Mentor Matching: Innovations in Clinical Practice Across PDS Networks

Teresa R. Fisher-Ari, Georgia State University
Ashley Eaton, Georgia State University
Margaret Dantzler, Georgia State University

ABSTRACT: As more PDS and ITP programs move toward year-long teacher residency/co-teaching models, it becomes even more critical that we—university faculty, P-12 administrators and PDS leadership—strategically match teacher candidates and experienced teachers. How might we go about doing this very complex work of matching and building partnerships that will be inherently personal and professional, longitudinal and deep, vulnerable and supportive, between two individuals who have never met? How do we and can we match mentors and candidates in order to foster positive, professionalizing, reciprocal, and mutually-developing partnerships? How might we match individuals in ways that promote the critically transformative experiences for mentor, mentee, and pupils? We posed these questions at a Questions Session at the 2019 NAPDS Conference. This manuscript forwards and extends that conversation, highlighting the innovative clinical practices for mentor matching shared across multiple PDS networks.

PDS Essentials represented in this manuscript: 1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community. 2. A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community. 3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need. 4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants. 5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants.

Matching mentees with supportive mentors is critical to the outcomes of teacher candidates' experiences and socialization and is a recurring focus on teacher education and *School-University Partnerships*. This is particularly relevant in Professional Development School (PDS) contexts where there is a shared commitment between the university and P-12 partners toward collaborative preservice, novice, and veteran teacher development that supports authentic student achievement (NAPDS Nine Essentials; Shroyer, Yahnke, & Heller, 2007). As more PDS and Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) programs move toward year-long teacher residency/co-teaching models (Fisher-Ari, Martin, Burgess, Cox, Ejike, & Benson, 2018; Sparks, 2017), it becomes even more critical that university faculty, P-12 administrators and PDS leadership intentionally match mentors

and mentees. However, there remain significant questions. Specifically, how do we and can we match mentors and candidates in order to foster positive, professionalizing, reciprocal, and mutually-developing partnerships?

We (a first-teacher/teacher residency alumni, a doctoral candidate and mentor teacher, and a faculty member) wondered how different school/university partnerships select and match mentors with preservice teachers and teacher residents. To hear a range of perspectives and ideas, we proposed and facilitated a question session at the 2019 Conference of the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) in Atlanta.

Description of Session at NAPDS

About 20 educators from across the country attended this session. Some participants coordinated and taught in teacher education programs, some were mentors, some community and school liaisons, some deans of colleges of education, and some novice teachers and preservice teachers. This room of educators committed to supporting and developing teachers grappled with the questions of matching mentors and mentees, bringing their collective experiences, practices, and hopes together. In this manuscript, we highlight those practices and possibilities and

several complexities related to the intentional selection and partnering of preservice teacher candidates with school-based mentors.

We framed this session around collaborative sharing protocols. After we articulate the guiding questions and purpose of our session, we asked participants to engage in a quick write about their most meaningful mentoring relationships, describing the characteristics of mentors who had supported them. Specifically, we asked, "What words describe the characteristics of your most meaningful personal mentors?" "How would you describe those relationships / collaborations? (How did they make you feel? What did they help you do? How did they support your growth?)" We shared those characteristics, making a master list and noting that different individuals had very different articulated needs from their personal mentors.

Then we moved to a small group brainstorming session in triads where individuals each shared around these four key questions:

- *When have mentor/mentee partnerships gone well in your work and what factors contributed to the success?*
- *When have mentor/mentee partnerships gone LESS well in your work and what factors were challenging?*
- *What strategies have you tried for matching mentors and mentees?*
- *What possible strategies/approaches/priorities might be interesting or helpful to try in your context?*

Next, participants engaged in several brief idea-exchanges with others. Through these brief conversations, participants extended their ideas and asked questions of others who were engaged in mentor matching across multiple contexts. Through these short conversations, participants imagined and extended their developing ideas for matching candidates and mentees. Finally, participants shared new ideas or practices they planned to take up to match mentees and mentors in their own context. During this full group wrap-up we collected ideas, recommendations, and tensions from each participant which after analysis and organization, have resulted in this manuscript.

Situating the Conversation

It is possible that there are underlying characteristics (i.e. responsive listening, trustworthiness, strong and effective communication skills, mutual respect, refraining from passing judgement, and holding a growth-mindset) that are important for all mentors (Johnson. 2002). Due to the very human and interpersonal relationships between mentors and their proteges, mentors with specific coaching styles, personalities, working practices, and pedagogical approaches might be better suited to support some candidates than others. In other words, each mentor/mentee collaboration is not inherently optimally supportive, depending upon a range of individual and contextual factors. Matching mentors and mentees to facilitate productive spaces of mutual learning, growth, and collaboration

is a complex and collective endeavor for leaders in the university and P-12 schools.

It is critically important to intentionally pair residents with mentor teachers who are already aligned with, engaged in, and open to approaches and pedagogical frameworks preservice teachers are encountering and challenged to take up in their certification program (Zeichner, 2010). Research on our PDS grant-supported residency program has offered us significant insights into the promise and complexity of mentoring. Some residents have attributed much of their success, professionalization, and development to mentors while others found a great deal of tension, anxiety, and shared spaces that were less-than-conducive to their risk-taking, growth, and development. Not all mentor-mentee relationships are mutual, respectful, or supportive to the novice teacher, the practicing educator, or to the learners (Kardos & Johnson, 2010; McIntyre & Byrd, 1998).

Strategically matching our candidates and experienced teachers is critically important, but how might we go about doing this very complex work of matching and building partnerships that will be personal and professional, longitudinal and deep, vulnerable and supportive, between two individuals who have never met? How can we understand the complexities of work-habits, interpersonal dynamics, and power-negotiation that has to happen for a meaningful and mutual collaboration? How might we understand and then put in to practice processes for matching individuals in ways that promote the critically transformative experiences for mentor, mentee, and pupils? How might we gauge and match mentor's and mentee's willingness to collaborate in a true partnership and inquiry on behalf of learners?

Our research has found candidates and faculty alike calling for mentors whose practice aligns more theoretical university-based learning and pedagogical decisions enacted in P-12 classrooms in order to support curricular and pedagogical coherence in implementing evidenced-based practices they engage with during their teacher preparation programs (Fisher-Ari, Martin, Burgess, Cox, Ejike, & Benson, 2018; Fisher-Ari, Tanguay, Lynch, Fernandes Williams, Saxton, & Dangel, 2017). Alignment between university and P-12 practices and priorities can significantly support teacher development as preservice teachers span boundaries (Fisher & Many, 2014; Many, Fisher, Ogletree, & Taylor, 2012; Meyers, Fisher, Alicea & Bloxson, 2014) and contexts. Mentor teachers' familiarity with, alignment with, and investment in the PDS and teacher education/preparation collaboration is key to the development of their protégé.

Another key criteria for meaningful partnership is a commitment to the simultaneous development of their mentee/resident and to a mentor's own continued development, learning, and rejuvenation (NAPDS Nine Essentials). In ideal partnerships, this mutual development and growth can be fostered in a co-taught classroom (Fisher-Ari, Martin, Burgess, Cox, Ejike & Benson, 2018; Guha, Hyler & Darling-Hammond,

2016), particularly when partnerships span an entire academic year.

Noting that the stance of PDS initiatives simultaneously focus on pupil achievement, in-service teacher development, and pre-service teacher support through intentional P-20 partnerships (NAPDS Nine Essentials; Shroyer, Yahnke, & Heller, 2007), we were anxious to understand the perspectives of participants from across partnerships. Recommendations, innovations, and challenges generated during the session are shared below.

Insights From the Field

Six important insights and overarching recommendations emerged from this conversation, namely: (a) understandings of our own most meaningful mentors; (b) acknowledgement of the challenge of vetting possible mentors; (c) efforts to meaningfully compensate mentors; (d) opportunities and needs for supporting, developing, and professionalizing mentors; (e) calls for collaborative models which simultaneously support and develop the mentor and the mentee (and university faculty) together; and (f) current and potential mentor matching practices and possibilities. Each of these overarching recommendations is discussed below.

Describing our Most Meaningful Mentors

First, in the session, we asked: "What words describe the characteristics of your most meaningful personal mentors?" We described these individuals as affirming and encouraging while being honest, authentic, and a "straight shooter." Our mentors were both knowledgeable and still learning. They had high expectations and believed in our potential and also were patient with us when we aren't yet who we were becoming. We thought of mentors who positioned conflict as an opportunity for growth. Our mentors didn't compare us to the teacher across the hallway, but helped us compare ourselves of today with our selves of yesterday. They helped us know better and do better. They were empowering, honest, helpful, empathetic, and no drama. They modeled practices, positivity, and demonstrated that mistakes and risk-taking were okay and necessary for growth. Existing research also aligns with these characteristics of meaningful mentors, acknowledging that mentors must tactfully negotiate providing straightforward and technical guidance, while empathetically nurturing the needs of the novice teacher (Pajak, 2001),

Vetting Mentors

Vetting emerged as a vital aspect of pairing mentees with mentors. Vetting is the process of selecting strong mentors based on selection criteria and dispositional stances aligned to research on mentoring, meaningful and supportive classroom practices and instruction, and alignment with the mission and vision of the teacher preparation program. In other words, making sure

that the mentees who work with preservice candidates are similar to the types of teachers that we would hope our candidates would become. Goodlad (1994) argued that

Through the session it became clear that processes for vetting possible mentors were challenging across context and experienced by many of the session participants. This topic brought up many more questions from the participants than possible solutions. It was clear that across a range of institutions, university and P-12 partners grappled with criteria and questions that might be appropriate to better understand the alignment of teacher stance, beliefs, dispositions, and attitudes toward core components of programs. This was especially true for programs with faculty and programmatic commitments to educational equity, racial justice, and social justice. Screening potential mentors for implicit and explicit biases and underlying (or apparent) practices that widen the education debt/opportunity gap (Ladson-Billings, 2006) is difficult. However, it is necessary if we are to ensure that teacher candidates are entering classrooms where they will see models of honoring pedagogy and equitable education.

This argument is not new. In 1994, Goodlad argued that a continued supply of excellent teachers is necessary for good schools, but that to foster and prepare excellent teachers, candidates and novice teachers must be "immersed in exemplary schools for significant portions of their induction." Finding sufficient exceptional schools as sites for each preservice teacher is a challenge, especially for large teacher education programs and PDS networks which might include dozens of school sites for hundreds of preservice interns. Faculty from very large teacher certification programs with significant numbers of school placements found this type of ideological and pedagogical vetting is very challenging (Fisher-Ari, Tanguay, Lynch, Fernandes Williams, Saxton & Dangel, 2017). Since several educators noted that principals generally selected mentor teachers who met baseline criteria (at least five years of teaching, completion of mentoring training or modules, required attendance in mentor-support sessions) these dispositional and ideological stances were often not an explicit part of the vetting process.

The very early PDS movement visionaries (Goodlad,1994; Holmes Group, 1986; 1990; 1995) emphasized that relatively few schools would meet the qualifications of a high quality PDSs. This argues for the building of professional capital across schools as a means of intentional, teacher-honoring reform (Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012) and has yet to be actualized in most U.S. schools. Problematically, this makes it unrealistic to assume that any instruments or processes for vetting mentors would identify the (at times) hundreds of teachers needed with the desired qualities/dispositions/ and practices. It would be difficult to locate the number of effective educators and strong mentors that would be necessary in order to ensure that each candidate is immersed in an optimum situation for developing them in to exceptional educators. This, clearly, is a much larger and more systemic issue that we must continue to address, but it is nevertheless one that is critical to consider and mitigate.

Finally, gaps in communication often made vetting, developing, and supporting the initiation of meaningful partnerships challenging. Participants discussed the persistent challenges of mentors who neither volunteered nor knew about mentees until they showed up in their classroom on the first day. Also, there were conversations about mentor teachers who did not begin their mentoring endeavors with clear understandings of the purposes and complex opportunities and responsibilities of their role. While lack of communication is far too frequent, it also has far reaching consequences for the mentors/mentees relationship and collaboration. Earlier research on mentoring indicated that a lack of clarity can create significant challenges in creating a strong relationship between pre-service teachers and their mentors, ultimately influencing each of their experiences in their work together (Glickman, 1990). Clearly, communication systems must be in place to better facilitate matching novices with mentor teachers who sought out and welcomed this opportunity and responsibility.

Taken together, the processes of vetting is rife with complexities due to the number of exceptional teachers necessary to ensure that each preservice teacher is supported by willing, engaged, pedagogically and dispositionally supportive mentors whose practices and stances are aligned with the missions, visions, and expectations of teacher education programs and professional development school priorities.

Compensating Mentors

Finding resources and compensation (financial remuneration and other forms of compensation) to offer these teachers or other significant benefits to acknowledge their time, effort, and contribution was another key area of conversation. Rarely are there substantive resources to underwrite this type of commitment that are commensurate with professionalizing others. One participant noted that mentors are given an honorarium of $2,000 each year they support a resident for a year-long partnership. Other participants noted that they collect and leverage student lab fees to provide a stipend for mentors $400 per year or per semester of student teaching.

The very small financial benefit offered to most mentors, unless there is substantial underwriting from grant funding, makes it evident that other means of professionalizing this role are important to consider. To be sure, when you look at $400 divided across 8 hours a day for 180 days, it is certainly not demonstrative of the value these mentors add to the development of the novice and to the field more broadly. Finding and imagining other ways of professionalizing mentors is necessary and a critical consideration for many programs.

Supporting, Developing, and Professionalizing Mentors

There are several ways that faculty and school administrators have found to support and develop individuals who have demonstrated interest and willingness to serve as mentors.

Mentor modules, https://mentormodules.com/, created through networks of collaboration and funded by (name grant) through Georgia State University are meaningful supports and freely and widely available at the link above. Opportunities for mentors to receive a Teacher Support and Coaching Endorsement through the university which positions teachers as leaders and adds to their certification and qualifications in ways that have lasting and significant impact not only professionally, but financially.

Some lingering questions posed centered on ways to meaningfully mentor and support the mentors themselves. Participants grappled with ways to better prepare our collaborating teachers without overwhelming them when there are already so many conflicting demands on their time. What training and coursework might be offered to mentors and what would the content of that coursework include? How might a spiral curriculum of supporting mentors in ways that mirror the goals and learning needs of the mentee provide a space for mutual learning across time? How might we help support more authentic co-teaching? Some of these questions initiated conversations about collaborative models for development of mentees, mentors, and university faculty.

Ideas for collaborative models. A meaningful triad of collaborative and mutual support- composed of the mentor teacher, mentee, faculty supervisor (Curlette, 2018)-could be a helpful model for supportive and reciprocal mentoring. This triad can offer authentic mutual support, meaningful collaboration, and reciprocal development. Strong relationships and communication between faculty and the mentor can balance the responsibility so that mentors have support in managing conflicts or challenges. These triads offer the mentor ongoing collaboration and support from faculty. In this model, each member of the triad is authentically learning with and from each of the other partners through mutually supportive and reciprocal relationships. Of note, the faculty member is certain to learn a great deal from this close and deep connection to schools, classroom, and learning and may well experience more development from the partnership than the other two members of the triad. Insights from session participants into ways to develop and support collaborative coaching/mentoring models offered meaningful recommendations for our guiding question about how to foster "positive, professionalizing, reciprocal, and mutually-developing partnerships."

Problematically, relationships between K-12 schools and universities do not consistently demonstrate the type of mutually beneficial and aligned partnerships described above. According to McIntryre & Byrd (1998), these partnerships are often nonexistent and in particular lack agreed-upon and mutually shared goals (Cromwell & Browne, 1993; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Watts, 1987; Zeichner, 1987). If partnerships are to be productive both on an organizational level between systems and on interpersonal levels between co-teaching collaborators) effortful consideration must go in to the development of the partnership based on shared and mutual stances, more than just words on a page (Meyers, Fisher, Alicea & Bloxson, 2014;

Saranson, 1971, 1996). Goodlad (1994) argued that this mutuality is necessary not only for P-12 the development of P-12 schooling, but also for the "sustained renewal" (p. 11) of university faculty and teacher education programs.

Mentor Matching

Specifically, we initiated this question session to gain insights into the question, "How do we and can we match mentors and candidates in order to foster positive, professionalizing, reciprocal, and mutually-developing partnerships?" The ideas shared around mentor matching were varied, unexpected, and particularly interesting and hopeful. Each idea offered possibility and also illuminated some of the complexities of developing mutually supportive and intentional partnerships.

Participants considered the use of personality inventories to identify individuals who, due to their self-identified strengths, working styles, personality, collaborative practices might be particularly well suited for mutual learning and development. This practice aligns with research from Lozinak whose inquiry indicated that personalities should be taken into account when matching mentors with mentees (Lozinak, 2016). Some possibilities included the:

- Meyers-Briggs test (https://www.myersbriggs.org/my-mbti-personality-type/take-the-mbti-instrument/home.htm?bhcp=1),
- Basis-A lifestyle test (https://www.basis-a.com/)
- Compass Points (https://schoolreforminitiative.org/doc/compass_points.pdf).
- Color Test (https://truecolorsintl.com/assessments/)
- Strengthfinder (https://www.gallupstrengthscenter.com/home/en-us/strengthsfinder)
- and related "Teaching to your Strengths" resource (https://www.gallup.com/press/176192/teach-strengths.aspx).

While these tests, and others like them, reveal some insights into individual personalities and stances, several (if not all) of these assessments have been critiqued. Partnerships based largely on these self-reported metrics for personality and collaborative processes would be limited in effectiveness insofar as the metrics and algorithms upon which they are based are incomplete or problematic. Partnerships forged based on these assessments may be productive, but also might be made less than ideal due to the limited and simplified nature of these self/personality assessments.

Three programs implemented processes of matching that harkened to dating/matching platforms and services. We learned that one program had developed an app (like a dating app) to match interns and mentors based on factors they felt were conducive to a meaningful partnership. This app has been used by their program for the past three years with success. Another university has created a model after the concept of speed dating. All of the students about to student teach the following semester meet in person for a meet-and-greet with possible partner teachers sitting together organized by school. The seniors who are completing their student teaching cover the mentors' class so that the teachers have coverage for this during the school day gathering. The rising seniors meet by table with teachers from each school and write the two schools that are not their preferences for student teaching. Notably, they are selecting schools of choice rather than mentors of choice.

University faculty then take that information and work to match student teachers with schools they most envision themselves working in and with faculty they can imagine learning and teaching alongside. Yet another university has each mentee create an introduction video, articulating their strengths and what they most need and are looking for in their student teaching placement. Each of the teachers who will be mentoring the following year (all of whom work in the same building) watch the video together. Leveraging what they know about each other as colleagues and friends, the mentor teachers consider the needs and strengths articulated by each mentee and pair them with the teacher they think will best support the growth.

As with every possibility, a note of caution is necessary. When we apply practices modeled after online dating/matching platforms we must consider how these matching practices might also be susceptible to some of the implicit and explicit biases (racial, gender, age, etc.) that have been identified in these formats (https://www.npr.org/2018/01/09/575352051/least-desirable-how-racial-discrimination-plays-out-in-online-dating). Exploring ways to maximize these approaches while decreasing bias and increasing representation would be a meaningful and equity-oriented caveat to the adoption of these practices.

In other spaces, site facilitators who are closely connected to schools and teachers leverage their knowledge of individual teachers and the bios of students to help facilitate relationships. Much like the previous example where individuals in the school noted each others' pedagogical and interpersonal strengths and working styles to facilitate matching partnerships, this approach is rooted in deeper knowledge of the mentor teacher, but less significant knowledge of the teacher candidate and their unique traits and needs. This might make it less likely that partnerships will be forged based on a deep knowledge of both collaborators in ways that are likely to be mutual and beneficial.

Other university and school/district partnerships have committees made up of individuals from both organizations to match student teachers to mentors. This significant knowledge of both the mentor/mentee that is brought to bear by members of the committee seems to be promising. It also is likely to be a time-intensive commitment on the part of the members of the committee, being sure that they come to know and speak for the potential partners they represent in deep and complex ways. One participant recommended that as we work to build partnerships, we continue asking "If it were your child being placed in a classroom, which teacher would you put them with?" Of course, this would require very significant knowledge of and care for each individual candidate on the part of the university representative. This might be difficult in larger programs when

faculty rarely teach candidates for more than one class or supervise them for more than one semester. Ideally, though, this dispositional stance and the requisite knowledge of and care for both the mentor teacher and the mentee by the committee members might foster intentional, positive, professionalizing, reciprocal, and mutually-developing partnerships.

Another exciting recommendation was to offer potential partners a scenario and to ask them discuss together how they might go about addressing the pedagogical/relational/ contextual challenge. Through this opportunity to role play and take up the possibility of working together through complexities, potential collaborators might be able to discern potential collaborators whose stance, commitments, and practices were more or less aligned with their own. This might help potential dyads determine which partnerships might be mutually supportive of growth. These role plays might provide potential dyads with insights into communication patterns, potential conflicts, and opportunities for mutual and reciprocal development and growth. These opportunities are bounded in both the content of the scenario and the length of the interaction which are inherently limited in their capacity to demonstrate how the dyad might collaboratively solve other complex and challenges together in the real and moment-by-moment complexities and decision making of classroom life.

When we considered the range of possibilities above, we were excited that these possibilities offered opportunities for dyads to be matched with more intentionally. Just as exciting, we came to see each of these as potential processes and experiences which might support both future interns and their prospective mentors in learning about and more clearly understanding and articulating their own strengths, social/emotional areas for growth, and problem-solving skills. We felt that these experiences might build increased self-knowledge in ways that could foster meaningful and mutual support. This self-knowledge could be harnessed in the development of authentic and reciprocal partnerships that would benefit students, novice teachers, and veteran teachers simultaneously. Leaving the session not only with possibilities for matching mentors, but also with those practices that could also be opportunities in their own right for development, was exciting and meaningful.

This session, as well as the recommendation that grew from it, reminded us that wondering, learning, and imagining is always most productive when engaged in collaboratively. While there are no definitive 'best' ways to address this question, the insights that have emerged from these conversations have clarified opportunities and helped us imagine new visions for learning together with our partners. Much gratitude to the participants and contributors for this ongoing conversation. SUP

References

Cromwell, R. R., & Browne, C. S. (1993). A clinical supervision program prepares teachers to become change agents. *Teacher Educator, 28*(2), 37-46.

Curlette, D. (2018). *An anchor action research study on student achievement utilizing the teacher-intern-professor model.* Retrieved from https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/eps_diss/179/

Fisher-Ari, T.R., Martin, A.E., Burgess, A., Cox, V, Ejike, J., & Benson, G. (2018) PDS teacher residents: Storied journeys with implications for partnerships and teacher recruitment, development, and retention. *School and university partnerships.. 2*(11). 62-72.

Fisher-Ari, T.R., Tanguay, C., Lynch, H.L., Fernandes Williams, R., Saxton, R. R., & Dangel, J.R. (2017). Striving for critically responsive teacher preparation: Remaining relevant by shaping programs to reflect who and where we teach. In R. Flessner, & D. Lecklider (Eds.), *The Power of Clinical Preparation in Teacher Education.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Fisher, T., & Many, J. E. (2014) From PDS classroom teachers to urban teacher educators: Learning from Professional Development School boundary spanners. *School-University Partnerships. 7*(1), 49-63.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). *Supervision in transition: A developmental approach.* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass,

Guha, R., Hyler, M.E. & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The teacher residency: An innovative model for preparing teachers.* Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Teacher_Residency_Innovative_Model_Preparing_Teachers_REPORT.pdf

Guyton, E. M., & McIntyre, D. J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 514-534). New York, NY: Macmillan

Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school.* New York, NY. Teachers College Press.

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group.* East Lansing, Ml: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the sign of professional development schools.* East Lansing, Ml: Author.

The Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education.* East Lansing, Ml: Author.

Johnson, K. F. (2002). *Being an effective mentor.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kardos, S. M., & Johnson, S. M. (2010). New teachers' experiences of mentoring: The good, the bad, and the inequity. *Journal of Educational Change, 11*(1), 23-44.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7) 3-12.

Lozinak, K. (2016). Mentor matching does matter. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 83*(1), 12.

Many, J., Fisher, T., Ogletree, S., & Taylor, D. (2012).Crisscrossing the university and public school contexts as professional development school boundary spanners. *Issues in Teacher Education, 21*(2), 83-102.

McIntyre, D. J., & Byrd, D. M. (1998). Supervision in teacher education. In G. R. Firth, & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 409-427). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Meyers, B., Fisher, T., Alicea, M, & Bloxson, K. (2014). Unfinishedness: Striving for a viable partnership between TFA and its university partner. *Teachers College Record, 116*(10), 1-32.

NAPDS 9 essentials. Retrieved from https://napds.org/nine-essentials/

Pajak, E. (2001). Clinical supervision in a standards-based environment. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(3), 233-243.

Sarason, S. (1996). *Revisiting "The culture of the school and the problem of change."* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Shroyer, G., Yahnke, S., & Heller, M. F. (2007). Introduction: Collaborative reconstruction and simultaneous renewal: The impact of professional development schools. *Journal of Educational Research, 100*(4), 195–196.

Sparks, S. (2017). Can teacher residencies help with shortages? Scholars at AERA take up the topic. *Education Week.* Retrieved from: http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2017/05/10/can-teacher-residencies-help-with-shortages.html.

Watts, D. (1987). Student teaching. In M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 151-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. (1987). Toward an understanding of the role of field experiences in teacher development. In M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 94-1117). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 35*, 89-99.

❖ ❖ ❖

Dr. Teresa R. Fisher-Ari is a clinical assistant professor in the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary and a Co-PI on the US DOE Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships Program: CREST-Ed: Collaborations and Resources for Encouraging and Supporting Transformation in Education [grant numberU336S140036]. In her teaching and research, she works to co-facilitate and co-examine teacher preparation and development opportunities that recruit, develop, and nurture teachers committed to educational equity and the holistic support of children through responsive, integrated, and critically just curriculum. She may be contacted at tfisher4@gsu.edu.

Ashley Eaton is a graduate from Georgia State University's Master's of Arts in Teaching Special Education program. She is also a former CREST-Ed teacher resident and participant in the Academy of Future Teachers. She teaches Special Education in an elementary school in Atlanta. She may be contacted at aeaton5@student.gsu.edu.

Margaret Dantzler is a graduate from Georgia State University's Master's of Arts in Teaching in Early Childhood Education and a doctoral candidate in the EdD in Curriculum and Instruction program at Georgia State University. She serves at the Multi-tiered Systems of Support coordinator at a public school in South Atlanta. She may be contacted at mdantzler2@student.gsu.edu.