

**Making Muffins:
Identifying Core Ingredients of School-University Partnerships**

Rebecca West Burns
University of South Florida

Jennifer Jacobs
University of South Florida

Wendy Baker
Hillsborough County Public Schools

Denise Donahue
Hillsborough County Public Schools

Abstract: National calls for transforming teacher education are harmonious – schools and universities must collaborate to transform teacher preparation (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), 2010; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 2010). Rather than reinventing the wheel, the field of teacher education needs to capitalize on the knowledge, research, and experiences the PDS literature has generated over the past 30 years. In addition, PDSs will need to attend to the discourse surrounding clinical practice. Using three national documents: (1) the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) Nine Essentials (2008), (2) the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010), and (3) the National Education Association’s (2014) report entitled *Teacher Residencies: Redefining Preparation through Partnerships*, we identify seven core ingredients of school-university partnerships. These core ingredients can serve as a framework that connects PDS to clinical practice, develops robust school-university partnerships, and keeps PDSs as the national leaders in the movement towards increased collaboration between schools and universities.

KEYWORDS: clinically rich teacher education, clinically-based teacher education, school-university partnerships, professional development schools, clinical experiences, field experiences

NAPDS NINE ESSENTIALS ADDRESSED:

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;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;

7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
8. Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structure

Introduction

In 1997, Marilyn Johnston and colleagues wrote the book *Contradictions in Collaboration: New Thinking on School/University Partnerships*. In this book, they offered insight into the challenges and benefits of creating and sustaining professional development schools (PDSs). This book is somewhat therapeutic for any individual who works across the boundaries of schools and universities because the issues and tensions described feel as relevant today as when the book was published nearly 20 years ago. But beyond therapy, Johnston and colleagues raise thought provoking questions for our field. For instance, Johnston asks,

Do we have professional agreement that collaboration between schools and universities is the best way to reform teacher education and promote professional development, inquiry, and change? If my own college is a reasonable sample, I would have to say no. Many of my colleagues think that collaboration is not worth the time and money it requires and that it detracts from the scholarly agenda of the university. (pp. 92-93)

Twenty years later, her worries are being acknowledged. National calls for increased school-university partnerships indicate professional agreement that school-university partnerships are imperative to the successful implementation of clinical practice (AACTE, 2010; NCATE, 2010). And yet, like Johnston (1997), many of us who work in PDSs continue to face the same controversies from almost two decades ago. Perhaps this is because building and renewing partnerships is hard work; or perhaps it is because PDSs, as robust school-university partnerships, are complex and difficult for outsiders to dissect. Either way, communicating the essence of PDSs is imperative for the future of the PDS community and is, no doubt, a worthy endeavor.

Organizations like NAPDS began this charge almost a decade ago with their creation of the Nine Essentials (NAPDS, 2008). If such a charge was already answered, why do we need to revisit the question of *What is a PDS?* Like so many innovations, when PDSs moved from conceptualization to application, the concept of PDS was widely interpreted (Abdel-Haqq, 1998; Goodlad & Sirotnik, 1988; Field, 2009). Likewise, the notion of school-university partnerships is equally problematic. Some use the term school-university partnership and PDS interchangeably. Look at Johnston's text as an illustration. She uses school-university partnerships in her title but the entire book is about her work in a PDS (Johnston, 1997). We would not disagree that school-university partnerships and PDSs are closely connected. In fact, we would contend that all PDSs are school-university partnerships, but not all school-university partnerships are PDSs, particularly if they do not adhere to the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008).

In addition to the complications from interchangeable terminology, the increase of school-university partnerships over the past 15 or more years has created additional language to describe school-university partnerships (Jacobs, Burns, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014) resulting in a need for a common lexicon (Zenkov, Parker, Dennis, & Degregory, 2015). This special edition of *School-University Partnerships* is occurring at an opportune time. Dialogue around what

constitutes a school-university partnership is imperative if PDSs are to remain viable and be national leaders in teacher education. Now, more than ever, the PDS community needs to have a strong, unified voice for understanding and articulating the essence of PDSs. So how do we address the question of *What is a PDS?* We propose that rather than address the question of what is a PDS, a more timely question should be: *What core ingredients are essential for the kinds of school-university partnerships needed to transform teacher education?* To address that question, we need to draw upon what we know about PDSs.

Johnston and colleagues (1997) offer an analogy that provides imagery for what constitutes a PDS and what constitutes a school-university partnership. She claims that PDSs are like muffins. Muffins come in different sizes and flavors. Walk into any grocery store and you can purchase mini muffins, blueberry muffins, chocolate chip muffins, corn muffins, and even seasonal pumpkin-spice muffins to name a few. And yet, despite this diversity, Johnston argues that muffins have core ingredients that make them muffins. While they have other ingredients that add taste to the standard muffin, they all have core ingredients that make the muffin a muffin. We propose that like muffins, school-university partnerships should have “core ingredients” that make them a school-university partnership. While school-university partnerships may have other ingredients that make them special and unique, essentially adding “taste” to the partnership, they all should have “core ingredients” that make the particular school-university partnership a school-university partnership.

Process for Determining “Core Ingredients”

It is an exciting but potentially scary time for PDSs. At the national level, the focus on how best to prepare teachers has included greater emphasis on clinical preparation. National organizations like the AACTE and the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (formerly known as NCATE) have been calling for increased school-university partnerships as the keystone for high quality teacher education (AACTE, 2010; NCATE, 2010). PDSs, as intentional school-university partnerships, are poised to lead this charge given the fact that PDSs have been in existence for over 25 years (Rutter, 2011). However, PDSs face competing concepts. PDSs are not the only innovations committed to school-university partnerships. Teacher residencies are another construct with parallels to PDSs. Organizations like the National Center for Teacher Residences are also creating a vision for teacher preparation (NCTR, n.d.). Multiple constructs with multiple visions have the potential to confuse, complicate, or even dilute clinical practice through robust school-university partnerships. To address this cacophony of constructs, we examined and compared the reports focused on school-university partnerships from three national organizations: (1) the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008), (2) the Ten Design Principles from the NCATE Blue Ribbon Report (2010), and (3) the National Education Association’s (NEA) Report (2014) *Teacher Residencies: Redefining Preparation through Partnerships*. Through comparison, we identified core tenants or “ingredients” for what we believe will strengthen and articulate a vision of what constitutes a school-university partnership with the potential to transform teacher education.

Description of Organizations and Reports

In 2007, NAPDS, an organization dedicated to supporting school-university partnerships and professional development schools (NAPDS, n.d.) gathered scholars and practitioners from across the country to articulate a shared vision of PDSs. The result was the creation of the NAPDS Nine Essentials, which can be found on the organization's web site (www.napds.org/) and in the 2008 publication of *School-University Partnerships* (NAPDS, 2008).

Within a few years of the Nine Essentials, NCATE, another national organization focused on teacher education, also gathered scholars and practitioners from across the country to rethink teacher preparation. This group created a Blue Ribbon Panel Report called *Transforming Teacher Education through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers* (NCATE, 2010). In this report, the authors described 10 design principles for turning teacher preparation upside down to place clinical practice at the core of teacher preparation. The authors argued that schools and universities must collaborate and create school-university partnerships, such as those found in PDSs, to actualize the transformation of teacher education.

Most recently, the NEA, the largest national organization representing over three million educators, created a task force composed of K-12 educators, politicians, and the organization's staff to examine teacher residencies. The result was the publication of the report, *Teacher Residencies: Redefining Preparation through Partnerships* (NEA, 2014), which offered characteristics, components, and guiding principles for teacher residencies. In their report, they highlighted programs as exemplars of their guiding principles and two of the programs highlighted – West Virginia University and Montclair State University – were specifically identified as PDSs.

It is interesting to note that activity around school-university partnerships appeared to have momentum during the years of 2007 – 2014 and it may still be present as the field of teacher education moves toward transforming teacher preparation. Table 1 lists the NAPDS Nine Essentials, the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report 10 Essentials, and the NEA's Guiding Principles.

Process of Comparison

First, we used the oldest document – the NAPDS Nine Essentials – as the anchoring document of comparison, and created categories from this document that were important to understand the construct (e.g. PDS, teacher residency) of each report. Those categories included: guiding principles, goals, purposes, missions, and recommendations. Next, we created a chart to compare the information from our search. We then looked across the information within the chart to identify commonalities that could exist as “core ingredients.” All commonalities were included in the “core ingredients.” However, when there were differences, the researchers discussed the relevance and importance of the difference to determine if it was essential in actualizing school-university partnerships that can actualize clinical practice and educational renewal. If the researchers felt it was essential in actualizing the reform narratives, it was included as a core ingredient.

Disclosure of Bias

We must disclose that all of the authors have experiences in school-university partnerships. Two have experiences in PDSs, one in a teacher residency, and one in both PDSs and teacher residencies. One of our authors has served on the Executive Board of Directors for NAPDS. We disclose this information because ultimately, it is our commitment to and care for collaboration between schools and universities that drives our passion for further investigation.

Table 1. Comparing the “Core Ingredients of School University Partnerships” with the Three Reports

<p>NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008)</p>	<p>NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report Ten Essentials (2010)</p>	<p>NEA Report on Teacher Residencies, Guiding Principles (2014)</p>	<p>School-University Partnerships for Transforming Teacher Education (2016)</p>
<p>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;</p> <p>2. A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;</p> <p>3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;</p> <p>4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;</p> <p>5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of</p>	<p>1. Student learning is the focus.</p> <p>2. Clinical preparation is integrated throughout every facet of teacher education in a dynamic way.</p> <p>3. A candidate’s progress and the elements of a preparation program are continuously judged on the basis of data.</p> <p>4. Programs prepare teachers who are expert in content and how to teach it and are also innovators, collaborators and problem solvers.</p> <p>5. Candidates learn in an interactive professional community.</p>	<p>1. Teacher residencies should be developed with the goal of not only preparing future teachers but also of serving as a mechanism to drive school renewal and improve student learning.</p> <p>2. Residency programs should be developed by local partnerships that bring together teacher preparation providers, school districts, and other stakeholders.</p> <p>3. Residency partners should decide together what learning experiences – how much time, the kinds of resources, and the quality of clinical experiences – their teacher candidates will need to become profession-ready.</p> <p>4. Residency partners should work together to ensure that the following signature components are in place –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A selection, training, and feedback plan for clinical educators – those school-based and provider-based faculty that 	<p>1. A shared, comprehensive mission dedicated to equity for improved PreK-12 student learning and educational renewal</p> <p>2. Designated partnership sites with articulated agreements</p> <p>3. Shared governance with dedicated resources that foster sustainability and renewal for the partnership</p> <p>4. Clinical practice at the core of teaching and learning</p> <p>5. Active engagement in the school and local community</p> <p>6. Intentional and explicit</p>

deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;

6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;

7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;

8. Work by college/university faculty and P-12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and

9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.

6. Clinical educators and coaches are rigorously selected and prepared and drawn from both higher education and the P-12 sector.

7. Specific sites are designated and funded to support embedded clinical preparation.

8. Technology applications foster high-impact preparation.

9. A powerful R&D agenda and systematic gathering and use of data supports continuous improvement in teacher preparation

10. Strategic partnerships are imperative for powerful clinical preparation.

will be training teacher candidates

- A preparation curriculum that coherently integrates all field experiences with coursework
- Clinical experiences that provide ongoing opportunities for teacher candidates to plan and deliver lessons and then analyze and reflect on their own teaching practice with clinical educators and peers.
- Frequent assessment and feedback so candidates improve their skills.
- Coherent systems designed to support improved student learning.
- A requirement that residency candidates demonstrate their teaching knowledge and skill by successfully completing a classroom-based performance assessment before they are deemed profession-ready

9. Residency partnerships must develop data systems that support continuous improvement and accountability for both candidates and programs, and that also allow school districts and preparation faculty to exchange information.

commitment to the professional learning of all stakeholders

7. Shared commitment to research and innovation through deliberate investigation and dissemination

The Core Ingredients of School-University Partnerships

From our analysis, we identified seven core ingredients (see Table 1) that should compose every school-university partnership, and they include:

1. A shared, comprehensive mission dedicated to equity for improved PreK-12 student learning and educational renewal
2. Designated partnership sites with articulated agreements
3. Shared governance with dedicated resources that foster sustainability and renewal for the partnership
4. Clinical practice at the core of teaching and learning
5. Active engagement in the school and local community
6. Intentional and explicit commitment to the professional learning of all stakeholders
7. Shared commitment to research and innovation through deliberate investigation and dissemination

For teacher preparation to be transformed, it will be critical not only to create school-university partnerships but also to recognize that all school-university partnerships share these common seven ingredients.

Core Ingredient 1: Shared, Comprehensive Mission

The first core ingredient is a shared, comprehensive mission dedicated to equity for improved PreK-12 student learning and educational renewal. All three reports included information about a mission. While the NCATE Blue Ribbon Report (2010) focused solely on teacher preparation, the other two (NAPDS and NEA) included elements broader than teacher preparation. The NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) indicated the mission should include equity and be greater than either institution, and the NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies mentioned school renewal and improved student learning. Our proposed “core ingredient” unites all three missions to compose a more inclusive and robust mission for school-university partnerships.

When schools and universities decide to create a partnership, one of the most important conversations is the task of creating a mission. In the spirit of collaboration, this mission needs to be beyond either institution’s individual goals. When PDSs were first emerging, symbiotic relationships were encouraged. John Goodlad (1988) said, “Symbiosis is a provocative concept. Viewed positively, it refers to unlike organisms (or institutions) joined intimately in mutually beneficial relationships” (p. 14). Creating a mission where both institutions receive benefits is tempting, but if teacher education is truly to be transformed, then the benefit of individual institutions should not be the primary goal. Instead, the goal needs to be more selfless than selfish. In lieu of symbiosis, partnerships need to focus on the collective good without sacrificing the attainment of self-interest (Schlechty & Whitford, 1988). This means that the partnership needs to make a commitment to a mission for the common good. Working for the common good includes a commitment to equity for all stakeholders.

John Goodlad and his National Network for Educational Renewal was one of four visionaries in the history of PDS (Rutter, 2011). Goodlad’s (1988) vision of school-university partnerships not only included a mission beyond either institution, but he saw school-university partnerships as the vehicle for, what he termed, simultaneous renewal. Goodlad believed that if schools and universities could work together in pursuit of a common good, then together they

would push back and change bureaucratic structures in both institutions. We believe that if Goodlad's vision is to be actualized, then the best hope is through school-university partnerships that are able to actualize comprehensive missions dedicated to equity and educational renewal.

Core Ingredient 2: Designated Partnership Sites

The second core ingredient is the identification of designated partnership sites with articulated agreements. All three reports referenced partnerships between schools and universities in their vision, but we feel that identifying dedicated partnership sites is imperative in the creation of school-university partnerships.

In some ways, this ingredient seems like common sense; however, actualizing this practice may not be as common. The term school-university partnership seems to imply the identification of specific schools that are willing to intentionally become specific and consistent partnership sites. However, the term school-university partnership could be interpreted more broadly as the loosely connected practice of a university placing teacher candidates in schools. If schools and universities can work together to identify partnership sites and express that commitment through formal agreements, transforming teacher education becomes more possible. Developing robust school-university partnerships takes time, so designated partnership sites may be identified based on their commitment to developing a relationship over time. These partnerships must be open and committed to the other ingredients such as professional learning for all, creating an engaged learning community, and innovation. This could include a willingness to hold teacher candidate classes at the school site. Designated and consistent partnership sites allow for building the capacity of all learners over time. These sites can potentially become centers of excellence that transform the way teaching and learning are conceptualized and practiced.

Core Ingredient 3: Shared Governance and Resources

The third core ingredient is shared governance with dedicated resources that foster sustainability and renewal for the partnership. This core ingredient is not new to the PDS literature. In fact, shared governance and shared resources appear in the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008), but the idea of shared governance was not universal across all reports. The NEA Report (2014) alluded to the notion of shared governance by using the term "shared decision-making." In our opinion, shared governance implies shared decision-making. Examples of shared decision-making could include schools and universities collaboratively deciding where teacher candidates are placed as well as the type of professional learning that meets the school's goals. In addition, schools and universities can work together to develop shared routines, rituals, and celebrations. In fact, we would contend that the absence of this ingredient could negate any potential for the development of school-university partnerships and ultimately the transformation of teacher education.

In addition to shared governance, resources are another important core ingredient referenced in all three reports. The NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) identified shared and dedicated resources as imperative to the function of PDSs whereas the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) referenced funding more broadly. NCATE (2010) argued that transforming teacher education through school-university partnerships required dedicated funding and also a

reallocation of resources at both universities and schools. Another identified type of resource allocation is restructured staffing. An example of both a shared resource and a restructuring of staffing would be the creation of boundary-spanning roles. The NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) specifically identified boundary-spanning roles, but the notion of boundary-spanning was absent from the other documents. The NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) included clinical educators and clinical coaches from both schools and universities, but did not specifically include formalized boundary-spanning roles. We feel that if school-university partnerships are to actualize a comprehensive mission committed to equity and educational renewal, then creating structures that permit shared governance, the dedication of resources, and the creation of boundary-spanning roles are imperative.

Core Ingredient 4: Professional Learning for All

The fourth core ingredient is an intentional and explicit commitment to the professional learning of all stakeholders. While all three reports were committed to teacher preparation, only the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) referenced a commitment to ongoing and reciprocal professional development. The NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies focused primarily on the qualifications of the clinical educator, also called the mentor teacher, suggesting that this individual required training. The NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) advocated for strengthening the selection processes of clinical educators. The NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies asked how partners might be involved in professional learning.

If school-university partnerships are to actualize the comprehensive mission of a shared focus on student learning and educational renewal, then attention to the professional learning of all individuals needs to be a focus. In school-university partnerships, the focus can no longer be solely on teacher preparation. Instead, the focus needs to be on a broadened conceptualization of teacher education. Teacher education should be seen as a continuum of lifelong learning from teacher preparation through in-service teacher education (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Some PDSs have been able to actualize this continuum (Burns, Yendol-Hoppey, & Jacobs, 2015). School-university partnerships should work collaboratively to consider ways to strengthen not only the learning of teacher candidates as the future workforce but to build capacity of teachers, mentor teachers, teacher leaders, administrators, and university faculty. School-university partnerships of the future need to enact what PDSs have made a commitment to already, the intentional and explicit commitment to resources and structures that facilitate the learning of all stakeholders.

Core Ingredient 5: Centering Clinical Practice

The fifth core ingredient is clinical practice at the core of teaching and learning. The direct mention of clinical practice was most prominent in the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010). However, all three reports alluded to the notion of clinical practice. The NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies mentioned that clinical experiences needed to be developed and implemented in coordination with academic coursework. The NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) argued that clinical practice should occur in every aspect of the curriculum in the preparation of teachers. In fact, all but the NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies specifically used the medical model of doctor preparation as an aspiring model for teacher preparation. It was

interesting to note that the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) were the least expressive about clinical practice.

So what constitutes clinical practice? The reports did not clearly articulate definitions of clinical practices but they did describe characteristics. One of the characteristics was the close coupling of practice, content, theory, and pedagogy. This was articulated in the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) when they claimed that teacher preparation programs needed to be, “fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses” (p. ii). The NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies advocated for an integrated curriculum of field experiences and coursework with mastery of subject knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. An integrated curriculum that is grounded in clinical practice would require significant changes for schools and universities, specifically with regard to how university faculty are rewarded and how P-12 schools are staffed (NCATE, 2010). The inclusion of clinical practice as a core ingredient of school-university partnerships is essential for the successful transformation of teacher education.

Core Ingredient 6: Engagement in School and Local Community

The sixth core ingredient is active engagement in the school and local community. All three reports discussed school-university partnerships including the aspect of community. The NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) spoke specifically about the importance of teacher candidates learning within the context of a professional community. The NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies referenced the importance of teaching and reflection within a community of clinical educators and peers. However, the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) expanded upon the idea of community. Essential #2 stated, “A school-university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community” (NAPDS, 2008, p. 2). This NAPDS Essential was more encompassing than the other descriptions as it communicated the notion of a collaborative school-university culture that is vested in the school community.

While we agree that a core ingredient of school-university partnerships is engagement within the school community, we also believe that community should be conceptualized more broadly beyond the school walls. In order to work for the common good and advance educational equity, school-university partnerships need to include engagement in the local community as well. Schools need to connect to the local community to build bridges between what occurs in schools and the home, incorporate cultural norms and patterns from the home and community, and understand the challenges as well as assets within the community (Noguera, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). By conceptualizing community as both the school and the greater local community, our core ingredient is a more inclusive notion of community.

Core Ingredient 7: Shared Commitment to Research and Innovation

The seventh core ingredient is a shared commitment to research and innovation through deliberate investigation and dissemination. Both the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) and the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) indicated that research and innovation should be an integral component. While the word research was not specifically used in the Nine Essentials, two of the essentials referenced research and innovation. NAPDS (2008) Essential #4 stated, “A

shared commitment to the innovative and reflective practice by all participants,” and Essential #5 stated, “Engagement in and public sharing of results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants” (NAPDS, 2008, p. 3). Research is implied in these essentials but the term was not specifically used. On the other hand, the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) specifically identified a powerful research and development agenda as one of the 10 design principles for clinically rich teacher education. Interestingly, the NEA Report (2014) on teacher residencies did not specifically include research and innovation as a component of teacher residencies.

Even though research and innovation were not present in all three reports, we feel that they should be included as a core ingredient of school-university partnerships. If school-university partnerships are to actualize educational renewal, then they must be committed to investigating innovations that actualize that agenda. Likewise, if they are committed to clinical practice and the professional learning of all, then research and innovation are imperative to foster learning. Research and innovation are not the sole responsibility of researchers in universities. Teacher inquiry is considered a signature pedagogy in the PDS literature related to research and innovation (Yendol-Hoppey & Franco, 2014). Teacher inquiry is the systematic study of a teacher’s own practice (Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2009) and is sometimes used simultaneously to mean practitioner research. In school-university partnerships, both research and practitioner research should be valued. By including research and innovation as a core ingredient, school-universities remain committed to their mission and they value the role of research for scholars and for practitioners.

Discussion and Implications

National calls for transforming teacher education are loud and clear - schools and universities must work collaboratively. As an example of this charge, the NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) stated:

All teacher preparation programs and districts have to start thinking about teacher preparation as a responsibility they share, working together. Only when preparation programs become deeply engaged with schools will their clinical preparation become truly robust and will they be able to support the development of candidates’ urgently needed skills and learn what schools really need. (p. 3)

Clearly, the future of teacher education is through school-university partnerships; however, loosely developed school-university partnerships will not be able to meet the calls for robust clinical preparation. For that reason, we drew upon recommendations from three national documents to blend the knowledge of PDSs, clinically rich teacher education, and yearlong teacher residencies to identify seven core ingredients of school-university partnerships. We hope that the articulation of these seven core ingredients will provide guidance and support for the development of robust school-university partnerships.

It is an opportune time for PDSs. However, PDSs will need to remain innovators if they want to stay at the forefront of teacher education. We feel that for PDSs to survive, the NAPDS Nine Essentials should be revised to include specific attention to the discourse surrounding clinical practice. NAPDS has the potential to be the leading organization on clinically rich practice found in robust school-university partnerships, but to do so, NAPDS needs to broaden their message and vision. PDSs cannot remain a niche community. “The nation needs an entire

system of excellent programs, not a cottage industry of pathbreaking initiatives” (NCATE, 2010, p.ii). By attending to the national discourse on clinical practice and offering a strong, unified voice to define PDSs and what they can do to transform teacher education, PDSs can thrive. Transforming teacher education will require robust school-university partnerships, and who better to be the national leaders of this movement than PDSs? Rather than reinventing the wheel, the field of teacher education needs to capitalize on the knowledge, research, and experiences of the PDS literature created over the past 30 years.

To return to the muffin analogy, robust school-university partnerships focused on clinical practice will require individuals who can work across the boundaries of schools and universities and who can teach in and through clinical practice. These clinical educators, whether they are school- or university-based, are all teacher educators. They are the “chefs” who must bring the ingredients together to make the muffins. Much like chefs who attend years of technical training to learn their craft, we contest that the same attention needs to be given to teacher educators. Working in and with schools is challenging (Johnston, 1997) and requires individuals with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to engage in the daily practices of building and facilitating collaboration and community in the partnership (Jacobs, Yendol-Hoppey, & Dana, 2015). Much like teaching, teacher education has a knowledge base and skill set (Loughran, 2006). Just as clinical practice is recognized as a necessary signature pedagogy of preparing teachers, clinical practice is equally important for the professional learning of teacher educators, particularly teacher educators who are going to cultivate robust school-university partnerships (Burns, 2014). Interestingly, only the NAPDS Nine Essentials (2008) attended to the notion educating teacher educators by noting the importance of professional learning for all. Their attention to teacher educators is an excellent example of how NAPDS is visionary in robust school-university partnerships. Raising the next generation of teacher educators who can cultivate the necessary relationships and an integrated curriculum of clinical practice will require an intentional commitment by doctoral programs to use inquiry and clinical practice as signature pedagogies for the education of teacher educators (Jacobs, et al., 2015).

Finally, we end this paper with another thought-provoking concept from Marilyn Johnston and colleagues (1997). In her muffin analogy, she discusses how different kinds of muffins are a matter of personal taste. Some muffins are healthier than others, and some taste better than others. However, the ideal muffin should be both tasty and healthy. To draw parallels to school-university partnerships, there are clearly some school-university partnerships that are healthier than others. Each year, NAPDS identifies PDSs that serve as exemplars of the Nine Essentials and serve as illustrations of both “healthy and tasty” school-university partnerships. However, not all school-university partnerships are “tasty” or “healthy,” and even fewer are “tasty and healthy.”

With the movement towards transforming teacher education, collaboration between schools and universities can no longer be a matter of personal taste. Instead, robust school-university partnerships focused on clinical practice that are dedicated to equity and educational renewal must become a part of the healthy diet for all teacher education programs. Make no mistake - becoming healthy is difficult, but nonetheless, teacher education can no longer afford to be gluttonous. Instead, we must summon the courage and willpower to move beyond superficial relationships and delve deep into school-university collaboration. By drawing upon three national documents to create seven core ingredients, we propose a framework that will help develop school-university partnerships that are both tasty and healthy.

References

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief*. Washington, D.C.: AACTE. Retrieved from <http://edwebsfiles.ed.uiuc.edu/transitions/AACTE-Policy-Brief-March-2010.pdf>.
- Burns, R. W. (2014). The new teacher educator: Preparing teacher educators for partnership work. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in Indianapolis, IN.
- Burns, R. W., Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Jacobs, J. (2015). High quality teaching requires collaboration: How partnerships can create a true continuum of professional learning for educators. *The Educational Forum: A Publication of Kappa Delta Pi*, 79(1), 53-67. doi: 10.1080/00131725.2014.971990.
- Dana, N. F. & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2009). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Field, B. (2009). *Professional development schools: A twenty-year retrospective and a challenge for the future*. Speech presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of the Professional Development Schools.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 3-31). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I., & Sirotnik, K. A. (1988). The future of school-university partnerships. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 205-225). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Jacobs, J., Burns, R. W., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2014, April). *What do we know about preservice teacher supervision since the release of the NCATE PDS Standards and the NCATE Blue Ribbon Report? A Meta-Analysis*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. Philadelphia, PA.
- Jacobs, J., Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Dana, N.F. (2015). Preparing the next generation of teacher educators: The role of practitioner inquiry. *Action in Teacher Education*, 37(4), 373-396.
- Johnston, M. (1997). *Contradictions in collaboration: New thinking on school/university partnerships*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Association for Professional Development Schools. (n.d.). *Nine Essentials*. Retrieved from <http://napds.org>.
- National Association for Professional Development Schools. (2008). *What it means to be a professional development school*. South Carolina: The Executive Council and Board of Directors.

- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (n.d.). *National Center for Teacher Residencies*. Retrieved from <http://nctresidencies.org/about/>.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010, November). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, DC: Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning.
- Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York, NY: Teacher College Press.
- Rutter, A. (2011). Purpose and vision in professional development schools. In J. Neopolitan (Ed.), *Yearbook for the National Society of the Study of Education, 110(2)*, 289-305. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Schlechty, P. C., & Whitford, B. L. (1988). Shared problems and shared vision: Organic collaboration. In K. A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-University partnerships in action: Concepts, cases, and concerns* (pp. 205-225). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Villegas, A. & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Yendol-Hoppey, D. & Franco, Y. (2014). In search of signature pedagogy for PDS teacher education: A review of articles published in school-university partnerships. *School-University Partnerships, 7(1)*, 17-34.
- Zenkov, K., Parker, A., Dennis, D., & Degregory, C. (2015). *How do YOU speak PDS?: Survey research on the state of a common language across our programs*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. Atlanta, GA.

Rebecca West Burns is an Assistant Professor at the University of South Florida. Her research agenda focuses on supervision in teacher education, school-university partnerships, and teacher leadership. Jennifer Jacobs is an Assistant Professor of Elementary Education at the University of South Florida. Her research interests center on equity-centered teacher education, practitioner inquiry, and teacher leadership. Wendy Baker is a Partnership Resource Teacher and an educator for two decades in Hillsborough County Public Schools. Her research interests include preservice teacher education, supervision, and school-university partnerships. Denise Donahue has been an educator for 25 years, working in early childhood, elementary, exceptional, and gifted education. She is currently a partnership resource teacher in Hillsborough County Public Schools.