Weaving Teacher Education into the Fabric of Urban Schools and Communities

By Jana Noel

Urban schools and communities face numerous challenges: Urban poverty; high mobility and displacement in and out of neighborhoods; inadequate funding to adequately cover the educational, social, and health needs of children and their families; and high teacher turnover are just a few examples. Too often, schools and teachers are inadequately prepared for the social, political, and economic conditions impacting the lives of their urban students, families, and communities. This is because, as Keyes and Gregg (2001) explain, "while an urban school is located *in* a community, it is not often *of the community*. Employees are rarely neighborhood residents. Many do not share the culture or race of their students" (p. 32). Koerner and Abdul-Tawwab (2006) add that "Most teachers in urban classrooms…often teach in communities that they have never previously even visited" (p. 37).

Jana Noel is a professor in the Department of Teacher Education and is the Community Engagement Faculty Scholar at California State University, Sacramento.

Clearly, a greater effort must be made to ensure that future teachers in urban areas learn to see themselves as part of a school's community. Indeed, such a movement has begun, as Murrell (2001) documents.

> A key component of the new national agenda is collaboration among institutions of higher education, the K-12 schools they work with, and a broad community constituency. The success of urban school reform will depend, in part, on how the

university, to learn, not that teachers, pre-service teachers, and teacher educators go into the community to learn. However, a growing set of literature is defining communities in terms of their assets, or the term used here, their strengths. Theories of community strengths urge teachers to go into the community, meeting and partnering with community members and agencies, to learn about the important community strengths that can then be utilized in a more culturally relevant education.

Funds of Knowledge

The concept "funds of knowledge," introduced by Moll, Amanti, Neff, and González (1992), refers to the sets of cultural and strategic knowledge and skills found within a particular community. Moll et al. (1992) describe funds of knowledge as a family's "development and exchange of resources—including knowledge, skills, and labor—that enhance the households' ability to survive or thrive" (p. 73). Funds of knowledge can include such cultural components as language and traditions, or can include the strategic network of relationships established within and outside the family and community. This community knowledge often does not coincide with the types of knowledge valued in the educational system, but when a teacher takes the time to learn and recognize a community's funds of knowledge, that set of cultural and strategic skills, she can more effectively draw on those to create a culturally relevant classroom (Ladson-Billings, 2006).

Community Cultural Wealth

In a similar fashion, Yosso (2005) developed the concept of "community cultural wealth," which "focuses on and learns from the array of cultural knowledge, skills, abilities, and contacts possessed by socially marginalized groups that often go unrecognized and unacknowledged" (Yosso, 2005, p. 69). Yosso (2005) details six types of "capital" held by members of marginalized communities.

1. "Aspirational capital"—"the ability to maintain hopes and dreams for the future, even in the face of real and perceived barriers" (Yosso, 2005, p. 77), also known as resiliency.

2. "Linguistic capital"—"the intellectual and social skills attained through communication experiences in more than one language and/or style." (Yosso, 2005, p. 78)

3. "Familial capital"—"those cultural knowledges nurtured among *familia* (kin) that carry a sense of community history, memory and cultural intuition." (Yosso, p. 79)

4. "Social capital"—"networks of people and community resources. These peer and other social contacts can provide both instrumental and emotional support to navigate through society's institutions." (Yosso, p. 79)

5. "Navigational capital"—"skills maneuvering through social institutions." (Yosso, p. 80)

> new national agenda makes good on its enthusiasm for creating new 'communities of learning,' embracing diversity, and preparing teachers through community and collaborative partnership. (p. 2)

Tying this directly to teacher education, Koerner and Abdul-Tawabl (2006) state simply that "It is the responsibility of Colleges of Education to enhance teacher education programs through community bridging, making and sustaining authentic collegial relationships with parents of students in urban schools and community organizations" (p. 39).

A number of socially transformative implications of connecting teacher education with urban schools and communities have been documented, including building trust with local communities (Murrell, 2001; Reed, 2004); creating a greater commitment to community through service learning (Andrews, 2009; Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 2000); preparing culturally responsive future teachers (Ladson-Billings 2006) who are more effective when working with community members to support classroom learning (Shirley et al., 2006); increasing the number pre-service teachers who choose to teach in an urban low income or diverse school (Noel, 2006; Wong & Glass, 2005) and are more likely to continue teaching in an urban school (Quartz, Priselac, & Franke, 2009); participating in community organizing (Oakes, Rogers, & Lipton 2006), and transforming the educational system (Au, 2002; Solomon, Manoukian, & Clarke 2005).

Despite the successes of connecting urban teacher education with school and community, these efforts have also been criticized for having a university-led focus. There is often an inequality of roles, with university programs and faculty setting the tone for interactions. Even when there are multi-leveled groups that involve university, schools, community members, and community groups and agencies in the discussions, it is often the university that provides the impetus and expertise to initiate change, not the community's own authentic efforts at change (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996; Reed, 2004; Weiner, 2000). As Zeichner (2010) points out, "even in the current wave of school-university partnerships in teacher education, colleges and universities continue to maintain hegemony over the construction and dissemination of knowledge" (p. 90).

To be a more meaningful part of the commitment to the development of teachers who are more authentically connected to community, teacher education programs must respond by transforming their focus and strategies to work more intimately with their urban communities and community-based organizations. In so doing, urban teacher education can move toward a more democratic form of education with input form all involved. This article presents one such urban teacher education program, framed by theories of community strengths, presence, trust, and critical identity theory.

Urban Teacher Education Center

Responding to the calls for teacher education to develop stronger connections

with their local schools and communities, in 2004 the Sacramento State Urban Teacher Education Center (UTEC) was created. UTEC is a teacher preparation program designed to prepare future teachers to work in low income, culturally and linguistically diverse urban schools and communities. UTEC moved teacher preparation off of the university campus and into Broadway Circle School (pseudonym), an urban elementary school in Sacramento.

Broadway Circle School is a very low income, culturally and linguistically diverse elementary school in a large Northern California city that serves children from two neighborhood public housing projects. Every family in the projects receives some form of federal assistance and 94% of students in the school receive free-or-reduced lunch, a federal measurement of poverty. The school's student demographics are 59% African American and 94% children of color. English Language Learners make up 23% of the school's population, with the main home languages being Spanish, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Marshallese, and Mien. Both Broadway Circle School and the school district in which it is located are in *Program Improvement* status, indicating that student test scores have not met the target set by the No Child Left Behind standards.

UTEC's level of diversity is much lower, as 80% of the university students and faculty in the program are White, middle class, monolingual English speakers, none of whom live in the Broadway Circle School neighborhood. A key principle driving the creation of the Urban Teacher Education Center, then, was that by moving teacher education into urban schools and communities, pre-service teachers and faculty would better understand the realities of urban education, including the social, political, and economic conditions impacting the lives and education of urban children and their families (Noel, 2006). UTEC operates under the principle that in order to effectively educate children in urban settings, teachers must learn about and engage in the communities of their students. Becoming part of the daily fabric of an urban community, through collaboration between universities, teacher education programs, urban schools, communities, and community-based organizations, should transform all partners. As Reid (2007) writes, "teacher education embedded within the context of inner-city education" (p. 228) can lead to transformation of teacher education, schools, and communities.

Theoretical Framework

UTEC, and this article, is defined by four theoretical frameworks: (a) community strengths, (b) theories of presence, (c) trust, and (d) critical/identity theory.

Theories of Community Strengths

Teachers, pre-service teachers, and teacher educators, as discussed earlier, are not often from the community of the school where they do their work. The expectation of traditional views on education is that students come to the school, or the

6. "Resistant capital"—"knowledges and skills fostered through oppositional behavior that challenges inequality." (Yosso, p. 80)

When urban educators come to realize that many children and their families maintain these forms of community cultural wealth, even through difficult times, educators can learn to build upon these to help support students and families.

As González, Moll, and Amanti (2005) write about the funds of knowledge approach, utilizing community strengths is "for educators who are willing to venture beyond the walls of the classroom. It is for those teachers and teachers-to-be who are willing to learn from their students and their communities" (p. ix).

Critical Identity Theory

In an urban teacher education program that seeks to integrate into a school and its community, merely locating a program at a school does not automatically equate to strong connections with the neighboring community (Noel, in press; Shirley et al., 2006). This is especially true in programs like UTEC, in which the university students and faculty are largely White, middle class, monolingual English speakers, operating a program within a very low income, highly diverse school and community. Such programs must consistently consider how people in the neighborhoods may take a racially, economically, educationally marked view of the university students and faculty, marking them as "other" while still assigning them with privilege (Noel, in press). At the same time, community members are also marked as "other" within the same categories. We are all working through how we see each other and how we can work together. To proceed within the framework of critical identity theory, then, entails directly addressing the impact of race, class, power, and privilege, especially White privilege, and how those interact to create power relations in low income, urban communities and schools. The discussion of critical identity theory that follows here focuses on Whiteness, surveillance, subtractive schooling, and the discourse of lived cultures.

Whiteness

UTEC has operated within Giroux's (1997b) and Rodriguez's (2000) perspective that Whites need to critically examine the impact of their race on relationships across race. As Giroux (1997b) writes, there needs to be a rearticulation of Whiteness in which Whites must "learn to engage in a critical pedagogy of self-formation that allows them to cross racial lines…to begin to forge multiracial coalitions based on a critical engagement rather than a denial of 'Whiteness'" (p. 299). Further, as Rodriguez (2000) describes, "Not disingenuously opting out of one's Whiteness, then, entails going head-on with, while at the same time re-working one's, Whiteness" (p. 17).

Surveillance

Part of the positioning of Whiteness as power is the institutionalized mecha-

nisms of surveillance in public housing projects. As part of our experiences within the Broadway Circle communities, UTEC faculty have learned that virtually any outsider, especially any White, professionally dressed outsider, will be seen as a threat to the neighborhood's well-being. The rules in public housing are extremely stringent, and families can be evicted for even minor infractions of either societal laws or neighborhood regulations. There is a feeling of surveillance, with federal, state, county, and city agencies coming into the main office to check on residents' statuses. There is a community policing unit within one of the Broadway Circle housing complexes, in an effort to ease the relations between community and police force. In other words, there is a high level of surveillance in the neighborhoods, exerting an ever-increasing level of control over both public and private lives (Noel, in press). And as Foucault (1977) explains, the surveillance and control emphasizes the "normal," the status quo, the cultural practices of those with power. These community members are outside the system of power, and status quo has brought them continued residence in the projects with continued surveillance. As Foucault (1977) writes,

> The judges of normality are present everywhere. We are in the society of the teacher-judge, the doctor-judge, the educator-judge, the 'social worker'-judge, it is on them that the universal reign of the normative is based; and each individual, wherever he may find himself, subjects to it his body, his gestures, his behavior, his aptitudes, his achievements. (p. 304)

It is likely that, at least at first, teacher education programs locating themselves within schools that serve public housing will be considered as "judges of normality." Teacher educators, and pre-service teachers, are teacher-judges, educator-judges, and in some ways, social worker-judges.

Subtractive Schooling

In a myriad of ways, then, a teacher education program located within an urban school and community can unintentionally cause social and psychological harm to that community if the relationships are developed without an awareness of these various components of critical identity theory. The idea of "judges of normality" can also be discussed in terms of Valenzuela's (1999) term "subtractive schooling." Any claim that the mainstream set of knowledge and experiences are the more acceptable form of life "can compromise students' [and adults'] relationships with peers, thereby circumventing their opportunity to participate in social networks characterized by the exchange of academic resources" (Pease-Alvarez, 2000, para. 2), thus circumventing their opportunities to participate in and fully benefit from their own communities' funds of knowledge and sets of cultural and strategic strengths.

While Valenzuela is speaking in terms of K-12 classrooms, the same can be said for teacher education programs located within those classrooms. Not only do university programs need to be aware of the dangers of subtractive schooling in classrooms, but also in all interactions with adults in the school and community

as well. When working in urban schools and communities, universities must recognize "the lived experiences of children [and adults] as they negotiate the myriad social relationships that define their lives" (Pease-Alvarez, 2000, para. 1). In so doing, pre-service teachers and teacher educators may eventually be included in a community member's attempts to participate in a social network that exchanges neighborhood and academic resources, and it is these sorts of conversations that can work to diminish the effects of subtractive schooling.

The Discourse of Lived Cultures

Continuing with the concept of recognizing "the lived experiences" (Pease-Alverez, 2000, para. 1) of children and adults, Giroux (1997a) speaks of "the discourse of lived cultures." Giroux describes the discourse of lived cultures as "an understanding of how [community members] give meaning to their lives through complex historical, cultural, and political forms that they both embody and produce" (p. 140). By listening to and learning from community members, teacher educators and pre-service teachers can begin to understand how they perceive their neighborhood, the school, and society overall.

In one example from UTEC, two parents conversed with the Coordinator about why they moved with their children to this public housing complex, how incarceration affects families and neighbors, their hopes for their children and grandchildren, and changes in children's behavior over generations. These community members also wanted to engage the Coordinator in a discussion about outside perceptions of their neighborhood, including issues of stereotyping. This example portrays how a true discourse may occur around how "members of dominant and subordinate groups offer accounts of who they are in their different readings of the world" (Giroux, 1997a, p. 140).

And finally, as much as this article is arguing for moving teacher education into urban schools and communities for the outcome of weaving into the fabric of everyday life, it also must be recognized that, framed within critical identity theory, community members may not welcome those attempts. Daniel's (2007) definition of community helps describe the likely outcome of the newly developed relationships between university, school, and urban community:

> the community to which I refer is a group of persons wherein the members remain aware of the intersections of oppressions, the multiple relational dynamics inherent in that space, and are continually working at making the community a comprehensive learning space for all of its members. (p. 32)

Theories of Presence

As discussed in the previous section, there are both real and perceived differences in level of authority and voice between community and university. Communities may not readily accept efforts of schools and universities to take a community learning approach to their lives. As Reed (2004) describes:

> Low-income neighborhoods are jaded by the comings and goings of organizations that have no grassroots base in the community…Local residents are weary of seeing new initiatives come and go. They are tired of the disruptions caused by those who live outside the neighborhood who try to offer solutions that, no matter how well intentioned, are not grounded in the realities of the street. (p. 81)

Recognizing this very real possibility, Murrell (2001) introduces the term "humility of practice," with which he reminds us that educators "have to avoid the fatal assumption that they know all they need to know about the culture, values, traditions, and heritages of the people they purportedly serve" (p. 31). When working to connect with a community, teachers, administrators, and faculty must come to recognize that they will be working with organizations, groups, and individuals whose lives are different than their own.

These efforts take not only effort, but also simply time. Murrell's (1991, 2001) concept of teacher education programs "being there" in schools and communities come into play here. As Murrell (2001) and Reed (2004) both describe, communities ask that we be physically present in schools in order to learn, to show commitment, and to build trust with community members. Community members need to realize that community oriented educators are there, in the community, for the long term. Further, not only does a teacher education program need to "be there" on a consistent basis, it also needs to be willing and ready to address the needs identified by the community. Murrell (2001) is aware of this concern within urban neighborhoods, when he writes that

> Critical pedagogy is a perspective that…our research, our theory, and our program development must be loosely linked to the everyday practical activities of school and community development. This means the elimination of 'helperism' in our relationship to our partners in urban communities and working with them on *their* enterprises of change. (pp. 32-33)

Rosenberg's (1997) sense of "dwelling" is another way to describe the importance of "being there," of spending time in the community. As Rosenberg describes, "We need to think about what it means for us to 'dwell' in the institution. To ask our students and ourselves to 'dwell' is to ask ourselves to exist in a given place, to fasten our attention, to tarry, to look again. We take root, day after day" (p. 88). With time, commitment, and humility of practice, urban educators can build trust with the community while learning with community members.

Theories of Trust

The most important requirement for the development of school-community-university connections is the development of trust. Such disparate organizations and groups need to feel both that they can trust the other, and that the other trusts them.

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) have identified five facets of trust involved in developing and establishing trust between people and organizations: benevolence,

honesty, openness, reliability, and competence. A key thread weaving through these facets of trust is the confidence that one person or organization has in the partner's intentions toward the people and project. As Tschannen-Moran (2004) writes, "Perhaps the most essential ingredient and commonly recognized facet of trust is a sense of caring or benevolence; the confidence that one's well-being or something one cares about will be protected and not harmed by the trusted party" (p. 19).

However, collaborative relationships do not begin with all five facets of trust already in place. Rather, trust builds over time. "Trust is a dynamic phenomenon that takes on a different character at different stages of a relationship. As a relationship develops, trust 'thickens' (Gambetta, 1988)" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy 2000, p. 570). Several authors describe the stages in developing trust between two institutional partners. First, when partners do not have a professional or personal relationship, they will make a calculation about the worthiness of a potential collaborative partner based on factors such as the amount of risk connected with the collaboration and whether the activities and partners can be monitored (Gambetta, 1988). This calculation of possible trust may be based in part on a trust in the profession; schools and community organizations trust universities in the institutional sense, and vice versa. Since there often are both regulatory and ethical characteristics attached to institutions, these characteristics may be used as part of the determination of trust at this initial level (Bottery, 2003).

Second, as the collaboration begins and activities commence, partners can gauge the repeated activities and level of commitment of their partners. At this stage trust moves beyond speculative calculation and reaches a new level based on knowledge of practice in a common realm (Bottery, 2003; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). This is a developing knowledge of individuals' work, commitment, and trustworthiness.

Third, as partners spend time working together, and repeated collaborative activities have been effective, partners come to recognize that they have developed relationships based on shared goals, procedures, and beliefs (Stefkovich & Shapiro, 2002). They come to realize that they can act on behalf of each other, comfortable and confident in the decisions, activities, and outcomes of the partnership.

Once these stages of partnership development have been reached, a nearly authentic partnership can be claimed. Flexibility is a hallmark of the mature partnership that has gone through this process of trust development (Hands, 2005). As challenges inevitably occur when individuals and organizations that may be of a fundamentally different nature interact, a more authentic partnership can expect partners to be able to act with flexibility, to enact change when needed, and to incorporate new community needs and institutional demands.

UTEC and Broadway Circle School

The Urban Teacher Education Center has operated under the theories of com-

munity strengths, with a focus on presence in the school and community—being there, dwelling, and taking root. It exemplifies the mature partnership in terms of trust, , while still continuously utilizing critical identity theory to examine its partnership in terms of race, class, power, and privilege. While a previous article describes the establishment of UTEC (Noel, 2006), the remainder of this article will describe the collaborative activities undertaken by UTEC, Broadway Circle School, and the Circle community organization, concluding with an evaluation of the program after five years of existence.

Family Resource Center

UTEC students, the UTEC Coordinator, and Broadway Circle School's Assistant Principal were responsible for creating the Family Resource Center in Broadway Circle School. In the spring of 2006 UTEC students served coffee to parents, assisted with computer access, and operated the children's book give-away section and the parent book exchange. In the spring of 2007, UTEC students opened the Family Resource Center to meet with parents and to help facilitate the principal's "Coffee and Conversation." This center now serves as a classroom for parent education, including a parenting workshop offered by the local university and a G.E.D. course offered by the school district.

MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement)

In the spring of 2007, UTEC students, with their professor and a second grade teacher, initiated the MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement) program at Broadway Circle School. Over 60 children participated in MESA, and UTEC student teachers taught the weekly activities. Three Broadway Circle School students won first place out of 500 students at the spring 2007 MESA competition. The MESA program continues today, with UTEC students helping regular classroom teachers to facilitate the weekly program.

Broadway Circle School Library

Broadway Circle School did not have a librarian in 2005-2006, so the library could not be utilized by children. UTEC students opened and operated the library during three lunchtime periods each week during the spring of 2006. Broadway Circle School students were able to go to the library to read during their lunch time. Records indicate that 80 students took advantage of the opportunity to go to the library during their lunch recess. Now that the school has a part-time librarian, UTEC students currently assist in the library, re-shelving books and creating bulletin boards.

Lunch Buddies

UTEC students in spring and fall of 2007 served as lunch buddies, matching with an individual student from Broadway Circle School to provide an adult mentor for selected students during their lunch one day per week.

University Field Trip for 5th and 6th Graders

Consistent with Broadway Circle School's focus on making students aware of the importance of attending college, UTEC students and Coordinator helped the principal and teaching staff organize and then helped lead a field trip of 5th and 6th graders to the local university in the spring of 2007.

Family Literacy Nights

UTEC students helped Broadway Circle School's reading coach and several classroom teachers plan, prepare, and facilitate a Family Literacy Night in the spring of 2007. Approximately 30 children and their families attend this first offering of the event. The Family Literacy Night has continued each semester since, with UTEC students helping to plan and facilitate the program.

Circle Community Tutoring/Mentoring Center

After-school tutoring/mentoring program within one of the housing projects was created and is operated by two men who grew up in the neighborhood, moved out to get their college degrees, and now give back to their former community by running the Circle Community Tutoring/Mentoring Center. UTEC students were invited to serve as tutors and mentors for the program, which serves approximately 100 children per year. This has now developed into a direct partnership between UTEC and the Circle community organization, and operates somewhat independently of the school. The UTEC Coordinator nominated the program for a Community Partnership Award from the local university, which they received in the spring of 2006.

"Community Liaison"

While serving as UTEC Coordinator, the author took a sabbatical during the fall 2006 semester, serving as an unofficial "community liaison," working to connect the school, the university, and the neighborhood community. She spent time building closer connections between Broadway Circle School and the neighboring public housing projects, as well as at the social services serving these communities. She also initiated a Community Outreach Committee at the school to help further the community involvement efforts of the school and communities.

After School Arts Program

UTEC students in the spring of 2008 initiated an After School Arts Program, which involved 15 K-6 students in music, arts and crafts. The result was the first After School Arts Showcase during the Back-to-School Night.

Evaluation of UTEC

After five years of collaboration, it was time to evaluate the impact of UTEC within the school and community (Noel, 2010). Evaluation instruments included

Likert Scale surveys, open-ended surveys, interviews, and a focus group (See Table 1). Questions asked reflect the themes found in the literature on urban community-based teacher education, critical theory, and trust, including the five themes listed below:

1. Perceptions of the benefits of the program for children and UTEC students.

2. Level of equality in partnerships (whether they feel valued in the process, whether they feel they have a say in the program's activities).

3. Perceptions related to trust and outsider status.

4. Communication issues (understanding the purpose of the program, timeliness of information, flow of communication channels, enough effort gathering information from school and community members).

5. Self-efficacy (I feel I make a difference, I will continue this work in the future).

Table 1

Instrument	Participants	N	% of total in group	Time of data gathering
Likert Scale Survey (LS)	Teachers	5	38%	Second-to-last week of 2008-2009 school year
	Support Staff (reading coach, library aide, office staff, custodial staff, playground staff)	5	38%	
	Administrator	1	50%	
Interviews (I)	Administrators	2	100%	Second-to-last week of 2008-2009 school year
	Teachers	2	15%	
	Support Staff	2	15%	
Focus Group (FG)	Community leaders	3	N/A	Two weeks after 2008-2009 school year ended
Open-ended Survey	Parents	17	30% of parents attending Open House 10% of school's total population of parents	2009 Spring Open House—a 15 minute time period just before event began Raffled two $25 Target gift cards

Findings

Benefits of the Program

Ninety-five percent of respondents in all evaluation instruments agreed that having UTEC at the school and community benefits the school's children and UTEC students (Likert Scale Question #2 and #6; Interview & Focus Group Question #9 and #12). However, when asked if they feel that UTEC students are adequately prepared to engage in the partnership activities (LS #7), 27% disagreed. Responses from interviews and the focus group (I & FG #29) confirmed the concern over lack of preparation. Interestingly, the concerns were expressed at a higher rate by support staff and community members (50%) than by school personnel (20%). The largest number of concerns from staff and community related to UTEC students' preparation for participating in the particular non-classroom-related activities coordinated by each of these respondents, including library and tutoring, and these respondents requested an initial training tied to the specific programs they operate.

Level of Equality in the Partnership

Likert Scale questions #10 and #11 asked whether participants felt like they "have a say" in what activities UTEC undertakes at the school and community (63% agreed) and in the organization of those activities (timing, number of students involved, etc.) (54% agreed). These two questions on the survey comprise the largest percentage of disagreement, with 36% and 45% either marking disagree or strongly disagree. Interestingly, more teachers perceived a lack of voice in these matters (50%), than support staff (20%). This is consistent with the interviews and the focus group (I & FG #4), in which one administrator described not having much say in the program while the community members felt very empowered to make decisions regarding the particular UTEC/community collaborative program that they coordinate.

Trust and Outsider Status

All school personnel respondents except for one teacher indicated that they "feel comfortable expressing my thoughts and opinions about UTEC to UTEC faculty" (LS #14). 100% of survey respondents responded either agree or strongly agree that "I feel that I can trust UTEC faculty and students" (LS #19), while one support staff member indicated disagreement with the statement that "I feel that UTEC faculty and students trust me" (LS #20).

Participants were also asked if they had any concerns about "outsiders" coming into the school or community. In LS #21, two respondents felt some concern originally about "outsiders" coming in, but in LS #22 it can be seen that those concerns had disappeared, as none expressed concerns about UTEC as "outsiders" currently. The community leaders in the focus group expressed two original concerns, now alleviated, related to outsiders. One, they thought that the program

might bring in a set of judgments about the lives of the people in the projects (a la Foucault, 1977). Two, they were sure that UTEC would not "stick around" (a la Reed, 2004). The community leaders expressed that they are "amazed" that UTEC is still active in their community after five years.

Communication

All interviewees and focus group members (I & FG #7 and #8) indicated that they feel comfortable and confident in communications with UTEC, with information flowing both ways smoothly and frequently. However, in the Likert Scale survey (LS #15), 27% of teachers and support staff disagreed that "an appropriate level of effort has been made to gather input from school and community members about UTEC structure and activities." Parents also need to be part of this communication feedback loop, and Q#1 of the parent survey asked "Has your child ever told you about the university students at Broadway Circle School?" Twenty-three percent of parents responded yes, 76% reported no. The three parents who answered the open-ended question regarding suggestions, all with children in grades K-1, expressed the desire to have more opportunities available for the primary aged children (since the focus of most UTEC activities is grades 2-6). As one parent wrote, "Be more available to the children who need it," because, as another parent wrote, "Children in 1st grade etc. should have a chance to go. The earlier the better." The third parent wrote "I did not know of the program for the university," and expressed verbally that it "sounds great" and she would like to learn more about it.

Self-Efficacy

A number of strong responses were given in the interviews and focus group regarding how the UTEC program has enabled the participants to feel like they can "make a difference" in either the lives of the children or the lives of the UTEC students (LS #16; I & FG #5). Ninety-one percent of the school personnel indicated agreement with the statement "I feel like I make a positive impact on how much UTEC students learned in their program."

One member of the focus group indicated that he finally feels like he is able to impact the children of the neighborhood at the full spectrum of their lives. He felt able to "give up" the tutoring/mentoring program he ran at the public housing site in order to run a similar program at the high school, because he knew his mother, the community's matriarch, in combination with UTEC, could run the elementary school program on their own. Previously, he felt he had to work only with the elementary children, and his impact might end as they enter middle school. Now he is confident that he, and his family, can make an impact, with UTEC's help, at all ages.

Two support staff remarked on their increased sense of self-efficacy through working with UTEC students. One stated that working with the UTEC students is "the best part of my job," since she gets to have leadership in this one program at the school. The other support staff member indicated that by being able to guest

lecture in a university class, she is able to sharpen her skills and realizes she has a lot to offer future educators.

Impact of UTEC on Future Teachers

The impact of UTEC's community engagement on UTEC students can be seen in several surveys conducted over the first two years of the program. When analyzing survey responses of UTEC students compared to traditional preparation programs on the university campus, UTEC students indicate a greater motivation to teach in urban schools (35% vs 67%), and greater desire to teach in areas of poverty (33% vs 65%). And in a pre- and post-program survey, UTEC students increased their desire to work with families and communities when they become teachers (increased from 54% to 95%) (Noel, 2006).

Conclusions

This evaluation of the first five years of the Urban Teacher Education Center provides insight into how one teacher education program is perceived to be integrated into a school and community. It presents the perceptions of the adults at the school and community related the development of trust between two disparate programs. It presents the voices of representative adults, including those often heard such as administration and teachers, as well as the often marginalized community members, parents, school aides, front office, and playground and custodial staff. The evaluation results indicate that the program has been integrated through multiple layers of the school and community. The impact of the Urban Teacher Education Center's approach to community engagement on the elementary school, the school district, and the university can be seen in both the fifth year evaluation and in the recognition UTEC has received in several arenas. UTEC was recognized for its collaboration with the school district and the community when it won the California Council on Teacher Education's Spring 2008 Award for "Quality Education Partnership for Distinguished Service to Children and the Preparation of Teachers." And the school district honored UTEC at a Board Meeting with a Special Recognition for Contributions to Urban Education.

Transforming urban education through school-community-university collaborations is not easy, and takes time. Urban education is difficult, but it is full of possibilities. As Kincheloe et al. (2006) write, "Philosophically, urban education presents an enormous challenge to our imaginations and suggests that we have a moral responsibility not only to transform but also to be hopeful about the possibility for transformation" (p. xix). By moving teacher education into urban schools and communities, I believe this can be achieved.

References

Andrews, D. J. C. (2009). "The hardest thing to turn from": The effects of service-learning

on preparing urban educators. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 42*(3), 272-293.

Au, K. H. (2002). Communities of practice: Engagement, imagination, and alignment in research on teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(3), 222-227.

Bottery, M. (2003). The management and mismanagement of trust. *Educational Management & Administration, 32*(3), 245-261.

Boyle-Baise, M., & Sleeter, C. E. (2000, Spring). Community service learning for multicultural education. *Educational Foundations*, 1-18.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations* (pp. 213-219). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Giroux, H. A. (1997a). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture, and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1997b). Rewriting the discourse of racial identity: Towards a pedagogy and politics of Whiteness. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(2), 285-320.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C.. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hands, C. (2005). It's who you know and what you know: The process of creating partnerships between schools and communities. *The School Community Journal, 15*(2), 63-84.

Hoy, W. K., & Tchannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five facets of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 9*, 184-208.

Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*, 593-599.

Keyes, M. C., & Gregg, S. (2001). *School-community connections: A literature review*. Charleston, SC: AEL Inc.

Labaree, D. F., & Pallas, A. M. (1996). Dire straits: The narrow vision of the Holmes Group. *Educational Researcher, 25*(4), 25-28.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). It's not the culture of poverty, it's the poverty of culture: The problem with teacher education. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 104-109.

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies*. Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 132-41.

Murrell, P. C., Jr. (1991). Cultural politics in education: What's missing in the preparation of African-American teachers? In M. Foster (Ed.), *Qualitative investigations into schools and schooling: Readings on equal education* (Vol. 11, pp. 205-225). New York: AMS Press.

Murrell, P. C., Jr. (2001). *The community teacher: A new framework for effective urban teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noel, J. (2006). Integrating a new teacher education center into a school and its community. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research, 2*, 197-205.

Noel, J. (2010, April). Evaluating a school-community based urban teacher education center: Impact, integration, and trust. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO.

Noel, J. (in press). A critical interrogation of privilege, race, class, and power in a university

faculty—urban community relationship. *The Urban Review*. (DOI: 10.1007/s11256-009-0131-4)

Oakes, J., Rogers, J., & Lipton, M. (2006). *Learning power: Organizing for education and justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Quartz, K. H., Priselac, J., & Franke, M. L. (2009). Transforming public schools: A synthesis of research findings from UCLA's Center X. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 42*(3), 313-326.

Reed, W. A. (2004). A tree grows in Brooklyn: Schools of education as brokers of social capital in low-income neighborhoods. In J. L. Kincheloe, A. Bursztyn, & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Teaching teachers: Building a quality school of urban education* (pp. 65-90). New York: Peter Lang.

Reid, C. (2007). The confluence of teacher education and inner-city activism: A reciprocal possibility. In R. P. Solomon & D. N. R. Sekayi (Eds.), *Urban teacher education and teaching: Innovative practices for diversity and social justice*. New York: Routledge.

Rodriguez, L. F. (2009). Dialoguing, cultural capital, and student engagement: Toward a hip hop pedagogy in the high school and university classroom. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 42*(1), 20-35.

Rosenberg, P. M. (1997). Underground discourses: Exploring Whiteness in teacher education. In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. C. Powell, & L. M. Wong (Eds.), *Off White: Readings on race, power, and society* (pp. 79-89). New York: Routledge.

Shirley, D., Hersi, A., MacDonald, E., Sanchez, M. T., Scandone, C., Skidmore, C., & Tutwiler, P. (2006). Bringing the community back in: Change, accommodation, and contestation in a school and university partnership. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 39*, 27-36.

Solomon, R. P., Manoukian, R. K., & Clarke, J. (2005). From an ethic of altruism to possibilities of transformation in teacher candidates' community involvement. In L. Pease-Alvarez & S. Schecter (Eds.), *Learning, teaching and community: Contributions of situated and participatory approaches to educational innovation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stefkovich, J., & Shapiro, J. P. (2002). Deconstructing communities: Educational leaders and their ethical decision-making processes. In P. T. Begley & O. Johansson (Eds.), *The ethical dimensions of school leadership* (pp. 77-87). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research, 71*, 547-593.

Weiner, L. (2000). Research in the 90s: Implications for urban teacher preparation. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(3), 369-406.

Wong, P. L., & Glass, R. D. (2005). Assessing a Professional Development School approach to preparing teachers for urban schools serving low-income, culturally and linguistically diverse communities. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(3), 63-77.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69-91.

Zeichner, K., & Melnick, S. (1996). The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176-196). New York: Teachers College Press.