Many university-based teacher educators recall the publication of Arthur Levine’s 2006 appraisal of teacher education in the United States, *Educating School Teachers*, as one of the first of several seminal reports on the field of educator preparation. This piece was a harbinger of things to come, as we have since seen a flood of similarly critical and constructive examinations of the training of teachers, put forth by scholars, policy institutes, and professional associations. For example, the 2010 report of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel, *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers*, was arguably an answer to Levine’s publication—this time offering the field a way forward with its laser-like focus on the clinical experience elements of teachers’ preparation.

While the Blue Ribbon Panel commentary was a long overdue call for teacher preparation to turn towards a clinical orientation, it also failed to provide a set of implementation steps for its recommendations. Furthermore, the design principles and proposals of the Blue Ribbon Panel report included just a handful clinical practice examples. As a result, educator preparation efforts have remained haphazard, with most programs struggling to determine how to transition to a clinical practice orientation and with most university faculty continuing to operate in traditional roles in their institutional silos.

By contrast, the recently published report of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Preparation’s Clinical Practice Commission (CPC), *A Pivot Toward Clinical Practice, Its Lexicon, and the Renewal of Educator Preparation*, was co-authored by an expansive team of practitioners, including numerous school- and university-based teacher educators from award-winning clinically-focused teacher preparation programs from across the United States. In fact, one of the critiques of the Commission is that its membership did not include some of the “blue bloods” of our nation’s Colleges of Education—in contrast to the affiliations of the Blue Ribbon Panel. Instead, the CPC members represented
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Due to changes in the Association’s bylaws, I (Doug) have the opportunity to write one more time for PDS Partners. I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Association leadership who have served during my presidency. As I reported at the membership meeting during our annual conference, this group has accomplished a great deal. Perhaps the single most important achievement was the very successful annual conference in Jacksonville, FL. It was our first conference conducted with an all-volunteer staff. Many of our members also volunteered to fill various roles during the event. Your participation was crucial to our success.

Also embedded in our bylaws is a goal of maintaining a balance of representation from colleges and universities, and K-12 environments. The elected members of the incoming leadership group, who will begin serving in their new roles June 1st, come very close to our 50/50 goal. Of the eight elected positions, five are from colleges/universities and three are from K-12 environments. While we do have K-12 representation on all of our committees, we need to work harder to balance our committee chairs; of the six committee leadership positions, one only—the primary co-chair for the 2019 conference, is from a K-12 environment. I make this appeal to our K-12 members, is this the year you will consider a deeper involvement in your Association?

In the spirit of this balanced representation, and as we make the transition to the new leadership, I will close this article with abridged remarks delivered at the membership meeting in Jacksonville, by incoming-President, Wendy Baker.

My passion for partnership work is connected to my daily collaboration with my school-university partners. We know there are so many working parts to a partnership and that the work is complex and rewarding. It is in the complexity of our partnerships that we learn how to continually renew and innovate our programs for all stakeholders through reflection and adjustment to propel our partnerships forward.

As president I hope to (1) encourage more P-12 stakeholders to become actively involved in the association and (2) continue to promote the hard work of school-university partnerships.

I invite you and your school-university partners to become involved in the association and join us next year at our 2019 conference located at the Sheraton Atlanta Hotel in Atlanta, Georgia, Thursday, February 14 – Saturday, February 16, 2019.

Thanks for a great year. We look forward to the continued growth and influence of NAPDS!

Doug Rogers & Wendy Baker

Sapp (lead conference co-chair for 2019) to see how they manage their professional responsibilities and their participation in Association leadership.
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a collection of “boundary-spanners”—individuals who and institutions that were engaged at a grassroots level with the principles outlined in the Blue Ribbon report. This composition facilitated a practical consideration of the design principles with an eye towards creation of a usable document.

Ultimately, the Blue Ribbon Panel Report and the CPC Report go hand-in-hand. While the Blue Ribbon Panel Report necessarily called for clinical practice to sit at the center of all educator preparation efforts and recommended ten “design principles” for reforms to the delivery, evaluation, and oversight of teacher education structures, the CPC Report serves as a set of proclamations for implementation of this clinical turn.

**An Overview of the CPC’s Work**

AACTE’s Clinical Practice Commission (CPC) members began their work in 2015 with the mission of operationalizing the principles and practices of the Blue Ribbon Report. Since its inception, the CPC has been comprised of approximately 40 university-, school-, and association-based teacher educators and administrators, who have met at least twice annually and engaged in numerous virtual discussions and writing exercises over the past three years—a collaborative process that culminated in the January 2018 publication of their report.

The CPC charge was both practical and ambitious. The AACTE leadership called on this diverse group of hybrid educators to (a) recommend a definition for clinical practice; (b) outline a lexicon for clinical practice; and (c) detail pathways to operationalize clinical practice. While the final CPC report details a set of “proclamations” that in many cases parallel the “design principles” of the Blue Ribbon Report, the Commission included a plethora of support materials in its digital appendices (available at http://aacte.lnk/cpc-press). These include data and related research reports, templates, and other materials that would enhance scholars’ and practitioners’ efforts to implement or investigate the types of clinical practices increasingly held up as the ideals of our field.

Unique to the vision of the CPC—as outlined in its final report—is the development of a common language for clinically focused educator preparation efforts. While the report authors acknowledge that clinical preparation efforts should always consider local contexts when determining program structures, they make the bold proposal that only via a common lexicon will our field finally be able to respond in a unified manner to the call to action made by the Blue Ribbon Report authors. While not exhaustive, this language established the following terms in Table 1:

The core content of the CPC report consisted of its 10 “proclamations,” which are informed by and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary-spanning teacher educator</strong></td>
<td>An individual (typically employed by a school district or college/university) working in a hybrid role across school and university contexts. These individuals serve teacher candidates at any point along a professional continuum and are active participants in teacher preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical coaching</strong></td>
<td>Clinical coaching represents the bridge between the work of university-based and school-based teacher educators engaged in teacher preparation and the practices in which these individuals engage. This term subsumes supervision and mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical internship</strong></td>
<td>The culminating clinical practice experience in some settings; can be of varying duration but no less than one university semester. During the clinical internship teacher candidates assume full responsibility for a pedagogical assignment under the coaching of school- and university-based teacher educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical practice</strong></td>
<td>Teacher candidates’ work in authentic educational settings and engagement in the pedagogical work of the profession of teaching, closely integrated with educator preparation course work and supported by a formal school-university partnership. Clinical practice is a specific form of what is traditionally known as field work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clinical practice setting</strong></td>
<td>A school or other authentic educational setting that works in partnership with an educator preparation program to provide clinical practice for teacher candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator</strong></td>
<td>Any professional worker in a school, university, or other educational context. This inclusive term encompasses teachers, administrators, counselors, professors, clinical coaches, and other roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator preparation</strong></td>
<td>The broad work of preparing new educators to enter the profession. Institutions of higher education officially house educator preparation programs, but the program delivery may be carried out in various education contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentor teacher</strong></td>
<td>A teacher who serves as the primary school-based teacher educator for teacher candidates completing clinical practice or an internship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td>Any professionally prepared educator who uses pedagogy to facilitate student learning in a school or other educational context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher candidate</strong></td>
<td>An individual enrolled in a teacher preparation program that leads to a recommendation for initial-level state licensure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher preparation</strong></td>
<td>The broad work of preparing teacher candidates to enter the teaching profession. Institutions of higher education officially house teacher preparation programs, but the program delivery may be carried out in various education contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-based teacher educator</strong></td>
<td>An individual involved in teacher preparation whose primary institutional home is a school. School-based teacher educators are a specific type of boundary-spanning teacher educators who assume mentoring and partnership responsibilities in addition to their school responsibilities. A school-based teacher educator may be otherwise known as a university liaison, site facilitator, cooperating teacher, mentor teacher, collaborating teacher, or school liaison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University-based teacher educator</strong></td>
<td>An individual involved in teacher preparation whose primary institutional home is a college or university. University-based teacher educators are a specific type of boundary-spanning teacher educators who engage in evaluation, coaching, instruction, and partnership and assume expanded and multiple responsibilities within, and often across, each of these four domains. A university-based teacher educator may also be known as a university supervisor, university liaison, clinical supervisor, or clinical faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
extend the “design principles” of the Blue Ribbon Panel Report, the “Nine Essentials” of NAPDS, and the ATE field-based teacher preparation standards (Table 2):

Ultimately, the vision of this first product of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission is operational rather than exhaustive, and the report is intended to be just the first of a series of ground-breaking documents and structures that unify the broadest range of school, university, policy-making, and professional association constituents behind these clinically-based educator preparation reforms. The CPC has already expanded to sub-committees that are considering the nature of such a clinical focus for educators working with students with special and exceptional needs and for school administrators. Members of the CPC are also examining state-level measures that might serve as the report’s first implementation efforts, while appreciating that no national recommendations should override considerations of local contexts. Collectively, these new cross-institutional frameworks are intended to build and sustain reforms that are rejoinder’s to Levine’s (2006) decade-old but not dated critiques and that turn the vision of the Blue Ribbon Report into everyday realities.
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UNIQUE TO THE VISION OF THE CPC IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON LANGUAGE FOR CLINICALLY FOCUSED EDUCATOR PREPARATION EFFORTS.
The Intersection of the AACTE Clinical Practice Report and the NAPDS Nine Essentials

Eva Garin, Bowie State University  
Rebecca West Burns, University of South Florida  
Drew Polly, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Overview
This is an exciting time for professional development schools (PDSs). Calls to prepare high quality teachers through clinical practice (e.g., American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 2010; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2010) position PDSs and particularly the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) to be leaders in developing the necessary school-university partnerships to actualize teacher education reform. In fact, the recent release of the White Paper, A Pivot Toward Clinical Practice, Its Lexicon, and the Renewal of Educator Preparation from the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission (2018), identifies PDSs as exemplars for developing the essential collaborative contexts between schools and universities to prepare the next generation of educators. Given this excitement, there is a need to more clearly understand how the guiding principles of PDSs intersect with key tenets of high quality clinical practice (see Table 1). In this article, we describe the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) and the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission Ten Proclamations (2018), the intersections among them, and the challenge to revisit the Nine Essentials on their 10th anniversary.

The NAPDS Nine Essentials
In 2008, the NAPDS responded to criticisms from the education community who claimed a lack of fidelity in the understanding and implementation of PDSs by outlining essentials that distinguish PDSs from other school-university partnerships. Those Nine Essentials include:

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 stakeholders, addressing social justice issues and the expanding roles of technology in the Nine Essentials?
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures. (NAPDS, 2008, pp. 2-3)

Now a decade old, the NAPDS community is seeking to understand if the Nine Essentials in their current form remain as a useful and valid framework for supporting PDS creation, development, and sustainability.

At the March 2018 NAPDS Annual Conference in Jacksonville, Florida, a session focused on just that topic (Badiali et al., 2018). During this session, attendees were asked to respond to three questions,

1. How are we using the Nine Essentials?
2. Is it time to reevaluate and refresh the Nine Essentials?
3. What do the current essentials mean to the NAPDS membership?

Audience members raised key questions such as, “How is the PDS community making the complex but necessary work of PDSs public?” “What outcome data are we collecting in terms of retaining teachers, improving test scores and deeply collaborating with teachers as demonstrated by collaborative research agendas and joint publications?” And, “how are we, as PDS stakeholders, addressing social justice and equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community?”

The Blue Ribbon Panel Report Ten Design Principles

At least once before, the release of a report caused NAPDS members to take stock of the Nine Essentials (Van Scoy and Eldridge, 2012). In 2010, NCATE released the Blue Ribbon Panel’s Report, Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers. This report called for increased clinical practice and school-university partnerships in high quality educator preparation.

To actualize this call, the Blue Ribbon Panel Report identified ten design principles that used language that is familiar and complementary to PDS work:

1. Student learning is the focus
2. Clinical preparation is integrated throughout every facet of teacher education in a dynamic way
3. A candidate’s progress and the elements of a preparation program are continuously judged on the basis of data
4. Programs prepare teachers who are expert in content and how to teach it and are also innovators, collaborators, and problem solvers
5. Candidates learn in an interactive professional community
6. Clinical educators and coaches are rigorously selected and prepared and drawn from both higher education and the P-12 sector

Table 1: The Intersection of the CPC Report and the NAPDS Nine Essentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAPDS Nine Essentials</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proclamations from the CPC Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Central Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Pedagogy Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Skills Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Partnership Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Infrastructure Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Developmental Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Empowerment Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The Mutual Benefit Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The Common Language Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The Expertise Proclamation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The intersection between the Nine Essentials and the Blue Ribbon Panel Report have been discussed elsewhere (see Van Scy & Eldridge, 2012). The authors identified key aspects of both reports including deliberate planned partnerships, comprehensive clinical preparation, high standards for all, and data-driven practices. An opportunity now exists to examine how the AACTE CPC report builds upon this report and intersects with the NAPDS Nine Essentials.

The AACTE Clinical Practice Commission Ten Proclamations

In February 2018, the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission (CPC) released a key document that built upon the Blue Ribbon Panel Report by advocating for a pivot, profession-wide, to embrace a common lexicon and a shared understanding of evidence-based practices for embedding educator preparation in the PK-12 environment. Much like how the NAPDS Nine Essentials aimed to provide a common understanding of PDSs, the CPC report hopes to develop a common understanding of clinical practice by outlining Ten Proclamations:

1. The Central Proclamation - Clinical practice is central to high quality teacher preparation.
2. The Pedagogy Proclamation - As pedagogy is the science of teaching, the intentional integration of pedagogical training into an educator preparation program is the cornerstone of effective clinical practice.
3. The Skills Proclamation - Clinical practice includes, supports, and complements the innovative and requisite skills, strategies, and tools that improve teacher preparation by using high-leverage practices as part of a commitment to continuous renewal for all learning sites.
4. The Partnership Proclamation - Clinical partnerships are the foundation of highly effective clinical practice.
5. The Infrastructure Proclamation - Sustainable and shared infrastructure is required for successful clinical partnership.
6. The Developmental Proclamation - Clinical partnerships are facilitated and supported through an understanding of the continuum of development and growth that typifies successful, mutually beneficial collaborations.
7. The Empowerment Proclamation - As emerging professionals, teacher candidates are essential contributors and collaborators within clinical programs and partnerships.
9. The Common Language Proclamation - Coalescing the language of teacher preparation and teaching around a common lexicon facilitates a shared understanding of and reference to the roles, responsibilities, and experiences essential to high-quality clinical preparation.
10. The Expertise Proclamation - Teaching is a profession requiring specialized knowledge and preparation. Educators are the pedagogical and content experts. It is through the assertion and application of this expertise that they can inform the process and vision for renewing educator preparation.

This report offers possibilities to guide PDS work. First, we, as members of the NAPDS community, must examine the proclamations alongside the Nine Essentials to determine areas of commonality and overlap. Secondly, we must look to see what insights from the CPC report we can integrate into PDS work.

**Examples of Alignment**
To promote the examination of the intersection of these documents, we have created a alignment matrix (see Table 1). In addition, we offer two examples from our own PDS work which demonstrate how the PDS Nine Essentials intersect with the AACTE White Papers. The first example include the Pedagogy Proclamation with NAPDS Essentials 3, 4, and 5, and the second example involves the Partnership Proclamation with NAPDS Essentials 3, 4, and 5.

The Pedagogy Proclamation
Educator preparation programs (EPPs) continue to emphasize the need for quality clinical educators that enact research-based pedagogies and practices in their classrooms. In the CPC report, the Pedagogy Proclamation states that “the presence of strong, embedded pedagogical training is the hallmark of effective clinical educator preparation.” This idea aligns with three of the NAPDS Nine Essentials, specifically Essentials 3, 4, and 5 as well as with the Blue Ribbon Panel Report which calls for candidates to “learn in an interactive professional community” and states that “strategic partnerships are imperative for powerful clinical preparation” (Table 2).

To illustrate, we draw upon an example from our work in PDSs. A teacher educator from a university provided ongoing professional development to a staff of teachers on research-based mathematics pedagogies in the spirit of the fourth NAPDS essential focused on improving and enhancing experiences for P-12 students (Polly, 2017). The teacher educator helped the teachers in the school reflect upon and consider how to best support their students’ mathematical learning. In addition to professional development during planning time, the teacher educator also spent time with teachers in Grade 3 and 4 co-teaching lessons, providing feedback, and supporting teachers in their classroom. Teacher candidates also worked in the same where the teacher educator worked.

PDSs that support clinical educators’ development of effective pedagogies can be a critical component

---

**Table 2: Alignment to Pedagogy Proclamation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogy Proclamation</th>
<th>NAPDS Essentials 3, 4, and 5</th>
<th>Blue Ribbon Panel Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As pedagogy is the science of teaching, the intentional integration of pedagogical training into an educator preparation program is the cornerstone of effective clinical practice.</td>
<td>Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need; A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants; Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants.</td>
<td>Learn in an interactive professional community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
of developing the clinical practice experience of teacher candidates. Without the partnership between faculty and clinical educators, there is no assurance that teacher candidates will complete their clinical work in a classroom with a clinical educator who is an effective educator. Pedagogy must be front and center with PDS work, where clinical educators enact research-based pedagogies, teacher educators support that enactment, and teacher candidates’ work supports teaching and learning as they continue to deepen their repertoire of skills and knowledge related to pedagogies.

The Partnership Proclamation

The Partnership Proclamation of the CPC Report calls for partnerships between teacher education programs and P-12 schools that have mutually beneficial outcomes that simultaneously renew teaching and learning in PK-12 classrooms and in higher education. This work aligns to all of the Nine Essentials since PDS work focuses on establishing partnerships between teacher education programs and P-12 schools. The Blue Ribbon Report also calls for “specific sites are designated and funded to support embedded clinical preparation” (Table 3).

The first NAPDS Essential refers to, “A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner.” For example, in one PDS partnership, university faculty members met with school administrators and instructional coaches about the design of concentrated intensive clinical experiences. In exchange for hosting teacher candidates, clinical educators and instructional coaches participated in professional development and ongoing support provided by the teacher educators (Popejoy, Good, Rock, & Vintinner, 2015). The professional development and support was tailored to meet the needs of the clinical educators and included a combination of planning support, curriculum resources, and co-teaching lessons.

Further, the NAPDS Essential Eight talks about the engaged involvement of teacher educators and school/district personnel. Mutually beneficial relationships are simultaneously beneficial, which means when a teacher candidate is in a school, the partnership should benefit clinical educators, teacher candidates, and most importantly P-12 students. These partnerships involve the idea of boundary-spanning, where teacher educators are invested in the work of P-12 schools and P-12 administrators and teachers are invested in the work of teacher education.

Discussion

In your own PDS partnership, how are the CPC Ten Proclamations being implemented, and how do you see them aligning with the NAPDS Nine Essentials? Beyond that, what lessons can the PDS community glean from the CPC Report that may warrant a revisiting of the decade-old Nine Essentials? How might implementation practices be altered? There is a need for more articles about the implementation of PDS in light of the CPC report as well as research studies examining the impact on candidates and P-12 students.

Indeed, this is an exciting time for PDS partnerships, as this model is again being held up as an exemplar for teacher preparation reform. We hope that the synergy of aligning national calls for renewing educator preparation with the NAPDS Nine Essentials will both sustain and build momentum in PDSs at national and local levels.
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Table 3: Alignment to Partnership Proclamation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Proclamation</th>
<th>Clinical partnerships are the foundation of highly effective clinical practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAPDS Essentials</td>
<td>All Nine Essentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ribbon Panel Report</td>
<td>Specific sites are designated and funded to support embedded clinical preparation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to the Clinical Practice Commission Report from the Ohio University Patton College of Education Professional Development School Partnership

Renee Middleton, Ohio University Patton College of Education
Marcy Keifer Kennedy, Ohio University Center for Clinical Practice
Liz Hoisington, The Plains Elementary PDS Partnership, Athens City School District

Note: This Question and Answer dialogue provides insight into the Clinical Practice Commission Report from three types of PDS partners: a Dean, a Clinical Practice Director, and a teacher heavily involved in PDS work.

1) The Professional Standards Commission Report shared that professional development schools are a strong model of clinical practice to prepare future teachers. In your role, what are the specific benefits that you have seen about how PDS partnership can support the preparation of future teachers?

Dean Middleton: Figure 1 shows The Patton College’s “Reimagined Clinical Model of Educator Preparation.” PDS Partnerships are one of the ways we go about preparing our future teachers. In your role, what are the specific benefits that you have seen about how PDS partnership can support the preparation of future teachers?

Liz Hoisington: There are many reasons why I think the clinical practice model is the best way to prepare future teachers. First, the amount of time the future teachers are spending in the classroom is a huge factor. During the many hours that the candidates are in our buildings they are able to have a wide variety of experiences. The teachers know their strengths better and can provide a lot more teaching time for them. Also, knowing them so well, we know what areas they may be struggling in and can mentor them in those specific areas. We can offer specific feedback, advice, give them articles to read, send them to experts in the building who can assist them and coach them ourselves. We are allowed time to meet with them individually to discuss any issues and provide specific feedback and suggestions.

The candidates almost become part of our staff. They are known by the students, parents, colleagues and administration. Because of this, they quickly feel as if they are an important part of our school. They have a sense of belonging and significance and are therefore more invested in the K-3 students academic and social growth.

Lastly, the candidates are mentored by experienced teachers. While meeting the expectations of the university and building on their content knowledge from their university courses, the mentors are able to give them real-life perspectives and practice. These two things combined helps the candidates build their teaching philosophies.

2) What strategies have you found effective to ensure that clinical educators (classroom
teachers) are well prepared to mentor and support future teachers during clinical work?

Dean Middleton: The PCOE faculty work with school partners to jointly design professional development. Our faculty are regularly in schools so are able to work closely with mentor teachers to identify support that is needed. We value and recognize the time and expertise of our school partners by supporting professional development and by doing an Annual Teacher Recognition Gala each spring.

I also greatly enjoy my time in our partnering schools. I make it a priority each year to block days so that I am able to engage with teacher candidates, teachers, administrators, and P-12 students in the schools. This is important and gives me the opportunity along with our PCOE faculty to support the work and address challenges immediately.

Marcy Keifer Kennedy: First and foremost, it is the collaborative conversations and planning that occur prior to the PDS work. Having the opportunities to work side by side as partners, school partners and university faculty can identify a clear mission and vision and then build structures to support that work. It is important to create professional development that equips all partners with the necessary tools to be successful but also having formal roles and role expectations that support the work. Whether they be school based teacher educators/school leaders in the PDS or university based teacher educators, there needs to be ongoing communication and evaluation or opportunities to “check in” and see how things are going from all perspectives.

Liz Hoisington: As the Teacher Liaison for our PDS, I work very closely with the teachers in our building in regard to our candidates. If there is a new staff member I meet with them one on one to discuss mentoring. Even seasoned teachers who are new to our building meet with me. They may not be experienced with mentoring or may have done it before than we do. Having the opportunity to co-teach the model, which is the model all of our classrooms follow. I share documents that I give my candidates at our first meeting with them. I always give my candidates a “Goals and Expectations” sheet. I share this document with my colleagues so that they can make one of their own, specific to their classroom. After each meeting that the liaisons have with the university faculty, I send an extensive email detailing everything that was discussed, including the expectations for the candidates by the faculty of assignments that will need to be completed in the classroom.

The university offers PD in mentoring. Several of our teachers have taken advantage of this opportunity to enhance their mentoring strategies.

The classroom teachers and candidates know that I will advocate for them. They can both come to me with any concerns and I will help them facilitate difficult conversations. I also sit in on those meetings to help facilitate the conversations, assist both the teachers and the candidates garner as much feedback as possible, and help as they strategize solutions to problems.

Lastly, I observe in the classrooms. Both the candidates and the mentors know that I stop in every so often for a few minutes to observe the candidates interacting with the students and the teacher. I always leave a little note letting them know what I noticed while in the room. If a teacher or candidate has brought up a specific concern, I always observe right away so that we can troubleshoot any issue quickly.

3) What ways have you found effective to involve faculty who teach education courses into PDS work?

Dean Middleton: We put it in our letters of offer to ALL faculty that they must be engaged and committed to the PCOE Clinical Model.

Mary Keifer Kennedy: In our own PDS programming some years ago, we started regularly scheduling pre-semester meetings for methods faculty and school partners. These were wonderful opportunities for all to sit and talk about expectations and how those expectations could be met in the context of the P-12 classroom. This was helpful in that various methods and strategies could be discussed or introduced. Some wonderful opportunities for professional development and sharing have come from these conversations. School partners are able to share current school practice or issues that impact instructional planning while faculty are also able to share their own ideas and research. These conversations are mutually beneficial and as the director, I am also fascinated by the ease of conversation when all sit at the table as partners.

Liz Hoisington: I feel very “heard” by the university faculty. I feel respected and as if they are truly invested in our partnership. I think that this is the best way to involve them. We liaisons go to faculty meetings at the beginning of each semester, we attend UPEP meetings, we get copies of their syllabi, and we always have the ability to contact them with questions or concerns. Many times the faculty asks our opinions about coursework and expectations in the field.

I am also an adjunct instructor at the university so I work closely with several faculty members to coordinate our coursework. This makes it much easier for the candidates to make cross academic connections and see the interdependency of one subject area with another.

4) For undergraduate pre-service teachers who feasibly cannot do a residency model or may have limitations on their schedule for intensive clinical experiences what suggestions do you have?

Dean Middleton: Be admitted into another program.

Marcy Keifer Kennedy: I struggle with this question. While I absolutely understand the challenges associated with clinical preparation for our students, I am torn because if we truly believe that these structures are the best way to prepare our teachers, then to say that some will engage and others won’t, are we saying that their preparation is not as important? I am unsure of how to fix this issue but if a program fundamentally believes in this work and that it is best way to prepare our future teachers for our P-12 students, then I believe they must stick by that resolution.

Liz Hoisington: I am very committed to this model, as are my colleagues and administration. We see the vast benefits of this model vs a more traditional approach to early childhood programming. There are ways that our candidates can work out issues with transportation, such as carpooling. Scheduling isn’t an issue for us because the candidates work in cohorts so schedules are in place for them. As far as scheduling for time in the schools, the days and times are scheduled for them.

I completely understand that if these solutions were not in place that there may be some problems logistically. However, the benefits of this model are so that, from my perspective, everyone is committed to making it successful for everyone.

5) In the next 3 years what are the most major things that need to be addressed nationwide to support effective models of clinical practice?

Dean Middleton: Research-based evidence to support the benefits of the clinical model and its efficacy and Implementation/Utilization of the Lexicon in our educator preparation programs.

Marcy Keifer Kennedy: I believe that there needs to be more scholarly work that shows the impact of these models on P-12 student learning. I believe that leaders in this work need to provide guidance and support to those who are just starting to engage in more in-depth clinical practice models. I also believe that administrators in P-12 schools and universities need to continue to support these models with resources and time to ensure mutual benefits to ALL partners.

Liz Hoisington: I think that there needs to be support for the mentor teachers. This support comes from accessibility to professional development, including conferences. I also think that there needs to be time and money for solid research into the clinical model for mentors and faculty to better understand the positive impact and learn about ways to improve the PDS model.

Renee Middleton is the Dean of the Patton College of Education at Ohio University and can be reached at middlet@ohio.edu. Marcy Keifer Kennedy is the Director of the Ohio University Center for Clinical Practice and a Past President of NAPDS. Liz Hoisington is a PDS Teacher Liaison and First Grade teacher at The Plains Elementary School in the Athens, Ohio School District.
Blurring Boundaries: NC School-University Partnership Summit

Somer Lewis, University of North Carolina Wilmington

In October, 2017 the Watson College of Education at the University of North Carolina Wilmington (UNCW) hosted a summit of school-university partnerships from across the state. University faculty, teachers, principals, partnership directors, district level personnel, community organizations and superintendents converged at the College ready to engage in critical conversations, reflect on current collaborations, and perhaps begin to further blur the boundaries of their school-university partnership work. Throughout the two-day summit, participants attended concurrent sessions led by school-university partnership teams and participated in whole group working sessions where they posed current problems of practice, explored the successes and challenges of each, and departed with new ideas related to their mutually beneficial collaborations. Overall, representatives from 17 PreK-12 school districts, ten University of North Carolina system institutions, and five community agencies participated in teams of three to six members over the course of the event.

The theme of this year’s inaugural summit focused on Blurring Boundaries: Creating Opportunities for School-University Partnerships. However, from the initial call to action presented by New Hanover County Schools middle school teacher Jeremy Buie, it became apparent that community partnerships, as a third component of the school-university dyad, must be elevated as an essential element of our collaborative work. Buie energized participants with his focus on creating a village of support for students to include school, university, family and community partners. This theme continued, as teams participated in over 16 concurrent sessions exploring topics such as service learning in action, developing multi-cultural self-efficacy of teacher candidates, seeking teacher quality by action, developing multi-cultural self-efficacy of exploring topics such as service learning in participating in over 16 concurrent sessions partners. This theme continued, as teams included school, university, family and community on creating a village of support for students to work. Buie energized participants with his focus as an essential element of our collaborative of the school-university dyad, must be elevated community partnerships, as a third component by New Hanover County Schools middle school with audience members to further unpack their personal anecdotes and rich examples of West's current work in Florida, as well as her previous partnership work at Pennsylvania State University, participants examined their own practices and discussed ways to further blur the lines of traditional school and university roles. Specifically, West discussed the importance of each partner being a learner and a volunteer, being willing to make mistakes and feel uncomfortable, and finally, sharing a common goal in always putting children first.

In addition, school-university teams participated in guided work sessions led by UNCW Watson College of Education Dean Van Dempsey. Teams generated school-university partnership problem statements and unpacked problems of practice from different points of entry identifying core strengths, mutually beneficial opportunities for growth, and core pieces of evidence or artifacts of success. Examples of problems identified included redefining the roles of teacher and principal educators, creating a sense of community with campus extension sites, lack of consistency in clinical experiences, collection of measurable impact data to reveal equitable benefits of school-university partnerships, and supporting a continuum of professional learning and practice. One problem of practice focused on sustaining and nurturing relationships in light of transition and turnover at both the university and school level. The team that identified this problem also shared their team strength as highlighting the mutually beneficial nature of their collaborative work. However, the team’s opportunity for growth focused on creating a shared space to communicate both researcher and practitioner knowledge to further enhance their collaboration. Teams then worked across school-university partnerships to share questions unique to local contexts as well as identify salient themes common to partnerships across the state. Within the collaborative contexts and discussion, themes such as equity, renewal, community, consistency and sustainability emerged.

The 2017 summit serves as the first in what we hope will be an ongoing collaboration of school-university partnerships across the state. Participant feedback revealed the summit provided a much-needed opportunity to engage in meaningful conversations about our partnership work and to consider new strategies to advance our respective missions both within and among our school-university partnership teams.

Somer Lewis is the Director of the Professional Development School System at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. She can be reached at lewiss@uncw.edu.
University-District Partnerships to Improve Clinical Experiences: The Niner Clinical Immersion School (NCIS)

Anne H. Cash, Rex Mangiaracina, and Laura Hart, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Context
As much of the country, educator preparation programs in North Carolina are faced with significant challenges. The demands of the accountability movement are increasing pressure on programs to produce not only more teachers, but also more effective teachers, trained to engage with a variety of student populations. The Cato College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte is a growing and vibrant community of educators whose vision is to be a national leader in educational equity through excellence and engagement. We are committed to preparing highly effective and ethical teachers, counselors, and school leaders who will provide all youth with access to the highest quality education possible and meet the needs of every student, regardless of background. In pursuit of this mission, we continually examine current practices and consider viable innovations. One recent area of transformation has been our clinical field placement model.

Close collaboration with P-12 partners is critical to improving clinical field placement opportunities for our candidates. Growth of a truly collaborative partnership requires time, communication, mutual respect, and a positive predisposition for change in the educator preparation program (Rosenberg et al., 2009). Below, we describe how we designed the Niner Clinical Immersion School (NCIS) clinical model with this in mind.

The NCIS Model
The Cato College of Education currently has MOUs with 115 school districts to place candidates for clinical experiences. Beginning in spring 2015, we engaged four area school districts in discussion of the NCIS model. We aimed to better leverage existing relationships with P-12 partners by involving them in the redesign from the very beginning.

One local need raised by P-12 stakeholders was the establishment of a recruitment pipeline for future employees. A high percentage of novice teachers, regardless of their geographical location, relocate back home once they complete their degree (Reininger, 2012). This can be a difficult recruitment barrier for schools to overcome, but through university partnerships, P-12 partners can advocate for teacher recruitment in their own high-needs geographic areas (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2005). The partnership can become a pipeline for filling vacancies; allowing districts to “grow their own” qualified teachers who are familiar with their district/school because of prior positive experiences as candidates.

As we engaged in discussion with selected school districts to strengthen university-district partnerships, we also engaged faculty in reviewing internal data to identify gaps in our pre-student teaching field experiences through the lens of CAEP Standard 2 (Clinical Practice). We considered data such as candidate exit surveys, feedback from previous student teaching supervisors, and feedback from the four selected area school districts to evaluate perceived preparation of previous candidates. There were significant areas of overlap noted by the P-12 partners and by the UNC Charlotte faculty. Targeted needs included revising our process for assigning candidates to placements and increasing field supports. NCIS represents a departure from a traditional clinical placement model in the way that it addresses these needs.

Placement Structure
Districts collaborated with the university to select NCIS schools in pairs, in order to assign candidates to two schools representing diverse experiences over the pre-student teaching period. There are many ways to define diversity; while we considered racial and ethnic populations, we also took cultural perspectives into account. For example, in one NCIS district, one resulting high school pairing utilizes an inner-city urban school with a rural school located in a traditional farming community. One of the privileges for seniors at this second site is Tractor Day, when students can literally drive their tractors to school. We believe this juxtaposition of P-12 sites within the context of the NCIS model provides a rich array of experiences for candidates. During school selection, district and university staff also discuss school leadership and opportunities to provide candidates with positive experiences in hard-to-staff locations.

We have designed NCIS placements to engage candidates in regular and sustained exposure to schools and mentor teachers’ classrooms. We make placement assignments prior to the beginning of the semester; because of this, candidates can enter classrooms earlier in the semester with the NCIS model than with our traditional model. NCIS candidates are discouraged from completing clinical hours “in bulk” and instead engage with clinical settings for an extended period; they stay at the second school for their student teaching assignment. In fact, NCIS candidates typically spent 15-20 more hours in the classroom within a given semester than candidates following our traditional clinical model. With this approach, candidates also have an opportunity to build relationships with P-12 faculty prior to student teaching. This is possible for two reasons. First, we provide candidates with details on all placement assignments, including their student teaching assignment, at the beginning of the program, allowing candidates to plan their personal and professional lives for the duration of the degree. Second, we only place candidates in two schools over the duration of the degree, one school in the first semester, and a second school in the second semester through program completion. Candidates spend time in the school they are assigned to for student teaching at least a semester before student teaching begins, and in many cases, candidates spend time working with the P-12 mentor teacher they are assigned to for student teaching before the student teaching semester begins. We believe improved relationships with P-12 faculty will be associated with increased effectiveness upon entry to the field (McCray, 2011) and a stronger likelihood of securing employment within the district (Holen & Yunk, 2014).

Increased Field Supports
With NCIS, we increased field supports available to candidates throughout the program (not just in the student teaching semester). First, we built an extensive network of support personnel during their clinical placements. We appointed NCIS liaisons to provide ongoing guidance to each candidate and to P-12 staff. Each liaison is a clinical faculty member from the Office of Field Experiences. The liaison visits the school site at least twice a semester to “check in” with the candidate and P-12 faculty, simply to ensure that the candidate is making progress in the program. The liaisons are the “boots on the ground” in this work. They answer questions, work with the candidate and P-12 partners to provide assistance, and help each candidate matriculate through the NCIS program. The liaisons connect UNC Charlotte Faculty, the candidate and the school district staff.

Second, we wanted to improve candidates’ performance of core teaching practices. We assign candidates a checklist of activities to complete in the classroom during each semester of their NCIS placement. The depth and breadth of assigned activities gradually increases in complexity across semesters in order to prepare candidates for the expectations of student teaching. For example, in the first semester, a candidate may work one-on-one assisting a student in some capacity. By the third semester, a candidate plans and tutors a special needs learner one-on-one at least three times, to improve a targeted skill or knowledge need while following all school/district requirements. The checklists are both closely aligned with coursework and provided to mentor teachers within the schools, again building on the communication necessary for effective university-district partnerships.

Finally, NCIS candidates also benefit from interactions with multiple mentor teachers at each school site. We place candidates with a team of mentor teachers during all semesters prior to
student teaching, not just one mentor teacher at a time. We believe this approach reduces demands on P-12 partners while leveraging experiences of both veteran and novice teachers to help candidates grow. This aspect of NCIS is still evolving. In practice, we are learning that communication across mentor teachers within a school varies from one school to another. Some schools have effectively used the checklists to communicate across mentor teachers and target needs for individual candidates while other schools have not.

**Authentic Partnerships for Continuous Improvement**

We continue to work closely with district and school partners at all points of the NCIS clinical model. We make placement decisions collaboratively, considering school needs and availability to effectively mentor according to the NCIS model. We regularly solicit school-level input via the liaisons and checklists. For example, the NCIS liaisons coordinate introductions between school leadership and candidates and communicate with school leadership regularly to assess candidate progress. Candidates and mentor teachers are encouraged to adjust checklists as needed to adapt to individual classroom realities.

**A Solid Start with Room to Grow**

We began implementing NCIS with our candidates seeking initial and/or Middle Grades and Secondary graduate certificate programs and not currently employed as teachers. So far, we see that NCIS candidates log more hours and more classroom visits before entering student teaching than candidates following our traditional clinical model. This appears to be paying off in terms of the quality of candidates’ observed classroom practices during student teaching. NCIS candidates report satisfaction with the increased supports and diverse placements. For example, candidates have said:

With this program, I became more hands on with the observations in the classrooms. The checklist helped me develop better relationships with students and teachers, as my previous experience there was no structure checklist. (High School Social Studies Candidate)

Having a liaison who can assist with issues or just answering a question or two definitely made me feel more comfortable in this program. (Middle School Social Studies Candidate)

I gained a better understanding of the school setting at my under-privileged school. I definitely received exposure to more teachers, and administration who checked on my progress throughout the semester. (Middle School Mathematics Candidate)

As word has spread, districts and candidates have been eager to participate and we have expanded to include our Elementary and Special Education graduate certificate programs as well. We intend to study the outcomes of NCIS candidates who have already graduated, to see if they are obtaining and keeping jobs in our partner districts. We look forward to continued engagement with district partners to identify and expand on the best practices for supporting our candidates’ success in the classroom. For more information on NCIS, please visit our website, https://ncis.uncc.edu.
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**Leading and Learning: “Better Practices” for Teaching Language Arts in a Professional Development School**

Vicki Luther and Sybil Keesbury, Mercer University

Just as learning is at the heart of all formal educational settings, the importance of providing opportunities for such learning through scholarly practice, discussion, and reflection is essential for success within Professional Development Schools. While some may believe that pre-service teachers are the ones to benefit extensively from a PDS model, in reality, the goal is to support and enhance the learning of both prospective and experienced educators (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster, & Cobb, 1995). The Holistic Child program of Mercer University, an early childhood special education teaching degree in Pre-K through fifth grades, maintains a collegial partnership with Ingram Pye Elementary, which is currently in its fifth consecutive year as a Professional Development School.

Throughout this time, the need for professional development of both the pre-service and classroom teachers has proven to be essential. While professional development is imperative in all school settings, it is perhaps especially so in underperforming schools that may have difficulty attracting and retaining educators (Calkins, Guenther, Belfiore, & Lash, 2007). Professional development is also exceptionally pivotal in the teaching of English language arts, as the concepts associated with reading, writing, listening, and speaking are critical in students’ understanding of all discipline areas, including social studies, science, and mathematics. Ingram Pye Elementary is a low socioeconomic urban Title I school. Rasinski (2017) states that research repeatedly shows poverty as “one of the most powerful correlates to reading difficulty” (p. 519); therefore, the importance of enhancing English language arts practices is essential. Rasinski goes on to say that children living in poverty are much more likely to struggle in reading and are much less likely to have access to materials that would help with reading improvement (2017). Due to such factors, there is a critical need for the teachers of Ingram Pye Elementary to gain skills on the implementation of current research-based strategies regarding reading instruction, especially in the context of phonemic awareness and phonics, which
As educators, we may never truly know the impact we may make on others. However, we firmly believe that these professional development sessions had positive outcomes. Many of the classroom teachers, from various grade levels and with varying years of teaching experience, shared with us that they had implemented at least one strategy learned from the professional development sessions into their lessons and classroom activities. Those teachers also said that the new information, suggestions, and ideas given in the sessions made a positive impact for their students and in their teaching practices. The teachers also discussed how strategies can be utilized in a variety of ways within different grade levels and class settings, thus scaffolding and differentiating instruction for a variety of learners.

A fifth grade teacher, who has been teaching for almost 20 years, said that through our discussions in a particular session, she learned how to make vocabulary more interesting for her students; she explained that she and the teacher candidate immediately began utilizing a particular strategy and had seen gains in vocabulary assessments. Having “lessons in common” with the teacher mentors allowed the pre-service teachers to feel more confident in their instructional practices and more comfortable in their year-long placements.

As university personnel, we believe we are creating teacher leaders at Ingram Pye by conducting common professional development times to improve reading instruction of the students, and we strongly believe that these teachers will soon begin leading their own professional development sessions. Although class sessions had been previously taught in the elementary classroom, this new approach allowed us to bring the teachers into class sessions with the pre-service candidates while matching instructional goals for all involved. Although it took structure and planning to allow teachers to be relieved from their classrooms at various times throughout the semester, we feel that these preparation efforts were well worth it, as teachers and candidates were able to collaborate and plan together. We learned that buy-in is essential in a process such as this; the school administration allowed for support staff to cover classrooms, and both the elementary and university administrators allowed for flexible scheduling for teachers and faculty members. We also found that meeting together during the summer, prior to the start of school, allowed time to prepare, and afforded the partners the opportunity to engage in much-needed conversations about roles, responsibilities, and expectations.

Giving time for teachers and pre-service teachers learn, share, and practice with one another builds the capacity for leadership within both groups. We chose not to think in terms of “best practices”; instead, we focused on “better practices” that can help teachers and pre-service teachers learn and lead cooperatively. There is great work to be done, and this approach shows that we can do it much better when we do it together.
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Editors’ Corner
Big Changes Are Coming to PDS Partners: We Have a New Name!

Eva Garin, Bowie State University
Drew Polly, University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Beginning with our Fall 2018 issue we will have a new name, PDS Partners: Bridging Research and Practice. In addition, we will be a peer-reviewed publication that comes out twice a year, Fall and Spring. In the spirit of PDS, the journal will concentrate on articles authored by both P-12 and college/university faculty. In addition to important news about the NAPDS and its conference, each issue will highlight PDS partnerships, projects, research, and “best practices” from around the United States and beyond. Each issue will also attempt to share stories and reports of PDS efforts from across the regions of the U.S., and from suburban, urban, and rural settings. We encourage you to submit articles and photos when appropriate. Current sections of the magazine include “Interns and the Internship,” “PDS Partners and Partnerships,” “PDS Researchers and Research,” “PDS Inquiries and Ideas,” “Professional Development and PDS,” “PDS and Alternative Schools/Community Settings.” Authors are also asked to identify at least one of the NAPDS “Nine Essentials” addressed in their article.

We are also offering mentoring for newer, less experienced writers in the areas of manuscript topics and outlines and other pre-submission support. We are very interested in articles from site-based PDS coordinators, mentor teachers/clinical educators and PDS liaisons.

This is an exciting time for PDS as we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the PDS Nine Essentials and respond to the February 2018 release of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission (CPC) report. The report is an important document that advocates for a profession-wide pivot, to embrace a common lexicon and a shared understanding of evidence-based practices for embedding educator preparation in the PK-12 environment. The report holds PDS partnerships up as an effective model of clinical practice to support teacher candidates. In this issue, three articles address the CPC report. The first article (Zenkov, Parker, Parsons, Keller Kennedy, and Stunkard) gives an overview of the CPC Report and the second article (Garin, Burns and Polly) discusses the intersection of the PDS Nine Essentials and the CPC Report. The third article is a question and answer dialogue with Dean Middleton, Clinical Practice Director Keller Kennedy, and Hoisington from the Ohio University-Athens School District Professional Development School partnership. In future issues, we welcome articles about clinical practice that align to both the Nine Essentials and the CPC report.

This issue also includes articles from NAPDS affiliates, regional PDS conferences, a report from the NAPDS Policy, Advocacy, and External Relations committee, and articles on innovative research-based practices related to NAPDS. We hope that this issue offers a plethora of topics of interest to PDS stakeholders while giving you some ideas of manuscripts that you would like to submit. Enjoy your summer and we look forward to launching our new publication, PDS Partners: Bridging Research and Practice.

Interested in submitting to PDS Partners: Bridging Research and Practice: Please submit manuscripts, ranging from 1,000 to 4,000 words via e-mail to egarin@bowiestate.edu or drew.polly@uncc.edu. Be sure to include how your article addresses at least one of Nine Essentials. More information can be found at http://www.napds.org/. Remember you can also find all past issues on the website as well.
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A PDS as a Catalyst for Change in a London Primary School

Jo Ebner, Thomas’s London Day Schools
JoAnne Ferrara, Manhattanville College

PDSs have been credited for taking a “think outside of the box” approach in forging new pathways to address the needs of schools and practitioners. In the United Kingdom there is currently a shift in educator preparation whereby initial teacher training seems to be moving away from being taught at university to becoming more school based and taught, led and accredited within UK schools. This article describes a primary school’s journey to connect with an American PDS and adapt components of the PDS model to meet their training needs and impact government policy.

Improving teaching and learning is an on-going concern among educators. Often attempts for improvement focus on ways to enhance teacher practice. As educators think about teacher practice and its link to student learning, conversations typically turn to identifying strategies that work, or addressing specific challenges. Ideally educators hope to uncover successful endeavours that can be transferred from one location to another. Often practitioners deeply steeped in the daily operations of a PDS, forget the how powerful PDSs are for educators unfamiliar with the model. Sharing successful strategies regardless of the setting help educators facing similar challenges to collectively find solutions. In thinking about ways educators help one another, PDSs emerge as an entity with unlimited potential to address the complexity of learning to teach and provide educators with a supportive learning laboratory to hone their craft and discover new ways to respond to long-standing problems.

Headmistress Jo Ebner, an innovative school leader at Thomas’s Kensington explored the PDS model and subsequently adapted it to meet the needs of her staff and school. By reaching across the pond to U.S. colleagues Jo successfully incorporated PDS into the school’s philosophy.

Local Context

Thomas’s Kensington is a co-educational school comprising 400 pupils aged 4 – 11 and approximately 65 full time staff. It is a private school, which means that parents pay school fees each semester (approximately $27,500 per year). The school is highly regarded and parents put their children’s names down for a provisional place at birth. There are waiting lists and reserve waiting lists for children to get into the school. Thomas’s Kensington is set in the heart of Kensington in central London, near landmarks such as The Royal Albert Hall and Kensington Palace. The school reflects the cultural mix of the local area of the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, which is not necessarily typical of that of London as a whole. 44% of children are British, 15% are American, 22% are from EU countries and 16% from a range of other countries. The children speak 30 languages between them, over 200 children (70%) understand one or more additional languages to English. Since pupils come from a wide range of countries and backgrounds, the school has an international flavour, but is immersed within a framework of strong British values.

The School was established in 1971 by Founding Principals, Joanna and David Thomas and is now run by their two sons, Toby and Ben Thomas. There are 4 schools in the group, Kensington, Battersea, Fulham and Clapham and the Thomas’s Academy, which is sponsored by the group and is a state school (public school in American terminology) under the auspices of the UK government with additional funding and support from the Thomas’s group. Each school has its own management structure and is led by a head teacher and a leadership team. The heads all work closely together to ensure that the Thomas’s values and vision are aligned. There is one school rule that underpins how every single member of the school behaves towards one another, that is to be kind. Thomas’s aims: “to create an ethos of kindness and understanding in which pupils’ strengths are identified and developed whilst their weaknesses are identified and supported”. The schools have a Christian ethos, which includes a regular weekly church service; a Carol service and nativity play at Christmas and an Easter service. All denominations are welcome within the schools.

Thomas’s Kensington is recognized as school of excellence by the Office for Standards in Education Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted). Ofsted judges the school outstanding in all areas (the highest rating) in 2008, 2011 and most recently in November 2017. All schools in the Thomas’s family of schools are judged outstanding. In each of the schools, there is a strong emphasis on high academic standards, alongside a commitment to a broad and vibrant curriculum and set within a framework of enjoyment, learning and achievement.

A sense of community and adherence to the school’s values is made explicit to all stakeholders. The school has very strong community links and many projects and events take place to ensure these remain strong. The school has a Community Cohesion Coordinator and there are two school charities supported across all the Thomas’s Schools. The Thomas’s Schools Foundation is the school charity working to benefit the local community and The CAIRN Trust, standing for Child Aid in Rural Nepal is a charity supporting and developing schools and education in Nepal.

Creating a Vision for Clinical Practice

The Headmistress is a strong believer in focused Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and as a result decided to establish a bespoke Masters (MA) degree in Educational Practice across all the Thomas’s Schools, in conjunction with Roehampton University. This was discussed and agreed between the Principals and other Thomas’s Heads and two universities bid for the opportunity to host and lead the MA, with Thomas’s deciding on the University of Roehampton. The Head of Partnerships at the University of Roehampton, helped devise the first bespoke MA in conjunction with the head. The first cohort of MA students commenced their studies in September 2014.

At Thomas’s Kensington there is a commitment to Continuing Professional Development (CPD), which challenges and focuses teacher improvement. Teachers are deeply involved in their own professional development and it informs their teaching and the pupils’ learning. The bespoke Master’s degree, is offered to all staff, with particular encouragement given to early career teachers. As a result of the MA, action research projects were undertaken by staff who were motivated and encouraged to take risks and innovate ways that may improve their pupils’ learning. MA staff are encouraged to feedback about their projects in staff meetings and to share their knowledge and expertise with staff, parents and across the Thomas’s schools.

A conference for parents: “An event engaging parents in the discussion of learning developed from our staff MA programme”, took place in October 2015 led by academics from Roehampton and Brighton Universities, outlining the research that staff were involved in and exploring current trends in the field of education. At the end of that academic year a journal was published containing abstracts from the various projects the teacher-students have undertaken and a whole staff annual conference takes place now at the University where MA student teachers give short lectures about their projects.

Leading Practitioners

The Thomas’s Leading Practitioner (LP) programme is another qualification that is run at Thomas’s and was designed to support and recognise the many high-quality teachers in the schools, who may not be seeking a management post, yet still have much to offer in terms of experience and expertise. The LP programme commenced in January 2014 and the first cohort of LPs graduated in the spring term 2016. The LPs work closely with the MA students – and sometimes a teacher can be undertaking both qualifications at the same time.

Professional Development Quality Mark (Gold)

In September 2015, Thomas’s Kensington achieved the Professional Development Quality Mark Gold Award recognising that professional learning is a strength within the school. Professional Development practice is embedded in all four key aspects of the Professional Development Quality Mark framework:
• Leadership of Professional development
• High Quality Professional Development
• Evaluating the Impact of Professional Development
• Collaboration and Partnerships supporting Professional Development

The Scholar in Residence (known as SiR) adds value to the staff development programme at Thomas’s Kensington and thereby enhances outcomes for its pupils. The SiR provides relational and informal support to staff, including those who are undertaking their MA degrees and/or the Leading Practitioners and he has also developed and led a whole school staff project on creative teaching and learning in the curriculum. The role of the Scholar in Residence that we piloted was to support the staff at Thomas’s Kensington and add a layer of rigour, challenge and academic expertise to teacher practice. The embedded nature of having the Scholar in Residence operating within the school offers the ability for theory and practice to work in tandem.

**The Influence the PDS Model**

As a result of these two programmes and the expanding links with the University of Roehampton, headmistress (school principal), was keen to explore and examine other ways in which the University and the School could collaborate. The model for initial teacher training that seems to be developing in the UK, is similar to the Professional Development Schools’ model from the USA, however not as comprehensive. Headmistress Ebner began conversations about ways in which she could creatively develop the university-school relationship, this was being replicated nationally by the huge shifts taking place in the educational landscape as changes were being announced in the UK educational system specifically in relation to initial teacher training.

Furthermore, the influence of Professor JoAnne Ferrara came to the fore and the already established relationship between Manhattanville University and Roehampton University, combined with the professional friendship between the head of partnerships and Prof Ferrara, meant that there was an awareness and understanding of the success of the PDS model. Having had the privilege of JoAnne visiting both the University of Roehampton and Thomas’s Kensington, a three-way dialogue took place between these professionals. A visit to Thomas’s Kensington and the University of Roehampton in the summer by Prof Ferrara, and a reciprocal visit by the Thomas’s Kensington headmistress in the fall, to see the PDS model in action at Thomas’s Edison School, New York, meant that the two Jos got together! This gave the added impetus to developing an innovative new project, based on the PDS model, influenced by the Edison School and culminated in a new and exciting model for education and teacher development which Headmistress Ebner was keen to trial in the UK. A proposal was drawn up and agreed and the notion of a Scholar in Residence was born.

**Scholar in Residence: the Rationale**

School improvement and initial teacher training is best driven through academically underpinning teacher CPD that bridges the gap between theory and classroom practice. There is a need to find a way for theory and practice to act reciprocally and as a result the first Scholar in Residence was appointed to work within Thomas’s Kensington school, released from Roehampton University to enable this professional learning to take place.

The Scholar in Residence (known as SiR) adds value to the staff development programme at Thomas’s Kensington and thereby enhances outcomes for its pupils. The SiR provides relational and informal support to staff, including those who are undertaking their MA degrees and/or the Leading Practitioners and he has also developed and led a whole school staff project on creative teaching and learning in the curriculum. The role of the Scholar in Residence that we piloted was to support the staff at Thomas’s Kensington and add a layer of rigour, challenge and academic expertise to teacher practice. The embedded nature of having the Scholar in Residence operating within the school offers the ability for theory and practice to work in tandem.

**Linking Teacher Practice to Student Outcomes**

The purpose of this project was to build teacher capacity and in turn, improve student success. Given that Thomas’s Kensington is high performing, academically rigorous school, the teachers and the Scholar in Residence sought to create more of an inquiry-based curriculum aligned to teachers’ MA degrees or Leading Practitioners program. Although teachers were highly skilled and successful, they desired opportunities to examine their craft. With this in mind, a project was launched entitled “Education Myths and Legends” looking at the research evidence for some treasured pedagogical methods. Teachers questioned their firmly held beliefs about “best practices” and accepted wisdom. After several discussions and investigations of current pedagogies, teachers began to adopt research-based practices to better meet the needs of their students. In doing so, a stronger community of learners emerged. As the SiR stated:

”By making this everyone’s problem we were able to encourage groups to find solutions. I am confident that there was a high level of engagement from teachers in this project. A high level of teacher engagement was evident. Teachers began to try out ideas and allow themselves to be subject to group accountability which allowed for refinement of ideas. The net result was a reported increase in the range of learning experiences available to pupils. Teachers were more creative in their approaches. Subsequent student learning was made real through creative engagement”.

The SiR noted teachers’ willingness to give new practices “a go” even is that meant stepping outside of their comfort zones. While doing so was initially difficult, teachers did increase the use of project-based and student-centred activities in their classrooms. Not surprising, students were more engaged and self-directed, and teachers discovered alternative ways to deepen learning. As expected from the initial results of this project, teachers benefit from meaningful opportunities to examine their practice and develop creative ways to respond to challenges.

**International Links**

As a result of this innovation there have been positive spin offs. The Edison PDS partnership encouraged the Headmistress and her staff to consider innovation approaches to educator preparation. As the staff started to unpack and understand PDS components excitement percolated about next steps. This international link with Manhattanville College and Thomas Edison Community School, together with their Academic in Residence, was established. This is operating at several levels: for staff who are forging links with fellow staff and who are examining possibilities for a teacher exchange programme; for pupils who are writing letters to each other across the pond with Thomas’s Kensington and enabled us to gain the prestigious *International Schools’ Award*, through our mutual academic partnerships.

To further develop the Scholar in Residence programme, Headmistress Ebner was awarded the prestigious Winston Churchill Fellowship travel grant to spend time overseas to pursue a research agenda. In the spring of 2018 she spent time the United States deepening her knowledge of PDSs with a specific focus on Scholar’s in Residence and attended and presented at this year’s NAPDS conference. By doing so, Headmistress Ebner has plans to expand the Scholar in Residence programme from a single site at Thomas’s Kensington to other schools in her network. A long-term goal of this initiative is to facilitate a redesign of educator preparation in the UK.

**Final Thoughts**

The implementation of the bespoke MA degree and the Scholar in Residence innovation was due in part to the PDS influence, but more importantly to the vision of a school leader and her desire to explore partnership models. The university/school relationship and partnership based on the US PDS model worked successfully as a pilot at Thomas’s Kensington and is a model that could be rolled out to other UK schools. Headmistress Ebner’s attendance at the NAPDS conference along with her visits to PDSs in the northeast, underscored the shared beliefs that by developing the very best staff we will in turn benefit the pupils that we teach and enhance their life-long learning.

For more than 25 years PDSs have created a vision for improving teaching and learning. As PDSs expand across the globe, may these partnerships continue to be beacons of excellence to others, and to foster forward thinking individuals that bring the expertise of the world’s educators together.

Jo Ebner is the Headmistress at Thomas’s London Day Schools. JoAnne Ferrara is a Professor at Manhattanville College. She can be reached at terraraj@mville.edu.
Unintended Outcomes of Classroom-based Research

Ronald Beebe, University of Houston-Downtown

Classroom-based research provides teachers an opportunity to systematically engage in critically reflective practice focused on enhancing teaching practice and improving student learning. Within urban school settings, findings often direct teachers beyond the classroom to issues of equity and social justice. This paper analyzes findings from 19 classroom-based research assignments completed in urban schools focused on teaching and learning outcomes. The results indicate teachers implicitly recognize the impact of curricular and policy directives on student outcomes and instructional practice related to issues of equity and social justice. This suggests teacher education programs need to assist preservice and inservice teachers in making explicit these tacit notions in the implications of classroom-based research in order to address inequities in urban schools.

Theoretical Framework

Noting the development of perspectives fostering the concept of teacher as researcher, especially for urban educators, Oakes, Franke, Quartz, and Rogers (2002) “suggest that teachers’ involvement in professional learning opportunities, where communities of practice develop, can influence their decisions to remain teaching in urban schools” (p. 232). Faculty learning communities provide an opportunity to develop shared knowledge that can lead to the adoption of shared practices. Within the context of this model, community members are able to address issues regarding instructional techniques, assessment strategies, student engagement and motivation, as well as research designs, methodologies and outcomes.

It is imperative that teachers are trained in various strategies to capitalize on student assets rather than focusing on deficits. These strategies must address the age, individual, and background of the child in order to create educational opportunities that incorporate authentic learning and are culturally relevant to each student.

Classroom-based research appears to provide an effective means of enhancing teaching practice as well as impacting academic achievement of urban high school students (Dinkelman, 2010). “Classroom research, due to its focus on problem solving, can be empowering for the struggling educator, since it forces the educator to take responsibility for finding solutions rather than blame” (Author & Author, under review). Such an attitude suggests teachers involved in a critically reflective research process tend to accept increased ownership for the learning environment and student outcomes.

Research Model

The model used for the classroom research course was informed by the notion of developing critically reflective practitioners (e.g., Brookfield, 1995; Larrivee, 2000), beginning with asking the question “I wonder...” within the context of the classroom environment. The focus of this reflection includes instructional strategies, assessment practices, and approaches to classroom management. Use of this approach has been demonstrated to provide an effective means of both professional development as well as opportunities for investigations into issues related to social justice and equity in both the classroom and the larger educational system (Hattam, Brennan, Zipin & Comber, 2009; Rogers, et al., 2005)

Social Justice. North (2008) describes social justice as “a contested, value-laden expression” and describes social justice education as “… a dynamic concept that has been associated with different beliefs, practices, and policies” (p. 1183). Additionally, Applebaum (2009) extends this idea, arguing “social justice education does not just aim to benefit the dominant but also hopes to create a safe place for the marginalized, or at least a classroom that does as much as possible to diminish the reproduction of oppression” (p. 8). The increasing face of diversity presented in the K-12 classroom places an increasing demand on teachers to engage students through culturally relevant pedagogies, understanding students’ funds of knowledge, as well as building empowering relationships rather than maintaining current structural inequities (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 2004).

Methodology

The classroom-based research papers of 19 Master of Arts in Teaching students were analyzed using content analysis to develop categories and themes based on teacher reflections related to the implications of their research findings. The results were then organized to address both student and teaching outcomes, as well as coded for a relationship to issues concerning social justice and equity.

Data Sources

Nineteen (19) papers were analyzed from a classroom-based research course completed by teachers as part of the requirements for a Master of Arts in Teaching degree in a large urban district in Southeast Texas. The teacher researchers were 15 females and 4 males, comprised of 8 White, 7 Hispanic, 3 African American, and 1 Asian. In terms of grade level representation, there were 3 High School teachers (1 Science, 2 technology, student n = 147); 4 Middle School teachers (1 English/Language Arts, 2 mathematics, 1 Science, student n = 327); 12 Elementary teachers (2 Math/Science, 2 Bilingual, 6 Generalist, 1 Pre-Kindergarten, student n = 276); and 1 Elementary Instructional Specialist (teacher n = 5, student n = 134).

Results

Impact on Teachers

In general, the outcomes of the classroom-based research projects provided positive academic outcomes. Students’ achievement improved because of interventions employed, student engagement and motivation increased, and overall classroom management improved. These are the expected outcomes of classroom-based research as indicated in the literature
Students regardless of ability had relatively high academic self-concept; however, in the middle of the study, the “high-ability” students were assigned to a different teacher and the “struggling students” were placed with the classroom researcher. At the end of the study, the academic self-concept measure was re-administered; the students that had stayed with the classroom researcher posted a significant drop in academic self-concept.

As one teacher researcher commented: “Classroom research, due to its focus on problem solving, can be empowering for the struggling educator. It forces the educator to take responsibility for finding solutions rather than blame.” This is a significant statement in light of the pressures faced in urban districts to address the needs of diverse student populations. Knowing that students bring various funds of knowledge that may or may not align with the dominant cultural perspective, educational practice needs to address biases that underlie current accountability practices. Several of these teacher researchers communicated their findings with administrators, yet in only one case was there a recognition of the effect of certain practices on students, their achievement, and their engagement with school. The one case that did result in a significant response relates to the “poor preforming” student being evaluated for learning disabilities.

Significance

Given a climate of increasing emphasis placed on accountability, exploring the impact of research in the classroom affords a critical perspective. Teachers who reflect on their practice in a systematic manner need to recognize that there may be unexpected outcomes beyond grades and test scores. Engaging in classroom-based research provides both an avenue for effective and meaningful professional development as well as an opportunity to examine inequities in the classroom and wider educational practices.

Learning to ask the “right” questions, classroom researchers begin to see what occurs in their classroom within the larger context of cultural, economic, and political structures. As a result, classroom researchers develop a better understanding of who their students are and how best to differentiate instructional and assessment methods to connect to their funds of knowledge – a key factor as classrooms continue to present an increasingly diverse face. Teacher educators and classroom teachers need to continue to develop and design rigorous research to explore and investigate not only the learning outcomes of students, but also the impact that current educational practices evolving from an over-emphasis on high-stakes testing has on the development and learning of diverse, urban students.

References


Ronald Beebe is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Urban Education Program at the University of Houston- Downtown. He can be reached via e-mail at beeber@uhd.edu.
NAPDS Policy, Advocacy, and External Relations: A Year of Progress

Rebecca West Burns, University of South Florida

The past year was full of activity for the National Association for Professional Development Schools Policy, Advocacy, and External Relations (PA&ER) Committee. As chair of the PA&ER Committee, it is my pleasure to introduce you to the committee, share our accomplishments, and offer some resources to support you in policy, advocacy, and external relations.

What is the PA&ER Committee?
The PA&ER Committee is one of five committees for the NAPDS. Those committees include:

1. Conferences and Programs Committee
2. Membership and Elections Committee
3. Communications Committee
4. Awards Committee, and
5. Policy, Advocacy, and External Relations Committee

The chair is an appointed position and serves a two-year term, which can be renewed according to the NAPDS Bylaws. The Chair attends all Association Leadership Meetings, provides monthly updates on committee activity to the Association Leadership, and offers input on Association Leadership decisions but does not have voting responsibilities. Only elected members to the Association Leadership may vote. According to Bylaw 4.3.2.3, the PA&ER Committee “…shall administer any liaison activities between the Association and those groups and committees at the federal, state, and local levels, and other professional organizations that concern the work of the Professional Development School movement.” When the Association Leadership developed their strategic plan, they included a specific focus on advocacy and collaboration. The change to the PA&ER Committee given in March 2017 is to develop programs and influence policy that positively impact P-16 education by reaching out to professional organizations, accreditation bodies, and government agencies.

Who Serves on the PA&ER Committee?
I currently serve as your PA&ER Chair. Currently I am an Assistant Professor at the University of South Florida, and I am a longtime advocate for professional development schools (PDSs). My passion for PDSs began in 2007 during my doctoral preparation at Penn State University, which won the PDS Exemplary Achievement Award in 2009 and again in 2018. It was there that I had the privilege to work alongside incredible teachers, school administrators, and university faculty to learn the value of collaboration and the power of PDSs in educational renewal. I continue that passion in Tampa, Florida where my school-based colleagues and I work collaboratively in our PDS to prepare high quality teachers, transform professional learning for inservice teachers, and educate the next generation of teacher education scholars. In terms of leadership, I have served as an elected member of the NAPDS Board of Directors from 2014-2017 and as the Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past-Chair of the American Educational Research Association Professional Development School Research Special Interest Group from 2013-2015.

I am fortunate to work with an amazing committee consisting of school and university representatives. The members of the PA&ER Committee include: Rachelle Rogers, Baylor University; Amanda Packard, Midway Middle School; Robin Johnson, Texas A&M Corpus Christi; Susan Ogletree, Georgia State University and AERA PDS SIG Research Relations Liaison; Donnan Stoicovy, State College Area School District; and Lakesia Dupree, University of South Florida.

NAPDS President Doug Rogers has encouraged all NAPDS Committee Chairs to have at least eleven members on each committee. We currently have seven members and are looking for four more dynamic, passionate PDS individuals who want to work with us to advocate for PDSs and for NAPDS. If you are interested in joining the team, please reach out to me via e-mail.

What has the PA&ER Committee Accomplished?
The PA&ER Committee had three major accomplishments during the 2016-2017 year:

1. Committee Formation
2. Information Dissemination, and
3. Cross-Organizational Collaboration.

The first accomplishment was the formation of the PA&ER Committee. Prior to March 2017, the committee was primarily an External Relations Chair. To date, the PA&ER Committee seven members, five are university-based and two are school-based individuals. A future goal of the PA&ER Committee is to add members, particularly school-based partners to ensure equal representation. In addition, until the most recent By-Law Revisions in December 2017, the PA&ER Committee was known as the Policy and External Relations Committee. Based on the NAPDS strategic plan, advocacy was added to the committee title and list of responsibilities.

The second accomplishment was related to information dissemination with the intention of keeping NAPDS members informed and aware of current key policy and advocacy issues and events. The PA&ER Committee has dedicated slots on the NAPDS Communication Plan, which is spearheaded by the Communications Committee. In the past year, the PA&ER Committee wrote four email blasts, two were related to policy updates (July 2017, November 2017), one was announcing the release of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education’s Clinical Practice Commissions report (#AACTEcp, January 2018). The last announced NAPDS’s endorsement of the Interdisciplinary Group on Preventing School and Community Violence’s Call for Action to Prevent Gun Violence in the United States of America (February 2018), which was in response to the shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida on February 14, 2018.

The third accomplishment was cross-organizational collaboration. NAPDS has been collaborating with three major national organizations: (1) the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) (see www.ate1.org), the American Educational Research Association PDS Research Special Interest Group (AERA PDSR SIG) (see http://www.aera.net/SIG079/Professional-Development-School-Research-SIG-79), and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) (see https://aacte.org/).

Collaboration with ATE, NAPDS and ATE have been collaborating over the past two years and have formed an official joint task force to explore collaboration between the two organizations. Joint Task Force members consists of members
from each organization’s leadership and the co-conveners, Dr. Barbara Purdum-Cassidy (Baylor University) and Dr. Rebecca West Burns (University of South Florida) are dual members of NAPDS and ATE. One outcome from this Joint Task Force is the back-to-back conference structure of both annual conferences to be held in February 2019 in Atlanta, GA. The second outcome has been the collaboration of the Clinical Practice Fellows National Symposium. NAPDS members have participated in this annual event and have even chaired some of the past four symposia.

Collaboration with AERA PDSR SIG. NAPDS has also been collaborating with the AERA PDSR SIG for the past few years, working to bring the organizations closer together and elevate PDS research. One outcome of this collaboration has been the creation of a hybrid leadership role that spans both organizations, known as the PDS Research Relations Liaison. Susan Ogletree (Georgia State University) is the assume this position, which serves on the leadership for the AERA PDSR SIG and as a member of the NAPDS PA&ER Committee. Under the leadership of Susan, the collaboration between AERA PDSR SIG and NAPDS has spawned policy and procedures related to PDS research requests. In addition, under the leadership of Past AERA PDSR SIG Chair, Linda Catelli, NAPDS and AERA PDSR SIG submitted a grant to generate funding to create a national agenda for PDS research.

Collaboration with AACTE. NAPDS has also been collaborating more closely with AACTE. In fact, several NAPDS members and specifically past and present Association Leadership members like Marcy Keller-Kennedy (Ohio University), Cindy Stunkard (Kutztown University), Audra Parker (George Mason University), Seth Parsons (George Mason University), and Kristien Zenkov (George Mason University) to name a few, participated on the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission. The Commission’s report, entitled A Pivot Toward Clinical Practice, Its Lexicon, and the Renewal of Educator Preparation (January 2018) does not endorse any one particular model, but it did recognize PDSs as an exemplary model of educator preparation. Collaboration with AACTE can be accredited to the hard work and willingness of former AACTE Vice President Rodrick Lucero to work with NAPDS to think about the importance of PDSs in the school-university partnerships needed to transform teacher education.

In Summary
The past year has been a productive one for the PA&ER Committee. The creation of a committee and the collaboration with three national organizations has resulted in several initiatives aimed at elevating PDS awareness at the national level. There are many ways you can get involved. As previously mentioned, the PA&ER Committee is seeking volunteers to serve on the committee. If interested, please contact me. Another way you can get involved is to work with your institution’s government relations office to reach out to your local, state, and federal representatives and have them visit your PDS. Seeing PDSs firsthand can be powerful and can support critical resources to sustain PDSs. If you are unsure about or new to advocacy, AACTE has a wonderful resource known as the Advocacy Center (https://aacte.org/policy-and-advocacy/advocacy-center). You also can sign up for their advocacy alerts that will send an email with important, timely information and ways you can support education advocacy. Now is the time for schools and universities to partner in advocacy to support high quality education for PK-20 students. Don’t delay. Start advocating today.

Rebecca West Burns is an assistant professor at the University of South Florida and currently the Chair of the NAPDS Policy, Advocacy, and External Relations Committee. She can be reached at rebeccaburns@usf.edu.

Connecting the PDS Community: NAPDS Affiliates

Michael Cosenza, California Lutheran University

Background
The National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) has established itself as a premier professional organization that provides support and advocacy for high quality teacher preparation through strong school-university partnerships. The Professional Development School (PDS), recently acknowledged as an exemplar model in the Clinical Practice Commission’s report, A Pivot Toward Clinical Practice, Its Lexicon, and the Renewal of Educator Preparation (2018), provides an excellent environment for new teacher preparation and simultaneous renewal for veteran teachers and teacher educators. Though there is both a body of scholarly literature and anecdotal evidence about the positive impact PDSs have on the professional development of teachers, the model is still underutilized and more importantly, largely unknown to policy makers.

In its strategic plan titled, VISION 21, the NAPDS has set for itself many challenging goals which include objectives for advocacy and outreach. The advocacy and outreach initiative has been set by the NAPDS leadership specifically to promote the PDS model and raise awareness of its benefits, while concurrently providing resources to support the creation and sustainability of these types of school-university partnerships. Additionally, this initiative is designed to increase awareness of educational policy makers at a national, state and local level, to gain more philosophical and financial support for this paradigm of high quality clinical preparation.

One strategy the NAPDS has put in place to achieve these goals is the creation of a network of regional, state and local affiliates. Over the years, many local PDS professional groups have popped up in states such as, California, Georgia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Texas. These groups are a mixture of ad hoc networking groups, university sponsored groups, and formally incorporated 501(C)3 professional organizations. There also may be other similar groups in other states that the NAPDS is not aware of. Regardless of the degree of formality, these groups are active, but working in isolation to meet the needs of their local communities of educators. Connecting the PDS community through a network of NAPDS affiliates can strengthen the ability of PDS advocates to reach more programs, organizations and policy makers. Connecting the PDS community in this way also can provide more opportunities for networking and sharing of best practices outside the annual conference sponsored by the NAPDS. Affiliates will be informed of events going on around the country broadening the opportunities to participate in PDS related activities throughout the year. Additionally, becoming an affiliate of the national organization gives the local groups more credibility as they advocate for PDS at the state and local level.

Southern California PDS
During the 2018 NAPDS Conference in Jacksonville, Florida, the Southern California Professional Development School (SCPDS) Consortium was recognized as the first affiliate of the NAPDS. The SCPDS had a unique beginning. During the National PDS Conference in Orlando, Florida in March 2010, several attendees from the state of California found one another during the luncheon. The attendees did not realize there was other PDS work taking place in California. This author, now curious about the expanse of the PDS model in the state, sent an email survey to more than 80 deans overseeing schools of education in California. The survey inquired about whether their programs were using the PDS model and if so, were they interested in networking. The survey uncovered 12 universities doing PDS work in southern California. An invitation was sent to those programs to attend a lunch meeting in June 2010. The goal of the luncheon was to explore the feasibility of creating some type of PDS group. During that meeting, it was agreed that there was both interest and a need for a local PDS group. The group was especially interested in providing support and professional development to P-12 teachers doing PDS work because it was difficult for to this group of professionals to attend national conferences due to school
district funding limitations. Additionally, the group wanted to set up networking meetings at PDS sites to learn about each other’s model and share best practices. SCPDS networking meetings were successful and an annual conference was started to provide a forum for the presentation of scholarly work by both teacher educators, P-12 teachers and teacher candidates.

With limited resources preventing the group from hiring an attorney, volunteers worked together to file the necessary papers with the state of California and the IRS to formally incorporate. Some documents were returned by the agencies because of mistakes or questions, but they were corrected and sent back with fingers crossed. Bylaws were developed, and in 2012, the SCPDS was approved as a 501(c)3 non-profit organization. Today a nine-member board of directors combined with five standing committees provide the leadership for the organization. The SCPDS has a website, a biannual magazine and other activities during the year to provide support and advocacy for PDS work at the local level. By becoming an affiliate of the NAPDS, the organization has more credibility and is better positioned to advocate the core values of the NAPDS Nine Essentials and provide support for PDS work in the state of California. Since its beginning, there are now members from northern California and Nevada.

The Call for Affiliates
As the affiliate network grows, NAPDS plans to hold an affiliate forum each year at the annual conference. This will give delegates from these groups an opportunity to network, compare work done at the local level, and assist each other in advocacy for PDS on a broader level. The NAPDS also plans to provide a time block and room for its affiliates to hold their own meetings during the annual conference.

The NAPDS is currently encouraging regional, state and local PDS groups to apply to become an affiliate. There is an application process that is submitted to NAPDS and reviewed by the membership committee. The guidelines for affiliations are:
• Affiliates will be represented at the annual NAPDS Conference and will participate in the national organization (such as presenting at the national conference or serving on a committee or as an officer).
• Two members of the affiliate's leadership will maintain individual membership in the NAPDS.
• The affiliate's materials (e.g., brochures, documents) will clearly indicate “An affiliate of the National Association for Professional Development Schools” and may use the NAPDS logo only to identify itself as an affiliate.
• Affiliate will have the link of the NAPDS on its website and promote its annual conference.
• The NAPDS will have an Affiliate page on its website with a link to the website of each affiliate organization.
• The NAPDS will list the local events of each affiliate on its website.
• Every year the affiliate will submit a brief report of highlights and/or goals accomplished that reflect the nine essentials. This summary is due July 1.
• On August 1 of each year, the affiliate will be billed an annual fee based on current fee schedule approved by the executive leadership (currently a flat rate of $100 subject to change in future).

Conclusion
Though the NAPDS affiliate program is just getting started, it holds great promise for providing stronger support and advocacy for the PDS model. Together with its affiliates, the NAPDS will be able to provide expanded support for P-12 teachers, teacher candidates, and teacher educators doing PDS work. With the Nine Essentials at the forefront, the NAPDS affiliate program will foster a relationship of reciprocity and mutual benefit. Continue to watch the NAPDS publications and website for more news about the progress of the affiliate program as well as for affiliate events and activities.

Michael Cosenza is an Associate Professor at the California Lutheran University, the President-Elect of NAPDS, and the Past President of the Southern California Professional Development Schools Consortium. He can be reached at mcosenza@callutheran.edu.

Considering Affiliation? The Story of PDS SERVE
Susan L. Ogletree, Georgia State University

PDS South East Regional Vision for Education (PDS SERVE) was organized to provide an affordable place for teams of local or regional PDS teacher scholars, principals, and university researchers to present their work; affordability was attained by lowering registration and travel costs for large teams. In particular, PDS SERVE was organized for P-12 teachers and teacher candidates.

PDS SERVE was not originally affiliated with the national organization, National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPSD), though possible affiliation was discussed in 2016 when PDS SERVE was organized. Affiliation with NAPDS is an important next step for PDS SERVE, and the organization has decided to apply for affiliate status. Whereas networking at the state and regional levels is important, networking at the national and international level may be even more important. As educators, we are now operating globally with boundaries being blurred on many different levels. Networking at the national and international level provides PDS practitioners and researchers a depth of information that cannot be obtained through local and state experiences. Affiliation of PDS SERVE with NAPDS strengthens both organizations.

Additional benefits of affiliation with NAPDS include giving PDS SERVE members a voice in national PDS standards as they are reviewed and updated, providing current PDS research through the national newsletter, and providing web site affiliation. PDS researchers are currently seeking to develop the evidence base for the PDS model. Having access to larger PDS research networks helps to move the PDS research agenda forward at all levels: local, regional and national. Successful evidence-based research requires meaningful collaboration between practitioner researchers and university researchers. Membership in the PDS-SERVE and NAPDS provides direct networking access to both practitioners and professors doing research in the same or similar areas. Both organizations provide opportunities for research dissemination through regional and national conferences and publication of articles in peer reviewed journals. Clearly, the two organizations are “better together!”

Susan Ogletree is the Director of the Educational Research Bureau in the College of Education & Human Development at Georgia State University and the NAPDS-AERA Research Liaison. She also serves as the Executive Board President of PDS SERVE and can be reached at sogletree1@gsu.edu.
A Vision Driven Organization

**UPCOMING EVENTS**

**BECOMING A MEMBER**

**NEWS & UPDATES**

Visit our new website at www.napds.org

**PDS Partners Call for Submissions**

*PDS Partners* is published three times per year (Winter, Summer and Fall) by the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS). Past issues and submission requirements can be viewed at napds.org. Articles can be submitted to pdspartnersmagazine@gmail.com.
Baylor School of Education proudly supports NAPDS —

- Sponsor of 2016 and 2017 Annual Conferences
- University Home of NAPDS President-Elect Dr. Douglas Rogers
- Supporter of the NAPDS vision, including “creating and sustaining genuine collaborative partnerships between P-12 and higher education.”

baylor.edu/SOE
School-University Partnerships Submissions
Seth Parsons, Mandy Beam, George Mason University

School-University Partnerships is committed to advocating for collaborative ventures across the PreK-12 and college and university communities as vehicles for the discovery and sharing of knowledge that shapes educational best practices. Honoring the voices of both school-based and university-based educators is central to the mission of the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS), and School-University Partnerships seeks manuscripts that represent partnerships across stakeholders. The journal strongly encourages submissions that reflect collaborative partnership initiatives. Submissions may focus on (but are not limited to) original school-university research designed and implemented collaboratively, descriptions of effective pedagogies and content delivery in PDS contexts, explanations of successful partnership models and structures, examples of measures of assessment and results of evaluative processes, and analyses of the professional development of all constituents involved with school-university partnerships.

Complete Submission Guidelines can be found at www.napds.org.

Submissions and any inquiries regarding past submissions can be made to: supjournal@gmail.com