Creating a Professional Development School: A Community College's Approach

Cara Kronen, Borough of Manhattan Community College-CUNY
Rebecca Garte, Borough of Manhattan Community College-CUNY
Jennifer M. Longley, Borough of Manhattan Community College-CUNY

Abstract: This paper describes the different elements of a Professional Development School (PDS) partnership between a Community College in New York City and a public elementary school in a low-income neighborhood that serves predominantly children of color and low-income families. A major component of the partnership was a school-wide comprehensive professional development (PD) program centered on progressive pedagogy. We situate this case study in a discussion of the NAPDS (2008) 9 Essentials. We offer insights for other community colleges looking to embark on PDS partnerships.

NAPDS Nine Essentials addressed 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; 6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved; 7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration; 8. Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and 9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.

The purpose of this descriptive article is to share the process of creating a Professional Development School (PDS) through a partnership between an urban Community College (CC) and a public prek-5th grade elementary school. This work is novel in that most PDS are formed with four-year colleges and not within CCs. This partnership was borne out of a private foundation grant, secured by the CC faculty. This article focuses on the first four years of the PDS program. We established a clearly defined purpose of our partnership (Clark, 1999), a schoolwide change to implement progressive pedagogy and child-centered teaching strategies (Bruner 1960; Dewey,1956; Freire,1970), accomplished through a comprehensive professional development (PD) program.

Our program was designed to impact several interrelated needs within the field of teacher education and New York City (NYC)'s inner-city schools. We created our model through a novel three-pronged approach. First, we created a program of extensive PD for the teachers, staff, and administration at the focus school, to help them achieve their goal of adopting progressive, inquiry-based methods (Schwab, 1960). This became the only public "progressive" school in the local school district and one of the few in NYC to serve mostly low-income students and students of color. Second, we planned to use the focus school as a model/lab school of best practices for the Teacher Education pre-service teachers (PSTs) at our CC, thereby creating a meaningful and innovative learning experience for a traditionally underserved population of postsecondary students. Third, we worked to create a cohort of highly skilled PSTs to assist the classroom teachers in the implementation of new teaching strategies they were learning in our professional development program.

The authors of this paper are the CC faculty, who in collaboration with the focus schools' administration and staff, created and implemented a whole-school PD program. In this work, we consider the following (1) How does our community-college-based PDS compare to traditional PDS partnerships? (2) How can we use the NAPDS (2008) Nine Essentials to establish a community-college-based PDS? While the NAPDS Nine Essentials are not meant to be a checklist, we found it helpful to ground our work in attempting to address each of these principals. (3) What is the impact and sustainability of the partnership for the disparate stakeholders? and (4) What lessons can be applied for other community colleges and similar institutions interested in PDS work?

The Partnership

The Focal Elementary School

The focal elementary school is a public prek-5th grade school in a historically Black neighborhood of New York City, where schools

suffer a poor reputation. Many families have opted out of district schools in favor of charter schools. According to the NYS Department of Education, at the start of this program, demographics of the schools' 174 students were as follows: 94% free or reduced-price lunch, 48% Black/African American, and 42% Latinx. Based on standardized test results, 50% of the students were proficient in math and 39% were reading on grade level. To thwart low enrollment, stakeholders at the focal school underwent an initiative to adopt a "progressive" or child-centered approach to teaching and learning (Bruner 1960; Dewey, 1956; Freire, 1970). The CC faculty entered this partnership in 2016 at the request of the school's principal.

The Community College Partner

The "university" partner in this PDS is a community college in NYC. More than 80% of the CC enrollees are students of color and nearly 85% qualify as living low-income. The teacher education programs at the CC promote developmentally appropriate practice, culturally responsive, and inquiry-based approaches to learning (Derman-Sparks & Edwards 2010; NAEYC, 2019). The teacher education faculty at this CC is composed entirely of former early childhood and childhood educators, school administrators, curriculum specialists, and professional development experts, most are doctoral level scholars and engage in research.

Early childhood PSTs take two upper-level fieldwork courses, where they complete 60 and 90 hours of fieldwork respectively. The capstone project includes planning two structured learning activities and conducting one. This lesson is videorecorded, and students complete a reflection assignment based on the recording. The CC faculty teaching through the PDS designed an experimental approach to these upper-level fieldwork courses, where PSTs were placed in the focus school for an entire academic year, instead of just one semester. Those PSTs completed an action research project, including writing mini-grants of $250 to support classroom change which they planned in collaboration with the cooperating teacher and professor. During the first 3.5-years project implementation, three cohorts of CC students ($n = 90$) were involved.

We believed that providing a culturally relevant, personally meaningful learning laboratory for PSTs should begin well before they are nearing teacher certification. Our goal for our PSTs was for them to get to know this school, its students, teachers, and administrators, from their very first semester in our program.

The PDS Program Inception

Just prior to the receipt of formal funding in 2016, the CC faculty offered a series of voluntary workshop at the request of the school administration. Simultaneously, we began placing PSTs in classrooms where teachers were already experimenting with child-centered pedagogy. The following semester, we formalized the PDS partnership with a foundation grant. We held planning meetings with disparate stakeholders including, teachers, paraprofessionals, administrators, other school support staff, and parents. The purpose of the meetings was to establish a common vision for school change and shared priorities for our program, similar to a PDS Advisory Council (Widdall et al., 2019). It was mutually agreed that we would help the staff implement a child-centered, inquiry-based curriculum. Full implementation of the program began in 2017.

Our programs for both teachers and PSTs were based in learning through participation in communities of practice (Lave & Wagner, 1991) which allowed for multiple entry points into the use of inquiry-based teaching practices. As teachers and paraprofessionals increased their knowledge and skills related to this teaching method, they simultaneously participated in transforming the culture of the school to reflect these new values. This coincides with Darling-Hammond's (1998) description of PDS as spaces where PSTs and cooperating teacher learning becomes: (1) experimental; (2) grounded in teacher questions; (3) collaborative; (4) connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students; and (5) sustained, intensive, and connected to other aspects of school change. We used a parallel process model in our program wherein teachers engaged in their own inquiry during PD workshops, supported our PSTs in such a process with their action research and facilitated inquiry-based curriculum with their classes.

Literature

The PDS literature is replete with robust descriptions and analyses of partnerships from research institutions and state colleges (Garas-York, et al 2017; McCormick, et al, 2013, Shroyer, 2017), and at predominantly Black and Hispanic serving institutions (Foster et, al 2009; Marchietello, & Trinidad, 2019). However, in an in-depth search of the literature, we found no evidence of CCs forming PDS partnerships, despite their long history of involvement in teacher education. This absence might be because despite rigorous accreditation and research expectations at some institutions, community colleges suffer from the perception that they are at the bottom of the prestige scale within the field of higher education (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Nagler, 2004). This reputation extends to CC faculty, who are often considered substandard and non-scholarly (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Grubb, 1999). Still, according to NCES, Community Colleges in the United States educate approximately 38% of all undergraduate students and play an increasingly vital role in providing higher education opportunities to students from a wide range of backgrounds (NCES, 2019). Compared with traditional four-year colleges, CCs offer an entry to college for more first-generation college students, students of color, and non-traditional students (Kaplan, 2018). Historically, CCs played a role in preparing teachers by strengthening articulation and transfer with university-based teacher preparation programs (Kaplan, 2018). As teacher certification requirements became more stringent, four-year colleges took over much of this work. In recent decades

however, many CCs have expanded their work in teacher education programs (Floyd & Arnauld 2007; Kaplan, 2018).

In a recent study, Guthery and Bailes (2022) found that teachers prepared in traditional certification programs have higher level of retention than their counterparts who earned certification through alternative pathways. They argued that one reason for this finding was that traditionally-certified teachers spend more time in classrooms prior to earning certification. Community College PSTs often spend even more time than the typical traditionally-certified teacher in pre-service settings. In most traditional teacher education programs, pre-service teachers do not engage in meaningful classroom-based activities until the 3rd of 4th year of their program. Because a community college program is only a four-semester sequence, students begin doing meaningful practicum work earlier and will often complete more than other traditionally or alternately certified teachers. The students in our CC program begin visiting classroom in their first semester.

Segal (2018) experimented with putting PSTs in classrooms and having them teach early in their 4-year sequence, arguing that PSTs need field-based courses and hands-on training, and opportunities to teach, earlier in their course sequence. Segal found that putting PSTs in the field and having them teach lessons in their first two years of college makes them more enthusiastic and confident about teaching, and a greater help to the partnering school. This early practicum work is also described by McIntyre et al (2018). They contend that earlier than typical experiences give students numerous opportunities to grow as pre-service teachers. Furthermore, it is beneficial to the partner school, offering valuable a resource in the extra help that the PSTs provide.

Professional Development Schools

Research suggests that both PSTs and in-service teachers can benefit from involvement in PDS programs (Castle, et al, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2007; Ridley, et al 2005). Studies comparing PSTs in PDS schools to traditional field experiences found better performance, more engagement by PDS PSTs (Ridley, et al 2005; Widdall et al., 2019). PSTs who completed teacher preparation programs engaged in PDS partnerships indicated higher self-efficacy and teacher efficacy as beginning teachers (Bebas, 2016; Epstein & Willhite, 2015). PDS partnerships also positively impact mentor teachers, enhance their practice, and increase their self-efficacy (Beaty-O'Ferrall & Johnson, 2010; Epstein &White, 2015; McCormick, et al., 2013). Successful partnerships impact student learning, engage teachers in meaningful, targeted, and ongoing PD, improve the learning experiences of PSTs, and use research to inform teaching and learning (Castle, et al 2006; Darling-Hammond, 1995, 2007; Darling-Hammond, et al, 2009; Holmes Group, 1995, Teitel, 2003).

School-based educators are sometimes resistant to and distrusting of PDS programs or university partners (Fisler & Firestone 2006; Gitlin, 2000; Trent, 2012; Walsh &Backe, 2013). School staff often experience their university partners as top-down, oriented only to their own needs, engaging in "drive-by" research, and out of touch with the concerns of practicing teachers (Gitlin, 2000; Walsh &Backe, 2013). Partnerships succeed when all stakeholders share a clear understanding of the collaboration's purpose and functioning, but this must extend beyond simply the existence of the partnership itself and include clearly measurable goals (Clark, 1999; Teitel, 2003).

Partnership sustainability is a concern raised in the PDS literature (Dresden et al., 2016; Mitchell, et al., 2014; Walsh & Bakke, 2014) Sustainability issues often occur because of the nature of the partnership. Authentic partnerships between schools and colleges must be co-constructed and require mutuality in roles, benefits, and outcomes (McNall et al., 2009; Walsh & Bakke, 2013). Research suggests that many partnerships are one-way collaborations, focused primarily on the pre-service teachers and not school and pedagogical improvement (Churrins, 1999; Walsh & Backe, 2013). In 2011, relying primarily on responses to a PDS Survey and follow-up interviews, Yendol-Hoppey and Smith (2011) found that school administrators saw their PDS partnership as a vehicle for improved teacher preparation, apart from their regular day-to-day operations of the school, and not transformative for the schools themselves. In the same work, the university leadership and PDS directors noted a lack of regular presence of university liaisons at school sites, citing the following barriers to university faculty being at the site and overall accountability: Professors have too many on-campus commitments, tenure and tenure-track faculty are disengaged from clinical work, and clinical faculty are stretched very thin. They also assert that "we still haven't broken down old stereotypes about 'work in schools' and what that work means for university faculty" (2011, p. 543). This last reason suggests that there is a stigma attached to on-site work, that it is less rigorous and meaningful that other research opportunities.

Community College Based PDS vs. Traditional PDS Partnerships

A recent special issue of *School University Partnerships* detailed various components of "mutually beneficial partnerships." Many of the components highlighted in the issue were present in the partnership we report on in the present study. For example, Littlefair (2018) described a program where schools co-constructed the professional development program together with teachers and administrators and tailored the program foci to the specific needs articulated by each school. Since participation was voluntary, as requested by the school, faculty responded to the program positively. In our case, the goal of our program was to provide each teacher with the degree of support that they needed to develop competence in using inquiry-based and project-based methods that were developmentally appropriate to their students. The topics of our workshops were developed in consultation with the school staff. However, due to the wide variation in capacity among the teachers, we also provided a coaching program where teachers were able to work

intensively with one faculty member on areas that they identified as needing support.

Segal (2018) described a model wherein there is methodological and theoretical continuity between what pre-service teachers are focused on, what faculty provide support for, and what teachers are learning. In addition, PSTs take an active role in the classroom, supporting teacher capacity for implementing new methods. This continuity occurred in our partnership as well. Our faculty facilitated workshops on inquiry based and constructivist approaches (Bruner, 1960, Schwab, 1960) to all subject matters. The workshops were designed to support teacher experimentation and cycles of inquiry. Initially, teachers would try out new methods with their colleagues during workshops, followed by classroom implementation on their own or with support from their coach, and then discuss in following workshops. Concurrently, PSTs developed an action research plan with their supervising faculty (who was also a workshop designer) and the classroom teacher, featuring the same inquiry-based methods teachers were implementing. Often there was a direct relationship between the PST's project and the work that their cooperating teacher was experimenting with. For example, in year one, a novice second grade teacher created a STEM area that included a variety of magnets to support student experiments. Her student teacher based their action research on the STEM area and created and led an inquiry based multidisciplinary activity related to concepts of magnetism.

Fall (2018) highlights how issues of social justice and equity impact instruction and how a school university partnership can disrupt hegemonic practices. Our partnership disrupted various elements of assumed social hierarchies. For example, we did not distinguish between paraprofessionals and teachers in eliciting feedback on areas of concentration or on the methods of delivery for workshops. We also attempted to "flatten" traditional hierarchies that exist between college students, teaching faculty, administrators, and college faculty. One example of this was our support for implementing a restorative justice program in 3rd through 5th grade (Sensory & DiAngelo, 2017). Paraprofessionals, classroom teachers, administrators, and college faculty all participated as equals in circles addressing tensions that arose in the school community. In addition, we included our students and all other classroom adults in co-planning their action research projects and served as facilitators, rather than directors of the process.

Finally, Mcintyre et al. (2018) described how they used a structure to add rigor into the clinical practicum. In our case, we embedded structure and resulting rigor through the action-research project. Similarly, we promoted a gradual release of responsibility model for the community college students, whereby we provided initial support for thinking through the project and then left the ordering of materials to the PST and cooperating teachers (with final responsibility left to the PST). The final planning and implementing of the activity, was left solely for the PST. We also structured this project with critical self-reflection built into every component. In this way, PSTs were scaffolded by both their professors and cooperating teachers in how to plan and deliver an effective inquiry-based activity.

Taken together, we utilized many of the components found in the literature that are argued to lead to effective PDSs. However, a few key differences should be noted. The first and perhaps the significant difference with extant models is scale. Early in our program, we focused all our efforts on one school. We used only our own students (two classes per semester) for the action research project version of the practicum. Although we were later able to expand to other schools within the same district and to involve an additional faculty member in using our model, this started later and was not included in our program evaluation. The small-scale nature of the partnership enabled a SUP that was highly idiosyncratic in terms of the fluctuating needs and foci of our partner school. For example, our first set of workshops focused on developing a child-centered approach to teaching and learning as well as planning interdisciplinary and inquiry-based curriculum and authentic assessment. These workshops were grade-level specific. Facilitators working with teacher teams used the professional learning community model to plan and implement classroom projects.

Year two introduced specific methods such as visual thinking strategies (Yenawine, 2013), descriptive inquiry (Rodgers, 2010), constructivist approaches to math instruction, experiment-based science, and critical literacy (Freire, 1970). Teachers selected topics of interest based on several offerings. However, in year three, ruptures between upper and lower grades, concerns about literacy achievement and discontinuity across grades and classrooms led to the creation of a different workshop structure wherein all school staff worked together to create vertically aligned literacy instruction. We supplemented our workshop offerings with coaching and content-knowledge (specifically math and science) professional development programs. In all, we provided highly intensive and individualized support to teachers that varied widely depending on their knowledge of the practices we aimed to help them develop. This degree of intensity and individualization was only possible because of the small-scale nature of the program. The school itself had 14 classroom teachers, 3-5 specials teachers (depending on the year) and approximately 20 paraprofessionals. Our goal was to involve every single staff member fully in our program.

Since our program was small, we were able to implement many more components of effective partnerships than are typically included in a single professional development program. In addition, because a small group of school staff and college faculty worked intensively within varied formats, we established relationships that informed decision making at every turn. This would not have been possible had these relationships been more distant. The relational nature of our program influenced our coaching and how we prioritized different forms of support for different teachers. We also encouraged close mentoring relationships between cooperating teachers and our students. Many of these pairs shared a common cultural background which enabled even closer and more trusting relationships to develop for the benefit of the student (Garte & Kronen, 2021).

We maintain that several of the components described above were related to the nature of our program being offered by a community college as compared to a university-based partnership.

The literature reviewed above cautions against a PDS characterized by disconnection. In our partnership, the opposite was the case. Instead, our faculty and students became so fully incorporated into the life of the school, that at times we struggled to maintain boundaries. Our faculty provided the entire professional development program for the school staff with bi-weekly workshops, coaching, and attendance at school-wide meetings. We also served as consultants to the school principal, advised school- based coaches and provided as-needed emergency support (e.g., when a new teacher was struggling). The heart of our PDS has been relationship-building. Our PSTs began observations in classrooms during their first and second semesters and continued practicum internships for their next two semesters. Many PSTs reported to their classrooms in between semesters and well beyond their required hours. Several volunteered at school functions and stayed late to help their cooperating teachers prepare for visits from the district.

Prior research also cautions against a lack of rigor, demanding instead, a robust assessment and analysis of programs outcomes (Breault & Breault, 2011; Castle et al., 2006; Clark, 1999). Therefore, we built a rigorous system of evaluation from the program's inception, both through an external evaluator and by our CC faculty. Program evaluation data were collected for three years (2017-2020). Data collected by our external evaluator included interviews and focus groups of teachers and paraprofessionals following each program year. They administered normed pre and post program classroom observation assessments of each teachers' use of developmentally appropriate practice, questioning, formative assessment, the use of inquiry, and classroom environment. They also administered self-efficacy surveys. The community college faculty administered workshop satisfaction surveys and collected observational data, coaching notes, as well as other ethnographic data.

The NAPDS Nine Essentials

1. **A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner individually and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community**. In creating this partnership, our mission was broader than either that of the focus school or the CC alone and was focused through a lens of social justice. The goal of educational equity for both institutions played a primary role in establishing the partnership. Thus, together the CC and public school aimed to create a bastion of high-quality, high-performing, progressive education that would attract all families from the community. More specifically, the CC did not previously have a partnership with any public schools, and none of the schools proximate to the college served a population of students who reflected the schools that the CC PSTs had attended or where they would most likely teach. In this way, the partnership provided a school where the CC PSTs could practice skills (Widdall et al., 2019) over many semesters, mentor teachers that established long-standing relationships with professors and PSTs and a racially and socio-economically representative context in which to learn these skills as suggested by research (Magaldi, et al, 2016; Ross, 2001;).

   The focus school did not have a PD program to support teachers in developing progressive pedagogy. Similarly, there was no comprehensive, school-wide PD program available to support the school's goals for change. The program not only provided workshops but also coaching and consultation regarding curriculum. Another unique benefit was that teachers were able to form relationships with CC faculty over time which enhanced trust and supported professional growth. In addition, the action research, extra help from CC PSTs and mini-grants all enabled teachers to innovate and try out new methodologies with a significant amount of support in place (Widdall et al, 2019). Both institutions were committed to enhancing the workforce, in-service teachers, and PSTs (Bebas, 2016; Widdall et al., 2019). Taken together, both institutions were able to extend their missions and their effectiveness as a unique result of the partnership.
2. **A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants.** Every member of the elementary school community participated in the program, including teachers who did not embrace progressive pedagogy and paraprofessionals who were often on the outskirts of school-wide decision making. At the start of our program there were divisions among staff that we hoped we could resolve through promoting shared visioning. Our facilitators incorporated tensions and conflicts that arose among school staff into discussions of pedagogy to analyze the collaborative learning processes. Throughout the program, the college faculty reflected on and revised our methods of working with our PSTs and their cooperating teachers. We also made changes to coaching and PD workshops based on feedback from facilitators, teachers and administration. PSTs also engaged in reflective practice as part of their fieldwork course using videos of their work with children taken over the course of the semester. Video use has been shown to promote self-reflectivity among teacher candidates (Xiao & Tobin, 2018).
3. **Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need.** This was the cornerstone of our PD program. Beyond simply asking the school administration about needs, the CC faculty

held working-groups, administered surveys, and spoke to teachers and paraprofessionals about where they saw their PD needs. Following each workshop/series we asked participants for feedback to tailor future programs. PD program planning meetings involved the school's PD committee and various members of the school community. At different points, focus groups of teachers and paraprofessionals were conducted by an external evaluator. The results were shared with the PD program directors for the purpose of informing program structure and content.

Our program was highly teacher-centered and based on responsiveness to the needs of the school's staff. For example, a group of teachers expressed interest in exploring ELA assessment tools for grades K- 2, that could be both used to capture data that could drive instruction in an inquiry-driven classroom. We facilitated the work of these teachers by obtaining the materials they requested, facilitating professional connections, and supporting their student-work analysis. When several teachers expressed concerns over their classroom libraries, we designed a PD series on how to maximize the use of the books and space in a classroom library. After engaging in the PD, the teachers visited their peer's libraries, describing their initial concerns, the changes they made, and the impact the changes had on the student's ability to access and use of their classroom library.

4. **A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community.** Darling-Hammond, et al. described how PSTs and their mentor teachers learn by engaging in work together (2009). Therefore, our PSTs engaged in an action research project in the second semester of fieldwork. They conducted formal assessment of their classroom environment and in collaboration with their co-teacher, chose one area that they thought could be improved or re-arranged to bolster children's learning. PSTs wrote $250 mini-grants for the materials necessary to make, implement and assess the impact of the change. The goals for our PSTs in this assignment reflected the same goals that drove our PD/coaching program with the teachers. We used the assignment to help scaffold the PSTs' ability to critically reflect on their engagement with children, understand the impact of materials and environment on children's behavior and learning, and connect those understandings to larger conclusions about classroom functioning. Similarly, we aimed for mentor teachers to support PSTs projects that reflected their own development of child-centered inquiry-based practice. In this way, Darling Hammond's description of the types of learning that should occur within a PDS were supported by our partnership.

   The PSTs completed their supervised fieldwork over two semesters at the same school, with the same professor, and the same peers. The PSTs formed an informal cohort among themselves, as they saw each other in the college classroom, in the halls of the focus school during their scheduled fieldwork days/times and often commuting to the focus school. This increased their sense of ease in the school and sense of membership. The PSTs became familiar and comfortable with the children, teachers, routines of the classroom, their peers, instructor, and school administration. Consequently, the PSTs developed a sense of belonging in the school and college community. When the PSTs develop a sense of belonging in their teacher preparation program, their self-efficacy increases (Bjorklund, et al. 2020) which encourages them to experiment with pedagogical practices in the classroom.
5. **An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved.** The articulation agreement was developed in collaboration with the school principal, the teacher's union representative and the project directors. This agreement outlined each of our roles and responsibilities, particularly in relation to the PD. Much of this agreement centered on tensions within the school that began to surface as the partnership evolved. These involved: teacher time for professional learning, decision making about PD content and schedule, and adequate materials to put teacher learning into action within the classroom. Through our grant we were able to provide appropriate materials to teachers for their classrooms and students. We also had several meetings with disparate stakeholders over year 1 and 2, that attempted to clearly articulate a shared definition of progressive pedagogy and the school community's goals.

   When planning PD, we worked to identify the unique needs of all school staff. We were responsive and flexible in how we captured the needs of the community. To ensure teachers had agency in PD, we used anonymous surveys, group discussions, inventories, and other methods for teachers to articulate their PD goals. Depending on the feedback we received, teachers worked with other new teachers, other early childhood teachers, by grade level, with their paraprofessional, across grade level, or in self-selected groups. Transparency was crucial in the process, to nurture the relationships with teachers and staff; we continuously shared the results and rationale for our efforts. Using the information collected, we jointly outlined a plan for each school quarter.
6. **A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration.** We experimented with different methods of shared decision making, beginning with the goal of establishing "model teachers" who could lead colleagues in implementing the methods we introduced during workshops and establish mentoring partnerships among the school

staff. Our goal was to enable teachers to lead change in the school through collaboration, hoping to tap into the unique expertise of the diverse teaching staff in the school. To foster collaboration, we intended to support the teachers to engage in professional learning communities based on their self-identified goals and common interests. During year 2, the CC faculty introduced the school to the Progressive Redesign Opportunity School (PROSE) model, a Department of Education program that allowed for greater autonomy of teachers and the administration regarding teacher evaluation and school governance. CC faculty supported the school in applying for and implementing the PROSE program and projects[1].

7. **Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants.** Evaluations captured the voices of school stakeholders through interviews, focus groups, and other ethnographic techniques. These data have been shared within and beyond academic communities through presentations and scholarly work completed in collaboration with staff from the focus school and even the CC PSTs. We continuously investigated practices and shared the results of those investigations. Several teachers who received coaching engaged in project-based learning with their classes. The teachers shared the results of their projects and experiences with their colleagues during PD, then invited coaches and PD staff to attend class project celebrations. PD sessions were designed to be opportunities for all staff to share and reflect on their pedagogical practices.

   During the last PD workshop series in year 3, we aimed to bring together the result of many different goals for our program. This series capitalized on the creation of a more collaborative school culture, instructional methods that were more interdisciplinary, and student-centered and greater consistency and vertical alignment throughout the school. Many teachers who had been engaging in authentic assessment practices shared and reflected with colleagues on what the analysis of student work and the creation of new assessment and instructional methods had shown them.

   PSTs shared the results of their investigations. Throughout the partnership, PSTs were videorecorded engaging with small groups of children to support the development of self-reflectivity. After the PSTs identified an action research project to focus on, they were recorded engaging with students in that area of the classroom. After they created changes, they were recorded again in the same area of the room. The pre- and post-change videos were routinely shared with their weekly seminars to debrief on their projects and explore the effects of the change on the classroom and children.
8. **Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings.** The partnership created reciprocal relationships with both organizations. While the CC faculty were frequent visitors to the school, the staff from the school also became frequent visitors to the college and have even been asked to teach coursework. The principal, teachers, and paraprofessionals all come to the campus annually to present at a career preparation events. The principal has attended at our departmental faculty meetings. Teachers at the school have served as mentors to PSTs, beyond the fieldwork period. These informal relationships developed naturally and spontaneously, some teachers and PSTs keeping in touch as the PSTs transferred to four-year colleges or to work in the field. The public school also served as a source of employment for several graduates of the CC program. A few were hired to work at the school itself, many more benefitted from the professional connections and network of the cooperating teachers. This was a value-added benefit of the program.
9. **Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.** The seed money for this partnership came from a large private foundation grant. The vast bulk of this money was spent on staffing the PD program and purchasing supplies and equipment for the focus school. Schools in New York City are consistently underfunded, and the project directors knew that to make a program of this scale work, monies would have to help make up for this shortfall. We ordered teaching manipulatives, imaginary play stations, block sets, puzzles, books for classroom libraries. Furthermore, when teachers engaged in project or inquiry-based units, we funded the supplies needed for those studies. The project directors recognized those teachers who worked with the CC PSTs by providing them with additional classroom resources, allowing them to keep the materials from the PST's action research min-grants. This incentivized their interest and commitment to engage and support the PSTs in the action research mini-grant project. Finally, we provided snacks at each PD session to demonstrate our support for the staff's well-being and to build stronger connections. We viewed eating together as community-building, and the staff noted their appreciation for this.

Impact of the Partnership

This model of PDS could potentially change the narrative about how to improve teaching and learning as well as diversify our schools and teaching force. We set out to apply the lessons learned by traditional PDS university partners. We established a

[1] Information about the PROSE program design and assessment frameworks can be found at https://www.uft.org/your-union/uft-programs/prose

clearly defined purpose of our partnership, moving the school toward more progressive teaching methods (Clark, 1999). We collaboratively developed a program grounded in communities of practice, offered targeted and ongoing PD, and improved the learning experiences of PSTs (Castle et al., 2006; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Holmes Group, 1995; Teitel, 2003). We believe that our partnership is unique in our focus on equity, our commitment to evaluation, and most significantly because we are a from a community college.

As we engaged in continuous reflection and analysis of both individual and school culture factors, we revised our plans and goals to reflect the ever-changing needs and priorities of all participants. Our emphasis on full inclusion introduced many challenges into our program. However, this also allowed us to gain insight into the barriers to school improvement and educational development of PSTs that are likely common across both pre-k through 12 schools and PST programs.

Rather than focusing exclusively on academic outcomes, we thought it more important to collaborate to help build the educators' capacity to implement research supported pedagogy while deepening their commitment to school-wide change. Data from interviews/focus groups from our external evaluator show individual differences in teacher and paraprofessional perceptions of the partnership, but overall, most valued the collaboration and partnership. Our most significant results regarding teaching practice were demonstrated through the pre and post classroom observation assessment conducted by the external evaluator. These showed that all but one teacher who participated in three years of our program, increased of an average of 8 points (range 5-15) on their overall teaching practice, most significantly in developmentally appropriate practice, formative assessment, and the use of inquiry. We also found an increase in math and science self-efficacy among teachers who received coaching, similar to findings by Epstein and Willhite (2015).

Evidence regarding the impact of program participation on the CC students suggests that they did benefit in the ways we intended from participation in our program. The CC college has made extensive use of the school as a model of how a culturally and socioeconomically diverse school environment can offer many of the practices, we teach our PSTs (Garte & Kronen, 2021). Our PSTs' participation in an action research project in conjunction with their cooperating teachers has shown a positive impact to the PSTs' sense of belongingness in their cooperating classrooms and commitment to their chosen profession (Garte & Kronen, 2020).

The change in school philosophy and teaching style led to a significant demographic shift in school enrollment since the start of the partnership. In the 2015-2016 school year, there were 174 students enrolled in the focus school, nearly 94% considered economically disadvantaged and qualified for free or reduced-priced lunch. Currently, 249 are students enrolled. While the number of economically disadvantaged students has not fallen, the overall percentage of students considered economically disadvantaged has dropped. The school population has become more racially integrated as well. The current demographic breakdown is: 40% Black, 38% Latinx, 15% White, 4% Asian, and 3% Other. This indicates that while still serving the needs of the students and community who traditionally attended the school, it now serves a larger and more diverse group of students. Research has shown that students from all socioeconomic and racial groups have better educational outcomes when they attend integrated schools (Kahlenberg & Potter, 2012).

While the teaching methods valued by the CC faculty emphasized child-centered approaches over test prep, test scores in both English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics have risen. Also, the number of students exceeding expectations and learning standards and earning the highest scores on the ELA and math increased significantly. Furthermore, there were increases in test scores amongst two key demographic groups within the school: Black and students with disabilities meeting/exceeding standards (NYSED, 2021).

Lessons Learned and Implications for Other Community College Partnerships

When one thinks of PDS, it is usually about the collaboration that occurs between four-year colleges and public schools. However, Community Colleges can create PDS partnerships with schools and provide robust and ongoing training for both pre-service and in-service teachers. Community college based PDS programs may even have unique advantages over their 4-year counterparts. Our students start their practicum experiences and actual teaching much earlier than PSTs in traditional programs, which has shown to be beneficial for both the PSTs and the partner schools (Guthery & Bailes, 2022; McIntyre et al, 2018; Segal, 2020). Additionally, community college faculty do not necessarily have the same limitations as described by Yendol-Hoppey and Smith (2011). While our teacher department is small, our tenured and tenure-track faculty are regularly in clinical settings and engaged with our partner schools often. Moreover, we have less demanding research and publications expectations as our colleagues at research institutions and are less constrained by the negative perceptions about "work in schools" (Yendol-Hoppey & Smith, 2011). These differences might be why the most effective elements for our CC PSTs were their relationships with their cooperating teachers and professors over the course of the yearlong fieldwork. Supporting these relationships towards optimal functioning required extra time and effort on the part of the project directors. We held additional meetings outside of our standard teaching hours with PSTs-co-teacher teams and provided a tremendous amount of assistance and troubleshooting regarding the action research projects. While this extra effort paid off, it may be difficult to implement in a program where faculty are not able to spend so much time in a school.

Finally, community college faculty might find relationship and trust building easier than our colleges at research institutions. The fact that we enjoy the lowest levels of prestige in academia (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Nagler 2004) may

ameliorate the perceived power differential that exists between university faculty and school staff in partnerships (Semel, 2010). Also, we are a department of practitioners, both full time and adjunct faculty have enjoyed with long careers in the field and are already widely known by the teachers in our partner school.

We were not immune to many of the same issues facing other PDS partnerships. The most significant conclusion that we drew from our partnership was the importance of establishing a clearly defined shared vision with full "buy-in" from all members of the learning community and the importance of establishing trust between institutional stakeholders. Although we believe our program was unique in its inclusivity and co-creation, we also recognize that we needed to devote more time to collaborative planning. Furthermore, our partnership would have been strengthened by a more concrete definition of the administration's goals for the school and the instruction they wanted in classrooms. Although we used the same language, such as "inquiry-based", "child-centered" and "progressive", we never insisted that the administration and teachers together with our team agree on a clear model of what that should look like within classrooms. As our partnership took shape many assumed commonalities that had not been explicitly defined, were revealed as major differences between stakeholders. As a result, the cohesion of our program was limited. Clear communication is key to fostering a strong and ongoing partnership.

Some factors limited the extent to which the two institutions could formally collaborate. During the 3rd year of the program, we aimed to work collaboratively with select teachers to provide "model classrooms" that our PSTs and college faculty could make use of throughout their coursework. However, logistical challenges related to time and teacher directives interfered with full implementation of this goal. In addition, cross institutional collaborations were limited by staffing changes, new mandates within the school district, and the lack of direct support for time commitments among teachers and administration. Although some aspects of this partnership may be replicable to larger scale initiatives and 4-year schools, the comprehensive and intensive nature of our involvement as well as the relationship-based method with which we learned about and responded to the ever-changing needs of the school community would be difficult to replicate.

Conclusion

PDS partnerships with community colleges can foster community within schools and outside of schools, for children, families, PSTs, staff, and faculty. The idea that CC PSTs can become teachers and should be strongly encouraged to do so, counteracts a stigma about such PSTs, that they do not possess the academic skills or potential to complete teacher certification requirements. Changing that narrative through mutual sharing of successes can help incentivize CCs to promote their teacher education programs as vehicles for change in the teaching force. Community Colleges like ours, educate a diverse group of future educators, thereby helping to create cohorts of teacher that reflect the changing demographics of the U.S. student population. Having deep ties to a school community through a PDS partnership may help CC PSTs develop the sense of belonging that will increase their self-efficacy and commitment to the field of education (Bjorklund, et al. 2020) CC faculty can contribute to the growth of a school's culture, while PSTs benefit from the mentorship and time in the PDS school classrooms. SUP

References

Bebas, C. (2016). School-university partnerships: The professional development schools model, self-efficacy, teacher efficacy, and its impact on beginning teachers. *School-University Partnerships*, *9*(2), 18-27

Bjorklund, P., Jr., Daly, A. J., Ambrose, R., & Van Es, E. A. (2020). Connections and capacity: An exploration of preservice teachers' sense of belonging, social networks, and self-efficacy in three teacher education programs. *AERA Open, 6*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858420901496

Breault, R., & Breault, D. A. (2011). *Professional development schools: Researching lessons from the field*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.

Castle S., Fox R. K., & Souder, K. O. (2006) Do professional development schools (PDSs) make a difference? A comparative study of PDS and non-PDS teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(1), 65-80. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105284211

Clark, R. W. (1999). *Effective professional development schools. Agenda for education in a democracy series. Volume 3*. Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college*. Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of 'No Child Left Behind.' *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *10*(3), 245-260. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503207

Darling-Hammond, L., Bullmaster, M. L., & Cobb, V. L. (1995). Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, *96*(1), 87-106. https://doi.org/10.1086/461816

Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession. *National Staff Development Council*, *12*.

Derman-Sparks, L., & Edwards, J. O. (2010). *Anti-bias education for young children and ourselves* (Vol. 254). National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Dewey, J. (1956). *The child and the curriculum and the school and society* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press. (Original works published 1899 and 1902)

Dresden, J., Blankenship, S. S., Capuozzo, R. M., Nealy, A. U., & Tavernier, M. D. (2016). What is a PDS? Reframing the conversation. *School-University Partnerships*, *9*(3), 64-80.

Epstein, A., & Willhite, G. L. (2015). Teacher efficacy in an early childhood professional development school. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education,* 7(2), 189-198. https://iejee.com/index.php/IEJEE/article/view/74

Fall, M. S. B. (2018). Presenting a social justice and equity-oriented PDS research model: Example of a sensory ethnography of the

experiences of English learners and the role of raciolinguistics. *School-University Partnerships*, *11*(3), 1-11.

Fisler, J., & Firestone, W. (2006). Teacher learning in a school-university partnership: Exploring the role of social trust and teaching efficacy beliefs. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(6), 1155-1185. https://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=12521

Floyd, D., & Arnauld, C. (2007). An exploratory study of community college baccalaureate teacher education programs: Lessons learned. *Community College Review, 35*(1), 66-84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552107302237

Foster, K., Reed, H., & McGinnis, K. (2009). After the funding flees: A how-to model for sustaining the professional development school partnership. *School-University Partnerships*, *3*(1), 113-118.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Garas-York, K., del Prado Hill, P., Day, L. K., Truesdell, K., & Keller Mathers, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Doing PDS: Stories and strategies from successful clinically rich practice*. Information Age Publishing.

Garte, R., & Kronen, C. (2020). You've met your match: Using culturally relevant pairing to cultivate mentoring relationships during the early practicum experience of CC Preservice Teachers. *The Teacher Educator, 55*(4), 347-372. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2020.1799128

Garte, R., & Kronen, C. (2021). From the margins of the classroom to mattering: How community college education students develop future teacher identities. *The Educational Forum*, 175-192. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2020.1789796

Grubb, W. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. Routledge.

Guthery, S., & Bailes, L. P. (2022). Patterns of teacher attrition by preparation pathway and initial school type. *Educational Policy*, *36*(2), 223-246. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904819874754

Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education: A report of the Holmes Group*. Author.

Hunzicker, J. (2018), Professional development schools: An overview and brief history. In Hunzicker, J. (Ed.), *Teacher leadership in professional development schools* (pp. 1-17). Emerald. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78743-403-520181001

Kahlenberg, R., & Potter, H. (2012). Diverse charter schools: Can racial and socioeconomic integration promote better outcomes for students? *Century Foundation*.

Kaplan, M. (2018). *It takes a community: Leveraging community college capacity to transform the early childhood workforce*. Bellwether Education Partners https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED585914.pdf

Lave, J., Wenger, E., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (Vol. 521423740). Cambridge University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Magaldi, D., Conway, T. & Trub, L. (2016). "I'm here for a reason": minority teachers bridging many divides in urban education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248822

Marchitello, M., & Trinidad, J. (2019). Preparing teachers for diverse schools: Lessons from minority serving institutions. *Bellwether Education Partners*.

McIntyre, C. J., Curry, D. L., & King, B. (2018). Mutually beneficial professional development partnerships: One model. *School-University Partnerships*, *11*(3), 1-14. https://3atjfr1bmy981egf6x3utg20-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/McIntyre.pdf

McNall, M., Reed, C.S., Brown, R., & Allen, A. (2009). Brokering community–university engagement. *Innovative Higher Education, 33*, 317–331. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-008-9086-8

Nagler, A. (2007). *The influences of institutional reputation on the labor market outcomes of education and training: A case study of community college nursing programs*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. North Carolina State University. https://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/bitstream/handle/1840.16/4193/etd.pdf?sequence=1

National Association for Professional Development Schools. (2008). What it means to be a professional development school. http://www.napds.org/9%20Essentials/statement.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Trend generator: Postsecondary Enrollment by Sector of Institution*. U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved May 3, 2021, from https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/TrendGenerator/app/build-table/2/2?rid=1&cid=9

New York State Education Department. (2021). School report card data. https://data.nysed.gov/

Ridley, D. S., Hurwitz, S., Hackett, M. R. D., & Miller, K. K. (2005). Comparing PDS and campus-based preservice teacher preparation: Is PDS-based preparation really better? *Journal of Teacher Education*, *56*(1), 46-56.

Rodgers, C. (2010). The role of descriptive inquiry in building presence and civic capacity. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *Handbook of reflection and reflective inquiry* (pp. 45-61). Springer.

Schwab, J. J. (1960). Inquiry, the science teacher, and the educator. *The School Review*, *68*(2), 176-195. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1083585

Segal, P. H. (2018). Breaking with tradition: A new approach to professional development schools. *School-University Partnerships*, *11*(3), 1-19.

Sensoy, O., & DiAngelo, R. (2017). *Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. Teachers College Press.

Semel, S. F. (Ed.). (2010). *Foundations of education: The essential texts*. Routledge.

Shroyer, M. G., Yahnke, S. J., Miller, T., Dunn, C., & Bridges, N. Y. (2014). The development of the KSU PDS model: 25 years in the making. *Educational Considerations*, *42*(1), 3-10. https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.1047

Teitel, L. (2003). *The professional development schools handbook: Starting, sustaining, and assessing partnerships that improve student learning*. Corwin Press.

Trent, J. (2012). Teacher professional development through a school-university partnership. What role does teacher identity play? *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(7). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n7.2

Walsh, M., & Backe, S. (2013). School-university partnerships: Reflections and opportunities. *Peabody Journal of Education, 88*(5), 594-607.

Widdal, V., Lachance, A., & Livermore, J. (2019). Learning while building: Enhancing opportunities for teacher candidate development within professional development schools through programmatic an analysis. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education, 10*(2), 72-89.

Xiao, B., & Tobin, J. (2018). The use of video as a tool for reflection with preservice teachers. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*, *39*(4), 328-345. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904819874754

Yenawine, P. (2013). *Visual thinking strategies: Using art to deepen learning across school disciplines*. Harvard Education Press.

Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Smith, J. J. (2011). What do we know about accountability and resources in professional development schools? *Teachers College Record, 113*(14), 531- 566. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811111301413

❖ ❖ ❖

Cara Kronen is an associate professor of educational foundations at Borough of Manhattan Community College. Her research areas include Urban Education, teacher workforce development and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

CKronen@bmcc.cuny.edu BMCC-CUNY 199 Chamber Street 616G New York, NY 10007

Rebecca Garte, PhD is professor within the Teacher Education Department of Borough of Manhattan Community College (CUNY). Her grant funded research has used observational and mixed methods to understand the factors that contribute to cognitive and social emotional outcomes for young children through late adolescence. She he has partnered with NYC public schools to create professional development interventions designed to investigate teachers' professional identities and practice from pre-service to in-service.

RGarte@bmcc.cuny.edu BMCC-CUNY 199 Chamber Street 616G New York, NY 10007

Jennifer Longley, EdD is an associate professor at Borough of Manhattan Community College- CUNY. Her research interests include infant-toddler educator development and exploring experiences of early childhood teachers.

JLongley@bmcc.cuny.edu BMCC-CUNY 199 Chamber Street 616G New York, NY 10007