Williams, Virtue, & Smith, 2016). Other considerations involve the different institutional structures found within academia and schools, the challenges of establishing clear roles and goals for all involved, and agreement among all parties regarding the vision for the work. We do not attempt to address all of these challenges in this paper, but highlight below some of the concerns most applicable to our experiences within our program and our analysis of the summer partnership.

Different worlds. Colleges of education rely on local schools for clinical experiences for its pre-service teachers. Ideally, these schools also benefit from the university's presence in the community by having access to the latest educational research and support from researchers and teacher educators. However, university/school relationships are often less than ideal. According to Turley and Stevens (2015), "Universities are notorious for creating Ivory Tower communities of elites, often from very privileged backgrounds, who isolate themselves from the urgent needs of the larger community (p. 8S)." The result is that academia and P-12 schools exist as "two largely separate worlds . . . side by side" (Beck & Kosnik, 2002, p. 7) separated by distrust and misunderstanding (Bullough, Draper, Smith, Birrell, 2004; Bullough, Hobbs, Kauchak, Crow, & Stokes, 1997). Therefore, it is not uncommon for teachers and administrators to view universities as "out-of-touch" with the realities of their students and teachers. Slater (2001) describes a university/school project she was involved in as having "two separate organizations, each with its own habitus" (p. 21), using Bourdieu's terminology to interpret these organizations. Cibulka

(2016) also claims that the institutional structures of higher education and P-12 schools are "fundamentally different" (p. xiv) and part of the reason "so little progress has been made in institutionalizing clinical partnerships" (p. xiii). These competing practices and values can create challenges when working across contexts, as "cooperation" does not necessarily translate into "collaboration" (Boyle-Baise & McIntyre, 2008, p. 317).

Slater (2010) claims that some of the "problems . . . with the dissemination of university-school collaborative efforts"(p. 1) include "the nature of the professorship and its reward structure" (p. 1), the culture of sites, and temporal funding. She also highlights the "issue of sustainability" (p. 2) and the challenges of duplication among projects. Again, this points to the inherent differences in the values and reward systems within academia and schools, and the difficulty of achieving a mutually beneficial partnership. According to Mikulec and Herrmann (2016), this component is critical to pre-service teachers' process of learning to teach. They state, "In order for a field experience to be truly meaningful, there must be a benefit to the students at the clinical site as well as for the pre-service teachers" (p. 58). If this does not occur, the concern is that pre-service teachers will "conceptualize what they are learning in teacher education courses and what they observe in the field separately" (p. 58). This goes back to the separation of the two worlds, as well as to the separation of pre-service teachers' theory and practice. Coherence across contexts matters, and often, this aspect is not achieved in clinical experiences.

Context, common goals, and roles. As teacher educators, we often supervise pre-service teachers in practicum and student teaching placements, and a recurring concern within our teacher education program is the context of the placement. In other words, "Will the school environment and the supervising/cooperating teacher support the goals of our teacher education program?" It is not unusual for our pre-service teachers to share that the methods we want them to implement cannot be accomplished or supported in their placement classrooms. Sometimes this occurs because a cooperating teacher holds different views on "good" teaching or views a specific lesson as impracticable. Other times it is the context and challenges of the school administration or culture, or bureaucratic realities such as testing or curriculum pacing. Regardless, pre-service teachers are bound by the expectations, protocols, and restrictions of their practicum and student teaching placements. Goodlad (1991) found some teacher education faculty wanted to limit pre-service teachers' time in student teaching placements because, "They felt that their teachings were undone by student teachers' experiences in the schools!" (p. 8). And even though this claim was made in the early nineties, we are still having the same dialogue with our colleagues. The value and contexts of clinical placements continue to be a question and concern, and according to Gelfuso, Dennis, and Parker (2015), clinical experiences that are "not expertly mentored could lead to grave misunderstandings about teaching and learning" (p. 3).

It is widely accepted that pre-service teachers need experience teaching, but many teacher education programs

exercise little control over what happens in placement classrooms. Some clinical experiences seem incredibly beneficial to pre-service teachers, while others may disrupt many of the practices or goals of their teacher education programs. We do not intend to minimize the import or expertise of in-service teachers, as our students have greatly benefitted from the knowledge and input of supervising/cooperating teachers who work with our program. However, we simply acknowledge teacher education's negligible agency in what occurs in clinical placement classrooms; and some in-service teachers may have been trained very differently than how we train our pre-service teachers today (Gelfuso et al., 2015).

A part of the challenge is the establishment, agreement, and understanding of the different roles of individuals involved in clinical placements. Garland and Shippy (1995) highlight the need for collaboration and communication regarding the roles of those involved within clinical settings. Even if a teacher education program establishes clear expectations for cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and pre-service teachers, it is difficult to assess and ensure these goals are met. Of course, administrative details (such as the number of hours a student teacher must complete or the number of lessons that will be observed) are easier to ensure. Other pedagogical goals (such as the implementation of a historical inquiry lesson) are more challenging to "insist upon, " as student teachers and university supervisors are often viewed as guests in the classroom and school. Therefore, collaboration often takes a backseat to the daily realities of the supervising teacher's classroom and the school context.

Purposes and coherence. The greater issue imbedded in these considerations centers around the purposes and coherence (or lack thereof) found within teacher education programs. Clinical experiences are meant to do something. Our goals for our pre-service teachers, and program design and coherence, influence the effectiveness of clinical experiences. Samaras, Frank, Williams, Christopher, and Rodick (2016) highlighted their concerns as teacher educators in a self-study examining pre-service teachers' perceptions of field experiences within their teacher education program. They studied how to "improve the quality of clinical experiences" (p. 175) and one of the concerns, expressed by Frank, was that her "students come back [from fieldwork] with a lot of what not to do rather than what to do" (p. 172).

Conflicting views on what constitutes good teaching can be problematic when the different components of a teacher education program do not reflect the same commitments. Effective teacher education might happen in the absence of a guiding sense of good teaching and without a coordinated program of experiences, but the argument here is the always challenging work of teacher education is more influential when framed by common vision and coherence. This camp/course integration served as a space for exploring what is possible when these two principles align, as the context allowed us to set goals for the university course and the clinical component. We also had the freedom to choose curriculum solely based on our

objectives as social studies teacher educators—instead of being tied to performance standards or assessments that often influence a clinical experience during the traditional school year.

Social Studies Teacher Education and the Teaching of History

We are all situated within the field of social studies teacher education, and within this field, there is limited research on clinical experiences and what social studies scholars and social studies teacher educators hope to accomplish in field placements (Adler, 2008; Clift & Brady, 2005). For most social studies programs, the student teaching semester is the primary clinical experience, what the Department of Education might characterize as an "add-on" semester after academic coursework (United States Department of Education, 2011, p. 7). Clearly, the push is to challenge and rethink this programmatic model. There has been some work done in social studies education on the conditions, practices and effects of pre-service teacher education (e.g., Conklin, 2008; Hawley, 2010; Manfra, 2009), but this important work is only in its beginning stages. Even though this paper is not an empirical research study, we hope to highlight some of the inner workings of teacher education and clinical experiences within the social studies in order to better understand what different clinical models can accomplish within a program. If context often limits our goals as teacher educators, what might be achieved when we pursue different types of collaborations with schools?

As social studies educators, we shared certain disciplinary commitments and goals for our pre- and in-service teachers and the middle school campers. Our objectives for the course and camp were informed by our understandings regarding how history is typically taught in P-12 schools. Teaching and learning U.S. history in American public schools is commonly based on telling a single "story of national freedom and progress" (Barton & Levstik, 2004, p. 166) and the celebration of many heroes and a few heroines—most of them White. This endeavor is intended to create a shared "American" identity and an emotionally invested "heritage" (Kammen,1989; Lowenthal, 1998), as well as a "U.S. nation-building story that sits at the center of how most children are taught and learn in history classes in American public schools" (VanSledright, 2008, p. 110). This heritage is so deeply engrained in our collective historical consciousness because it is, as Seixas (2016) describes it, "a past that is bequeathed to 'us'. . .and that we, therefore, have an obligation to preserve for those who come after us" (p. 22). Through this approach, however, the past remains a "foreign country" for many students (Lowenthal, 2015) because they *learn a history* instead of *how to study history.*

Doing History

Our course and camp sessions were based on the rationale that the most powerful approach to teach history is to "do history" (Levstik & Barton, 2015); that is, have students critically

examine dominant historical narratives, engage them in analysis and interpretation of historical sources, empower them to create reasonable historical accounts based on their own sourcework, and help them make sense of multiple and contrasting historical accounts. Research shows that "history as an investigative process…shapes and cultivates deeper historical understandings of the sort epitomized by the experts than do our more common and traditional ways of teaching history in school" (VanSledright, 2011, p. 2). Barton and Levstik (2004) argue that doing history "engages students in a process critical to democratic pluralism: that of reaching conclusions based on evidence" (p. 190). In order to reshape how history is traditionally taught in the United States and to create an atmosphere of democratic thinking and learning, we therefore have to "shift teachers' practices away from the ubiquitous PowerPoint presentations of repackaged textbook histories and more towards historical study as an investigative enterprise that depends on being able to think historically" (VanSledright & Reddy, 2014, p. 32). Accordingly, teaching historical thinking skills was an important part of our curriculum.

The sourcework completed during the camp was guided by a set of heuristics described by Wineburg (1991a, 1991b) and Reisman (2012) as: *sourcing* (analyzing not just the historical document itself, but considering the author's positioning, her motivation to create the document, and the purpose of the document), *contextualization* (situating the documents in their historical and geographic context, and trying to remove one's lens of the present when analyzing them), *corroboration* (comparing all documents and accounts available, especially when they contradict one another, and accumulating and weighing evidence for creating reasonable accounts), and "*close reading*" (carefully considering word choice, sentence structure, structure of argumentation, rhetorical and stylistic devices, color palette, image composition, etc. in written and visual documents).

To facilitate students' learning of these historical thinking skills, we partnered with a local historic house museum to develop a series of investigations around two key local families: the Clarks[1] and the Muses. The two families were chosen for study because they had significant roles in local history; their legacies remain and are reflected within the community as familiar buildings and streets still display their names. The curator of the museum (a scholar of the Civil War) and a second local historian helped us find and select original sources that illuminated the history of the two families under investigation, including the political, economic, cultural, and social impact of these families on their communities. They also introduced us to other historians who agreed to serve as additional resources for students and helped us plan field trips.

The process of compiling the materials took several weeks and required the effort of all people involved in designing the course and the camp. A considerable amount of time went into

[1] All names are pseudonyms.

locating, selecting, and editing the materials so that they could be used for "doing history" with middle schoolers. The process of selecting original sources required a variety of considerations:

- Are the sources adequately relevant to the historical question that guides the investigation?
- Do the sources cover a variety of perspectives so that multiple, possibly contrasting, accounts of the families and their members could be created from them?
- Are the sources interesting for middle schoolers to study?
- Are the sources appropriate for the reading level of the campers?
- How can we select a variety of textual, visual, and haptic sources so that the campers are not overwhelmed with text?

Our goal was to demonstrate to the campers that all kinds of material objects could serve as historical sources. We therefore included a large variety of materials in the investigation packets:

- Personal letters from family members and slaves
- Excerpts from a book about the institution of slavery authored by a prominent member of one family
- Original newspaper clippings
- Images of postcards and paintings of family members and slaves
- Historical photographs and maps
- Current photographs of local buildings and other landmarks that carry the names of the families
- Speeches authored and given by prominent family members
- Contemporary newspaper articles about the families and their influence
- Short excerpts from different history books
- Articles from a magazine about the preservation of Southern history at historic house museums

Some of the sources came from a private collection, but the majority came from a special collections library that holds a large corpus of sources about the families we investigated. Without the help and the knowledge of the local historians, the project would have been much more difficult to realize. Having access to these collections was essential for the creation and success of the investigation packets. Final products included a set of three "Case Files" used to investigate each family.

The Clark files focused on the family's views and influence on the institution of slavery, female education, and Confederate policy and secession. The main focus of the investigations were the two Clark brothers: Tim Clark—a prominent lawyer, Confederate States Army officer, politician, and author; and Henry Clark—Governor, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, and general in the Confederate Army during the Civil War. The packet on the institution of slavery included excerpts from Tim Clark's book on slavery, letters, images of paintings, the bill of sale for an enslaved woman, and newspaper articles. The education packet featured newspaper articles, historic postcards,

photographs, letters, and images of paintings of family members. The secession packet included letters from family members, political speeches, photographs, and an original $20 bill from 1862 that featured Henry Clark.

The Muse files focused on how Muse family influenced the infrastructure, culture, and politics within the local community and within the South. The main focus of the Muse investigation was a man named Michael Muse—the son of a former slave who became successful in varied businesses across the state and within local and national politics. The infrastructure packet included articles and photographs pertaining to Muse's real estate developments, including newspaper articles detailing his renovations of the local downtown area and the construction of government buildings. The culture packet contained pictures of postcards and newspaper articles that detailed his buildings and businesses that catered to the African-American community, including the Muse Theatre—the first African-American owned and operated vaudeville theater in the state. The politics packet featured sources pertaining to Michael Muse's political career, on both the local and national level, as well as his obituary that detailed his many achievements.

Context

This atypical educative experience was designed and organized by the university-based director of the PDS partnership in collaboration with school district leaders. The goal was to provide an enriching summer experience targeted especially for K-8 students identified as likely to suffer from summer lag. The camp and university course took place in a community that has one of the highest poverty rates in the nation (nearly 40%), and the local public school district serves a diverse body of students: 39% African American, 7% Asian, 5% Hispanic, 46% White, and 3% Multi-racial. The camp was designed to bridge university resources with some of the needs of the students and families within the school district.

The Camp

The four-week long camp was free and included breakfast and lunch for participating campers. Campers arrived at 8:00 a.m. for breakfast and stayed until 3:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. Fridays were reserved for camp-wide fieldtrips to local sites of interest. Monday through Thursday, campers attended a variety of "courses," some required and some elective. Each camper, for instance, participated in a literacy course for one hour a day. Campers chose, however, from electives on robotics, community engagement, trapeze and historical investigation. These elective courses ran for either one or two-hour blocks for two weeks at a time. The elective associated with the *Teaching History* course was entitled, "Mysteries of the Past[2]," and ran for two hours a day, four days a week, for two weeks (a total of eight sessions, 16 hours).

_____

[2] Identifying city in the title was removed.

The University Course

The twenty university students who participated in the camp were all enrolled in a teacher education course called *Teaching History*. This was a split-level course (undergraduate/graduate) offered to all middle and secondary social studies education students as an elective. Unlike the more general methods course offered as a part of the core, *Teaching History* is an optional "content-pedagogy" course that fuses attention to content knowledge and methods in history education. The course is typically offered once during the academic year and once during the summer. This was the first time the course was offered in conjunction with a field experience. Approximately half of the students were undergraduate aspiring teachers; the other half were graduate-level practicing teachers. Beginning in early June, students gathered with us at the house museum. We met five times for 5-hour long sessions. These sessions included intensive study of the content that would be the focus of the camp (Antebellum and Civil War history and local history with particular attention paid to the Clark and Muse families) as well as review of research on powerful teaching and learning of history. As context for our study, students were introduced to the investigations they would be conducting with the middle school children. They spoke with local historians and spent a morning visiting local historical sites that would be camp field trips.

"Mysteries of the Past"

There were 17 middle schoolers (rising 6th, 7th, and 8th graders) who participated in "Mysteries of the Past."

Beginnings. At the start of camp, we invited the middle schoolers to join us on a scavenger hunt where we would look for things that are "old," things that are "historic" and things that are "important." The purpose of this hunt was to help students begin to think about historical significance by asking: What is worth remembering? and Who decides? This was an important grounding concept for our impending inquiry. That same day, we introduced students to our two families, showing them slides of photographs taken around town. Images included plaques from historic homes, street signs, historic markers, parks and neighborhoods. Each of these photographs included the name "Clark" or "Muse." Some campers had heard of the families before, but could not demonstrate any in-depth knowledge about their histories. We leveraged the contrast between the visible impact of the families and the lack of knowledge about them as a starting point for the historical inquiry.

Our friend, the curator of the museum, brought in a variety of original personal objects that one of the families possessed for the campers to examine. Campers were asked to wear white gloves in order to protect and hold objects that were over 150-years-old—among them handwritten letters and notes, a first edition book with handwritten comments, a strand of hair, a corkscrew, and a handheld fan used during a dinner at The

White House. The encounter with the artifacts raised students' interest for the families and excitement about the project; they engaged in discussions about the stories of artifacts and started to ask historical questions about the families and their legacies. Students chose the family they preferred to study and were put into groups. Because so many wanted to study Clark, we had two Clark groups and one Muse group (5-6 students in each).

Investigations. After our initial two sessions, we introduced our first investigation. Each group was given the first of three "Case Files." The authors led the groups, and the university students were evenly divided as teaching assistants. To begin, instructors offered contextual background for the study. Then the middle schoolers were invited to read one primary document together and to work with an accompanying "Detective's Log" to record notes from their examination. The log asked them to pay particular attention to the type of document being examined, the author and his/her purpose, the audience, the context, and how the content of the document compared to others under examination. After working through one primary document together, middle schoolers were then assigned to work with university students to examine the rest of the sources in the file. Small groups then came back together to compare notes and to collaboratively generate an historical claim about the focus of the file.

A note about contextualization. When studying the actions, motives, and arguments of individuals that were influential actors in the past, it is difficult and actually counterintuitive to remove one's present perspective, values, and knowledge about the future impact of these people, and to see the world through their eyes. This act of "contextualizing" is particularly difficult for young people who have little prior knowledge of history.

For instance, in examining the contents of **Clark Case File #1: Female Education**, students considered the Clark family's contribution to female education. They learned that Tim Clark had indeed funded the development of the first institute of higher education for women in the community, the Laura Clark Institute. However, they also learned that much of the energy for this initiative came from the women of the family rather than from Tim himself. They also learned that the school was for white women only, and that part of the rationale for the school included keeping their children away from Northern schools, which the Clarks believed proliferated dangerous ideas about abolition. In the face of such complex evidence, students put forth the following claims:

- In the 1850s, girls' education was poor. The Clark family felt like women should have the same opportunity as men for a good education (white women).
- The Clarks did some good. Tim build the Laura Clark Institute, but he was inspired by "a mother."

Groups were required to identify the evidence that supported their claim and to explain how they arrived at their claim in front of their peers.

In the days that followed, groups worked through their two additional Case Files, generating claims for each. They also visited the Clark House and the Muse Theatre, spoke with local historians and further developed their ideas about these families' contributions to local history.

Final presentations. On the final day, groups worked together to come up with a final claim about each family's contribution to the community's history. They pulled from all three Case Files, their meetings with local historians, their field trips, and any additional reading they had completed outside of the camp. They then put together tri-fold board presentations stating their claim, including supporting evidence. Students presented these boards to families and community members during an end-of-camp celebration. They also became the focus of an exhibit at the Clark House that ran through the summer and fall.

The Benefits and Challenges of the Collaboration

After we completed the camp and course, we reflected on what the experience taught us as teacher educators. Some of our initial reactions centered on the mere accomplishment of the project itself. By the end of the summer session, we were both proud of what we had accomplished and grateful that it was completed. We did not, and could not, know at the beginning of this course/camp hybrid the amount of time and planning that would be required to successfully implement our goals and vision. At the same time, we came away believing that our effort had been well worth it. In what follows, we reflect on what this atypical university/school collaboration offered our pre- and in-service teachers, the middle school students, and us as teacher educators.

What Made the Collaboration Successful?

We viewed this teaching experience as a "success." One of our goals for the university students was for them to implement the historical inquiry methods they were learning about in their course in the camp context. For the middle schoolers, we hoped they would complete a historical investigation, learn about historical evidence and case building, and find the process engaging. We observed both occur. The results and process were admittedly more nuanced than we mention here. But overall, we were pleased with the results for both our university students and our campers. Below we detail additional reasons for that conclusion.

Uncommon freedom and opportunities. Combining the camp with the university course allowed for the university students to gain experience in the classroom they would not have had otherwise. In the future, many of them will go on to practicum and student teaching placements, but this was a different type of instructional space. The setting of this camp allowed us to have more control than we normally would have as visitors/advisors in a typical clinical setting. In this case, we were not a guest in someone's classroom, but designers and teachers of the curriculum. We also were "in charge" of the middle schoolers, assuming responsibility for them during our camp sessions.

Earlier we mentioned researchers (e.g., Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Cibulka, 2016; Slater, 2001) who highlighted the differences between the institutional structures of academia and P-12 schools. We were able to overcome many of these differences since we were not bound by the administrative realities found within the normal school year. Again, we had much more control and authority to change the curricula and lessons as we deemed necessary—scaffolding instruction not just for the middle school students, but for the university students as well. Adjustments in pedagogy occurred in real time for both groups, and many of the university students commented on the value of this unique experience. We also were able to focus on coherence and vision across contexts, since we planned for both the course and clinical component.

Reflection and feedback. The camp context created a unique space for reflection and feedback. As we mentioned, we were able to guide both the university and middle school students during the lessons and activities. In most traditional clinical experiences, the university supervisor is not present when pre-service teachers teach the majority of their lessons. Of course, observations do occur and input is given after these visits, but rarely does the feedback occur in "real-time." We have experienced moments during traditional clinical observations when we wanted to offer support during a lesson. Usually this is not possible due to the context. In the case of the camp, we could come alongside the university students (both the pre- and in-service teachers) in the middle of a lesson or activity and provide input and clarification.

The university students also had a space to reflect as a community after the campers left the sessions. We would debrief as a class—discussing what had gone well during the camp session and what needed to be changed or addressed. According to Mikulec and Herrmann (2016), clinical experiences need to allow for reflection so pre-service teachers can "incorporate what they are observing at their clinical sites into their own understanding of teaching and learning (Hughes, 2009; Liakopoulou, 2012)" (p. 58). Reflection can be a powerful tool to help pre-service teachers understand what happened, and why it happened.

Gelfuso et al. (2015) highlight how reflection is needed for pre-service teachers to "make meaning" of their field experiences and the important role of university supervisors (or what they refer to as a "knowledgeable other") to support and guide this process:

> Perhaps what makes the construction of Theories about teaching and learning so difficult is the nature of reflection. Part of reflecting on experiences is using previously constructed theory (ideas/suggestions) to select or reject the pertinent aspects of an experience. These judgments or discernment play a critical role in knowing, as Dewey (1933) writes, ". . .what to let go as of no account; what to eliminate as irrelevant; what to retain as conducive to the outcome; what to emphasize as a clew to the difficulty" (p. 123). The knowledgeable

other is needed to provide support and guidance as the pre-service teacher reflects on her field experiences. (pp. 9-10)

Having our course embedded in the camp clinical site allowed us time before and after the camp sessions to make sense of problems of practice, and the space allowed us to guide and challenge the pre-service teachers' judgments on their experiences with students.

Collaboration and support. Simply put, we could not have done this work alone. The three of us worked weeks before the course and camp preparing resources for the historical investigation. Together we were able to prepare a larger bandwidth of materials, which allowed the campers to choose a historical investigation according to their interest. We believe creating choice in the curriculum led to higher student engagement and interest. We also had the help of the local teachers, historians and a museum curator who provided invaluable resources and knowledge that informed our work. Without their expertise, community connections, and documents, we would have been at a great disadvantage. It truly did take many members of the community to accomplish our goals.

Having the university students in the camp sessions also meant having more "teachers" for the middle schoolers. This allowed us to provide one-on-one instruction and support for the campers. As a result, some of the middle schoolers who struggled with academic tasks were given the immediate help they needed to accomplish the work, and we observed improvements in reading proficiency and willingness to engage with intellectually difficult work.

We also had the advantage of seeing other teacher educators "do the work" of teaching and teacher education. Because of the structure of the course and camp, we participated in unintentional peer observation and found value in watching each other engage with the university students and the middle schoolers. Often within academia, time considerations and institutional expectations do not allow much opportunity to observe the work of other teacher educators. This context allowed us to better understand how our peers approach challenges and questions with pre- and in-service teachers and middle schoolers.

What Were Some Challenges We Faced?

Even though we found the university/school collaboration to be effective, we also faced challenges during its implementation. This was the first time the university partnered with the school district to provide this summer program, and as a result, there were both expected and unexpected issues that surfaced.

Opportunity cost for research faculty and time constraints. Hauver was the only tenured professor and therefore positioned as such to the work of the PDS. The reality of being tenured faculty at a research institution means certain work is valued over others. Slater (2010) states that the "nature of the professorship and its

reward structures produces a time constraint" (p. 1) for university-school collaborative efforts:

> Traditionally, the professorate is judged according to criteria of the triumvirate of research, teaching, and service. Research is judged based on a hierarchy of refereed journal publications and grants which are often valued more than that of action research or book production that takes a considerable time to bring to fruition and publication. Collaborations take time away from these more rewarded endeavors. (p. 1)

According to Cibulka (2016), this reward structure often means clinical work is devalued and assigned to adjunct staff.

As a tenure-track faculty member, Hauver felt the pressure of the time commitment this collaboration demanded. Because she was deeply committed to offering a meaningful experience for the university and middle school students, she felt compelled to focus her energies on being a good teacher; meaning that her orientation to the experience as a researcher faded to the background. Intentional and systematic research may be more easily fused with teaching in future iterations of the experience, but did not feel possible this first go-round. So in a sense, her commitment to this partnership came at a cost—as she devoted time to work she valued, but work that would not necessarily be "rewarded" by her institution.

The challenge of focus. We wondered at times if the quality of the university course would be compromised for the pre- and in-service teachers. The camp involvement meant less instructional time for the university students as half of the course meetings would be helping with the camp. Many of the students were also new to teacher education. They not only had to learn the instructional strategies and theories taught in the course, but they also had to be comfortable working with the middle school students. Our planning became a continuous shift—at times foregrounding the education of the middle schoolers and at times foregrounding the education of the university students. We fluctuated between our roles as teacher educators and middle school teachers. Even though we believe the university students benefitted from this unique experience, we do not know what information or learning may have been lost by the truncated course meeting times. In the future, this could be addressed by changing some of the structural components of the course, but would be difficult since the expected course hour requirements included time spent with the campers.

Camp or school? For the members of the community, the offering of the summer day camp was presented as such—a "camp." Even though there were some objectives for the camp to serve as an academic bridge over the summer months, this was not summer "school." Since the camp took place at a middle school, certain "school discourses" found their way into the space. For us, that led to questions on how to structure our time with the campers. Conversations with other faculty (involved in other sections of the camp) often reflected this tension, as we all tried to navigate what "camp" looks like when it is held in a

traditional academic space and includes academic work. For example, since it was a camp, there were no consequences for campers who did not want to complete an academic task. This was not a significant issue for us, but did create frustration at times.

The camp setting also made our work with the pre- and in-service teachers challenging since this was not a typical "school" setting in which to learn how to teach history. This context was different than what the pre-service teachers will experience in their upcoming practicum and student teaching placements. We are unsure what this may mean for them when they try to recreate the methods learned within this collaboration. Of course, some of what they learned and experienced (e.g., interactions with students, scaffolding material, lesson planning) could be beneficial in any educational context. But they may not have an opportunity to attempt historical investigations and inquiry methods in their future field placements, and if they do, they may experience hindrances to the work—such as time constraints and lack of instructional support. As such, we considered and wrestled with how to frame this work for our pre-service teachers. We want them to incorporate historical thinking curriculum in their future classrooms, but did not want to create unrealistic expectations for what that might look like in a different context.

Significance of the Work

The integration of our university course and the community camp produced value not found within a typical teacher education course. For us, challenges did exist, but were not insurmountable, and did not deter us from future commitments to these types of collaborations. Even though it would be difficult to recreate our camp activities during a regular school year, we still found value in doing this work. The non-traditional space provided an opportunity for pre- and in-service teachers to see middle schoolers (in our case, middle schoolers identified as "struggling") successfully engage in academically challenging work. Accordingly, there was benefit in having the pre- and in-service teachers witness students (who may not typically "like" or "do well in" history class) conduct historical inquiries and engage in investigating their community's heritage. Admittedly, it took us the better part of our first full week together to get a sense of students' academic, social and emotional needs. We worked hard to differentiate camp experiences so that all students would be engaged and find success. We learned as we went, revising and adapting as our relationships with students developed. It wasn't perfect (what teaching is?); nonetheless, we came away with a strong conviction that all students can and want to "do" history…it's up to us to make it accessible, relevant and engaging.

The collaborative context also allowed us to try inquiry methods in a risk-free environment. We did not have a test "to teach to" or a pacing guide to follow. Our main goals focused on student engagement and learning—with little concern of failure. Of course, we wanted to succeed in our objectives, and we

wanted all of the students to enjoy the sessions and find them educative. But we were not concerned with any punitive assessment or consequence for ourselves or for the campers. The type of freedom we experienced in this context can demonstrate that what research suggests makes for powerful teaching and learning actually has merit. Of course, we often hear from in-service teachers that many practices we promote cannot be attempted amidst testing demands and pacing guides. To test this notion, Hauver developed a program, the Investigative History Fellows Program, as an extension of our summer work. Beginning in August 2016, Hauver invited six teachers who had been identified as teacher leaders by their principals to gather with her at the local house museum. Together with the social studies coordinator for the district and local public historians who had served as partners in the summer, they spent this past academic year thinking together about how to meaningfully and intentionally integrate investigative approaches (like those from the summer) into the history teaching at their respective K-12 schools. The first year of this program came to a close in June, 2017. Year two is just beginning. So far, products include district-wide lesson templates and examples, presentations at regional conferences and the development of a strong network of colleagues committed to enhancing history teaching in their district.

According to Mikulec and Herrmann (2016), "Meaningful early field experiences are an integral part of the transition from student to teacher" (p. 57). But we need to keep asking, "What makes a field experience *meaningful?*" This question is critical to reform, especially since "teacher candidates often cite field placements as the most powerful learning experiences of their preservice education, valuing field experiences over the content of teacher education courses" (Howell, Carpenter, & Jones, 2016, p. xxii). What happens in these spaces matters. Darling Hammond (2014) argues that, "Strengthening clinical practice in teacher preparation is clearly one of the most important strategies for improving the competence of new teachers and the capacity of the teaching force as a whole" (p. 557), but this requires examining the many factors that influence clinical work:

> At minimum, these include creating a coherent vision and curriculum within and across the coursework and clinical components of the program, developing tasks and analytic opportunities that connect theory and practice, establishing school partnerships that are designed to support exemplary practice and pedagogical learning for teaching diverse learners, and incorporating strategies for assessing beginners' capacity to practice—and informing ongoing program improvement—through sophisticated and educative assessments of what candidates can actually do when they are ready to enter the profession. (p. 557)

Coherence and vision, bridging theory and practice, a school context that supported our goals—all were essential to this partnership. We left this experience with a deeper commitment to collaboration with other teacher educators and members within the community. We also left believing more strongly in finding ways that disrupt the separation of *the learning* and *the doing* of teaching. With this reflective piece, we hope to invite others into the conversation and encourage the rethinking and restructuring of traditional teacher education practices. `SUP`

References

Adler, S. (2008). The education of social studies teachers. In L. S. Levstik, & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 329-351). New York, NY: Routledge.

Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Boyle-Baise, M., & McIntyre, D. J. (2008). What kind of experience? Preparing teachers in PDS or community settings. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 307-329). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., Draper, R. J., Smith, L., & Birrell, J. R. (2004). Moving beyond collusion: Clinical faculty and university/public school partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(6), 505-521.

Bullough, R. V., Jr., Hobbs, S. F., Kauchak, D. P., Crow, N. A., & Stokes, D. (1997). Long-term PDS development in research universities and the clinicalization of teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 48*(2), 85-95.

Cibulka, J. G. (2016). Foreword. In P. B. Howell, J. Carpenter, & J. Jones (Eds.), *Clinical preparation at the middle level: Practices and possibilities* (pp. xiii-xv). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Clift, R. T., & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 309-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Conklin, H. G. (2008). Promise and problems in two divergent pathways: Preparing social studies teachers for the middle school level. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 36*(1), 36-65.

Cowan, R., & Berlinghoff, D. (2008). Course embedded fieldwork: A look at a working model. *Language and Literacy Spectrum, 18,* 20-27.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 547-561.

Garland, C., & Shippy, V. (1995). *Guiding clinical experiences: Effective supervision in teacher education.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Gelfuso, A., Dennis, D. V., & Parker, A. (2015). Turning teacher education upside down: Enacting the inversion of teacher preparation through the symbiotic relationship of theory and practice. *Professional Educator, 39*(2), 1-16.

Goodlad, J. I. (1998). Teacher education: For what? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 25*(4), 16-23.

Goodlad, J. I. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. *Educational Leadership, 49*(3), 4-10.

Gordon, M. (2007). Introduction. In M. Gordon & T.V. O'Brien (Eds.), *Bridging theory and practice in teacher education* (pp. xi-xvi). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Hawley, T. S. (2010). Purpose into practice: The problems and possibilities of rationale-based practice in social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 38*(1), 131-162.

Howell, P. B., Carpenter, J., & Jones, J. (2016). Introduction. In P. B. Howell, J. Carpenter, & J. Jones (Eds.), *Clinical preparation at the middle level: Practices and possibilities* (pp. xxi-xxiv). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Hughes, J. (2009). An instructional model for preparing teachers for fieldwork. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 21*, 252–257.

Kammen, M. (1989). History is our heritage: The past in contemporary American culture. In P. Gagnon (Ed.), *Historical literacy: The case for history in American education* (pp. 138-156). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kennedy, M. M. (2008). The place of teacher education in teachers' education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1199-1203). New York, NY: Routledge.

Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (2015). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Liakopoulou, M. (2012). The role of field experience in the preparation of reflective teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(6), 42-54.

Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, D. (2015). *The past is a foreign country-revisited*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Manfra, M. M. (2009). Critical inquiry in the social studies classroom: Portraits of critical teacher research. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 37*(2), 156-192.

Mikulec, E., & Herrmann, A. (2016). "We matter just the same": Students and pre-service teachers working together in an alternative educational setting, *Teaching Education, 27*(1), 57-71.

Ravid, R., & Handler, M. G. (Eds.). (2001). *The many faces of school-university collaboration: Characteristics of successful partnerships*. Englewood, CO: Teacher Ideas Press.

Reisman, A. (2012). Reading like a historian: A document-based history curriculum intervention in urban high schools. *Cognition and Instruction, 30*(1), 86-112.

Samaras, A. P., Frank, T. J., Williams, M. A., Christopher, E., & Rodick, W. H., III. (2016). A collective self-study to improve program coherence of clinical experiences, *Studying Teacher Education, 12*(2), 170-187.

Sandwell, R. (2007). The internal divide: Historians and their teaching. In M. Gordon & T. V. O'Brien (Eds.), *Bridging theory and practice in teacher education* (pp. 17-29). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Seixas, P. (2016). Are heritage education and critical historical thinking compatible? Reflections on historical consciousness from Canada. In C. V. Boxtel, M. Grever, & S. Klein (Eds.), *Sensitive pasts: Questioning heritage in education* (pp. 21-39). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.

Slater, J. J. (1996). *Anatomy of a collaboration: Study of a college of education/public school partnership*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Slater, J. J. (2001). The process of change in school-university collaboration. In R. Ravid & M. G. Handler (Eds.), *The many faces of school-university collaboration: Characteristics of successful partnerships* (pp. 11-22). Englewood, CO: Teacher Ideas Press.

Slater, J. J. (2010). The meme of collaboration. In J. J. Slater, & R. Ravid (Eds.), *Collaboration in education* (pp. 1-14). New York, NY: Routledge.

Turley, R. N. L., & Stevens, C. (2015). Lessons from a school district–university research partnership: The Houston education research consortium. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 37*(1S), 6S-15S.

United States Department of Education (2011). *Our future, our teachers: The Obama administration's plan for teacher education reform and improvement*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education.

VanSledright, B. A. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge, and school history education. *Review of Research in Education, 32*, 109-146.

VanSledright, B. A. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

VanSledright, B. A., & Reddy, K. (2014). Changing epistemic beliefs? An exploratory study of cognition among prospective history teachers. *Revista Tempo e Argumento, 6*(11), 28-68.

Williams, T. M., Virtue, D. C., & Smith, D. E. (2016). Working hand-in-hand to strengthen preservice teacher education: The development of a middle level PDS partnership in South Carolina. In P. B. Howell, J. Carpenter, & J. Jones (Eds.), *Clinical preparation at the middle level: Practices and possibilities* (pp. 119-133). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Wineburg, S. (1991a). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(1), 73-87.

Wineburg, S. (1991b). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*(3), 495-519.

Zeichner, K., & Conklin, H. (2008). Teacher education programs as sites for teacher preparation. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 269-289). New York, NY: Routledge.

❖ ❖ ❖

Kimberly R. Logan is a part-time instructor at The University of Georgia. Her research interests include the role of religious beliefs for pre-service teachers in teacher education programs and teacher training.

Jennifer Hauver is an Associate Professor at Randolph-Macon College. Her scholarship focuses on young people's democratic and civic learning in schools and communities.

Sebastian Burkholdt is a doctoral candidate in Social Studies Education at the University of Georgia. He completed teacher training in Germany in 2014, and received a M.A. in German Literature in 2012.