
Considering Professional Development School Partnerships in Light of CAEP Standard Two

Drew Polly
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Abstract: With the adoption of the 2013 Standards from the Council for Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP), educator preparation programs and partner schools are revisiting what effective clinical practices look like. To that end, this article examines the overlap between CAEP Standard 2 focused on clinical practice and the relevant essentials from the NAPDS *Nine Essentials* document. The article includes two vignettes of Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships that provide contrasting images of what PDS relationships could look like. Implications include examining as a field and as individual partnerships how closely partner activities align with the standards and goals widely accepted by our institutions.

KEYWORDS: CAEP Standards, Professional Development Schools, clinical experiences, elementary education, mathematics education, tutoring

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;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration

Author Note: While this article was written by a university faculty member, this work would not be possible without partnerships with both Charlotte-Mecklenburg and Kannapolis City Schools.

Introduction

Context of Educator Preparation

The 2013 Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Standards were adopted in recent years by multiple educator preparation programs in the United States. These new standards have a great influence on the program and curriculum revisions occurring in Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs). In the 2013 CAEP Standards, Standard Two and all of its components focus on Clinical Practice and Partnerships, topics that resonate with individuals involved in Professional Development School (PDS) work. In the past decades, most PDS

partnerships have framed their work around the *Nine Essentials*, a document written by leaders of the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS), reflecting research-based practices about school-university partnerships (NAPDS, 2008). As is the case when new accreditation standards are created, there is a need to critically analyze the fit and alignment of those standards and other frameworks. In this article I provide an analysis of the 2013 CAEP Standards and the NAPDS Nine Essentials with a focus on similarities and commonalities. I also describe two vastly different vignettes and examine how these two Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships reflected and addressed the CAEP Standards.

PDS Partnerships historically involve relationships between educator preparation programs (EPPs) and P-12 schools. Due to the requirement for EPPs to meet accreditation standards, these PDS partnerships usually align to Standards. In the early 2000s, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) published PDS Standards as well as a set of descriptors to describe what it looked like for school partnerships to be considered beginning, developing, at standard, and leading in PDS work (Polly, Smaldino, & Brynteson, 2015). These NCATE PDS Standards and other research on the field were used to develop and frame the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) Nine Essentials (NAPDS, 2007), which were created by NAPDS members to describe the characteristics of PDS partnerships. The current climate of accountability and standards driven alignment in educational programs calls for leaders of PDS partnerships to ensure that their work is driven by and meets the expectations of related standards (Smaldino & Luetkehans, 2015). This article examines what it means to be a Professional Development School in light of the current climate of accountability and the 2013 CAEP Standards.

Accountability, Standards, and PDS Partnerships

The role of accountability in Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) is not new. Multiple studies have cited the experiences of creating and sustaining PDS' while P-12 schools and EPPs are in the midst of high-stakes accountability related to learning outcomes (Steel, Shambaugh, Curtis, & Schrum, 2015; Zeichner, 2007). The publication of the NCATE-sponsored Blue Ribbon Panel Report (NCATE, 2010) encouraged EPPs to examine and reform their programs, including ways to enhance or develop strong partnerships between programs and K-12 schools (van Scoy & Eldridge, 2012) and provide comprehensive documentation and evaluation of that work. In a synthesis of the recommendations in the Blue Ribbon Report and the NAPDS *Nine Essentials*, van Scoy and Eldridge (2012) found commonalities in both documents related to: deliberate planned partnerships, comprehensive clinical preparation, high standards for all, and data-driven practice, with a heavy emphasis on data-driven practice and continuous evaluation of PDS work in light of accreditation standards.

Heafner, McIntyre, and Spooner (2014) examined the intersection of CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice and Standard 4: Program Impact in light of school-university partnerships. They concluded a need for teacher education programs to set up and design comprehensive models for teacher candidates and practicing teachers to develop their knowledge and skills while simultaneously using data and program outcomes to evaluate and modify program implementation.

Field and van Scoy (2014) provided a historical overview of two decades worth of PDS work and program revisions based on program outcomes. They concluded that one of the most critical components of success was flexibility during times when stakeholders examined data and found a need to modify specific aspects of their partnership in order to better serve partner school students or teacher candidates. Another conclusion was that these revisions and modifications were mostly possible due to the strong relationships built over time between administrators and faculty from both the university and partner school.

Many teacher education experts have advocated for PDS Partnerships that support clinical practice and teacher candidate preparation in this era of accountability and teacher reform. Darling-Hammond (2014) was one of those advocates writing:

In highly developed professional development school models, curriculum reforms and other improvement initiatives are supported by the school and often the district; school teams involving both university and school educators work on such tasks as curriculum development, school reform, and action research; university faculty are typically involved in teaching courses and organizing professional development at the school site and may also be involved in teaching children; school-based faculty often teach in the teacher education program. Most classrooms are sites for practica and student teaching placements, and cooperating teachers are trained to become teacher educators, often holding meetings regularly to develop their mentoring skills. (p. 553)

The comments of Darling-Hammond above and others reflect the power of PDS partnerships to support educator preparation programs. Due to the widespread adoption of the 2013 CAEP Standards there is a need to examine PDS work and activities in light of the new standards. In the next section I provide a synthesis of the NAPDS Nine Essentials and the 2013 CAEP Standards, for the purpose of highlighting characteristics of PDS Partnerships that align with both the Nine Essentials and CAEP Standards.

Examining the CAEP Standards and Nine Essentials

2013 CAEP Standards

The council of Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP) published its first set of Standards in 2013. As the organization that replaced both NCATE and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), thousands of teacher education programs are looking to these new Standards and examining their programs in order to make sure they are aligned to the standards. The sub-standards aligned to the work of PDS partnerships are in Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice (Figure 1).

While the CAEP Standards do not explicitly talk about Professional Development School partnerships they require educator preparation programs (EPPs) and their partners to engage in three large efforts. First Component 2.1, EPPs must form mutually beneficial arrangements (partnerships) that include shared responsibility for clinical preparation of future pre-service teachers. The Standard also says that there must be coherence and consistency between the educator preparation program, which implicitly means that educator preparation programs and school partners must be in constant communication and philosophically aligned when it comes to teaching strategies and approaches.

In Component 2.2, school partners are charged with identifying, developing, and retaining high-quality clinical educators who will host and work with pre-service teachers and mentor them through the process of learning how to teach. The role of EPPs in this Standard is to establish and refine identify criteria for teachers to serve as clinical educators. Further, EPPs are to partner with school partners to ensure continuous improvement and growth of clinical educators' knowledge and skills, which will in turn make them more effective working with pre-service teachers.

The last sub-standard in the cluster, Component 2.3, describes the expectations for clinical experiences. The words depth, breadth, coherence, diversity, and duration are included to describe the types of clinical experiences that EPPs and school partners should provide to their candidates. Sub-standard 2.3 also mandates the use of multiple performance-based assessments to evaluate the progress of candidates in these clinical experiences.

NAPDS Nine Essentials

The nine essentials for PDS Partnerships, as defined by members of the National Association for Professional Development Schools, are shared in Figure 2 (NAPDS, 2008). As the CAEP Standards speak specifically to the goal of supporting the development of teacher candidates and future teachers, that lens will be used to highlight the relevant aspects of the *Nine Essentials* document. Essentials 1, 2, 3, and 7 all have close alignment with the 2013 CAEP Standards.

Essential One sets the stage for the rest of the nine characteristics of PDS partnerships by stating that the partnership has a comprehensive mission that extends beyond the mission of any partner. More specifically, PDS partnerships cannot be formed only to support teacher candidates or on the other hand only the teachers in the partnership school. The comprehensive mission shared by NAPDS partners should simultaneously provide benefit and include goals involving both the EPP and the partner school.

Essential Two calls for a commitment from both EPPs and school partners to preparing future educators and encouraging their active engagement in partner schools. Specifically,

PDSs, however, are more than simply places where teacher candidates complete their clinical experiences. Instead, they are schools whose faculty and staff as a collective whole are committed to working with college/university faculty to offer a meaningful introduction to the teaching profession. As such, PDSs create a school-wide culture that incorporates teacher candidates as full participants of the school community. (p. 4)

The *Nine Essentials* holds that teacher candidates, although they are in schools temporarily and are still learning how to become teachers, are full participants in the school community.

Essential Three calls for ongoing professional development for all stakeholders guided by need. This includes clinical teachers in the partnership school, faculty members, as well as teacher candidates. In the *Nine Essentials*, NAPDS (2008) recommended the design and implementation of professional development specific to the needs of the school that include partner school faculty, teacher candidates, and EPP faculty. Further, the document mentions the need for professional development to be explicitly connected to classroom practice.

Essential Four calls for PDS partnerships to participate in innovative and reflective practice that goes beyond just the status quo of teacher candidates spending time in partner

schools gaining experience. NAPDS calls for the co-mingling of theory, practice, and careful thought when considering partnerships that will benefit all of the stakeholders involved. This innovation must be shared by both the EPP and partner school and not a situation in which one entity controls the projects and efforts. Further, innovative and reflective practice means that teacher candidates should be encouraged to teach freely and hone their knowledge and skills in a positive and nurturing school environment. Essentials 5 through 9 are focused on organizational structure and are not detailed in depth here in order to focus more intentionally on the alignment between the *Nine Essentials* and the 2013 CAEP Standards. In the next section connections are made between the *Nine Essentials* and the 2013 CAEP Standards.

Making Connections between CAEP and NAPDS

While the 2013 CAEP Standards do not specifically mention Professional Development Schools, CAEP Standard 2 specifically delineates the types of partnerships expected between educator preparation programs (EPPs) and partner schools. Table 1 provides alignment between the two documents.

Table 1

Alignment of the NAPDS Nine Essentials and 2013 CAEP Standards

		2013 CAEP Standards		
		CAEP 2.1. Partnerships for clinical preparation	CAEP 2.2. Development of Clinical educators	CAEP 2.3. Strong Clinical experiences
NAPDS Nine Essentials	NAPDS 1: Broad partnerships	X		
	NAPDS 2: Committed to candidate preparation	X		X
	NAPDS 3: Professional development for all		X	X
	NAPDS 4 : Innovate and reflective practices for all	X	X	X
	NAPDS 7: Ongoing reflection	X	X	X

As those involved with Professional Development School work and affiliated with CAEP institutions consider what it means to be a Professional Development School it is critical to keep in mind the alignment between the accreditation Standards and the underpinnings of PDS work as established by NAPDS. In the next section we describe two PDS efforts in light of the 2013 CAEP Standards and NAPDS *Nine Essentials*.

Examples of PDS Partnerships

PDS Partnership Focusing on Tutoring Elementary School Students

Overview. In this unique PDS project, teacher candidates in the first semester of their junior year tutor students in urban schools in which over 90% of their students qualify for free and/or reduced lunch. This project has taken place in 4 different elementary partner schools, but has been the most intensive at 2 of those schools. In their first semester of their junior year, candidates complete 5 education courses: instructional design and technology integration, child development, teaching mathematics to K-2 learners, teaching reading to K-2 learners, and physical activity for elementary school students. As part of the clinical, school-based assignment for the instructional design and technology integration class, students complete this intensive tutoring assignment.

Involvement of Candidates. Students are assigned to a classroom teacher and work with one child in that classroom for 45-60 minutes each week for 10 weeks in a tutoring/individual teaching setting. The instructional materials that candidates use to tutor come from the clinical teacher at first, but towards the end of the semester candidates sometimes bring their own materials.

Candidates reported that their tutoring involves either literacy or mathematics help and that in most cases, the teachers gave them activity sheets or worksheets to do with students or academic games to play with students. Most candidates also completed clinical experiences for other courses in that same classroom, which typically ended up totaling 40 hours of observations, tutoring, small group teaching, and whole class teaching in that classroom.

Involvement of Partner School Faculty. Teachers at the partner school were responsible for identifying students who would be tutored as well as organizing the instructional materials for the candidate to use with the student. Most of the faculty members worked with candidates for the tutoring assignment as well as clinical activities for other courses. This intensive involvement with candidates allowed partner school faculty to give them feedback on lesson plans or lessons that candidates taught, talk with candidates and answer questions about lessons that clinical teachers taught, and serve as an in-school source of mentorship and support.

Still, though, in some cases candidates went to the classroom tutored the student and then left with little interaction with the clinical teacher. In cases that this occurred, candidates completed their other clinical activities with another teacher in a different school. While going to multiple schools gave candidates' exposure to various school settings, it did not allow them to develop as close of a relationship with teachers and students compared to candidates who completed all of their clinical work in one classroom.

Alignment to 2013 CAEP Standards and NAPDS Nine Essentials. This PDS project aligns most directly with CAEP Components 2.1, 2.3 and NAPDS Essentials 1, 2, 4, and 7. For both the university and the school, this effort was mutually beneficial beyond the mission of just the single entities (NAPDS 1). Candidates participated during the semester in an intensive, innovative set of clinical experiences that allowed them to become part of the school community and spend considerable amounts of time working with students (CAEP 2.3, NAPDS 2 and 4). In the past two semesters, both university and partner school leaders modified the program so that candidates were placed at their tutoring school for other clinical experiences as well. Thus,

candidates had an intensive, deep experience in a school culture compared to candidates who tutored at the school but went to other schools for their other clinical activities (CAEP 2.3, NAPDS 7). They were also more immersed in the school community than candidates in previous semesters, who did not tutor and simply spent limited hours observing classrooms.

In terms of improving this project to better align to the standards, a commitment to have all candidates complete all of their clinical experiences in one or two classrooms in the school would help ensure that candidates have an intensive clinical experience and opportunities to engage deeply with the school's culture, students, and teachers. Further, professional development or additional resources could be provided to partner school faculty about how to best support and mentor teacher candidates.

Influence of the PDS Project. Research about the influence of this PDS project is in its preliminary stages. At this point, survey data has been collected about the experiences of both candidate and partner school faculty. Survey data from the first two semesters of this project indicate that candidates enjoy ongoing work with their student that they tutor and that they reported that they made a positive difference on their student. Further, some candidates reported feeling connected to the school due to the amount of time that they spent there for their clinical activities. All candidates tutored in low-performing, urban schools and reported that they felt more aware of the opportunities and challenges to teach in these types of environments.

The partner school teachers reported that their students showed growth academically during the time that candidates were tutoring their students. Further, teachers also reported that they felt positive about being able to support and work with candidates who would become elementary school teachers, and wanted more opportunities in future semesters with tutoring, other clinical experiences, and full-time student teaching.

Plans for future semesters include further support for clinical teachers by providing resources or guidance in working with candidates, as well as flexibility to have candidates either tutor students or work with students during whole class or small group activities. In terms of evaluating the project, both university leaders and partner school administrators have expressed interest in looking at how much tutoring students actually impacts students' academic performance. This type of evaluative work would need to carefully and thoughtfully consider how tutoring influenced student learning in conjunction with other academic efforts, such as daily classroom experiences or other interventions.

PDS Project Focusing on Elementary Mathematics Teaching

Overview. This partnership took place between the university and an elementary school in which over 75% of its students qualified for free and/or reduced lunch, and over 40% of its students were English Language Learners. This PDS partnership emerged from an existing partnership between the author's university and the partner school that was focused on designing interdisciplinary literacy units. However, due to a few consecutive years of low student achievement in mathematics, the school administration asked the author to provide support around their mathematics program to their teachers. This PDS work focused on professional development through workshops, planning sessions, selecting effective mathematics curriculum, and providing in-class support to teachers. In line with Essential Seven from the NAPDS *Nine*

Essentials and CAEP Standard 2, support was school-specific, ongoing and modified to meet the needs of teachers and their students.

Involvement of Partner School Faculty. Clinical teachers and teachers in the partner school were more directly involved in and influenced by this PDS partnership compared to teacher candidates. A few clinical teachers participated in multi-year work with the author that involved co-planning, co-teaching, classroom-based support, and mentorship around mathematics teaching. A few of the clinical teachers even participated at the district level leading mathematics workshops and providing oversight on district pacing and assessment projects.

The entire staff participated with the author in planning meetings and workshops about effective instructional strategies. Further, the entire staff started teaching with and received support using a reform-based mathematics curriculum. Lastly, every teacher participated in district-wide professional development related to mathematics teaching that was a related project to this PDS work. The entire staff engaged in approximately 5 days of professional development in their school and 8 days of district-wide professional development in a two-year period, a total of 78 hours for each teacher.

Involvement of Teacher Candidates. Teacher candidates were primarily involved in this project indirectly through their clinical activities in the classrooms of the partner school. During the first semester of their junior year candidates have to complete whole group teaching, small group teaching, and teacher observations in a classroom. During the second semester of their junior year candidates spend two whole weeks teaching and observing in one classroom. During their senior year, candidates are in their student teaching classroom; they spend one full day per week in their student teaching classroom in the first semester and are in that same classroom full-time for 15 weeks in their final semester teaching and carrying out the duties of a classroom teacher.

The partner school only has four teachers per grade level and 20 teachers in the entire school. Most semesters between one-third to one-half of all classroom teachers work with candidates. More specifically, each year the school hosts between six to 12 first semester juniors, 8 second semester juniors, and between two to four candidates during the student teaching year. Though very few candidates directly participated in mathematics professional development activities they benefited by working with clinical teachers who had developed their knowledge and skills related to mathematics teaching.

Alignment to 2013 CAEP Standards and Nine Essentials. As indicated by the description above this project focused intensively on CAEP Component 2.2 and NAPDS Essentials One and Three by developing the skills and knowledge of clinical teachers. In addition, during the program more teacher candidates were placed in these clinical teachers' classrooms, which made the experience for both clinical teachers and teacher candidates more worthwhile (CAEP 2.3, NAPDS 4). The reflective work on how to bring teacher candidates into the project by placing them in classrooms of teachers who had participated in the professional development made candidates' experiences very valuable (CAEP 2.3, NAPDS 4 and 7).

In terms of ways to improve this project in the future, there would have been an added benefit if teacher candidates' schedule allowed them to participate in the planning sessions and professional development activities. A handful of candidates participated in this manner during their full-time internship, but candidates who were not yet in internship did not have this opportunity. Those candidates who participated in the professional development reported that

they enjoyed participating in professional learning opportunities that aligned so well to what they had learned in their courses and the work in their student teaching classroom. They also reported in turn feeling more confident in their ability to teach mathematics to their students.

Influence of the PDS Project. In the research studies conducted related to this project found gains in teachers' use of student-centered pedagogies (McGee, Wang, & Polly, 2013; Polly, Wang, McGee, Lambert, Martin, & Pugalee, 2014; Wang, Polly, LeHew, Lambert, & Pugalee, 2013), shifts in teachers' beliefs to more student-centered approaches to teaching mathematics (Martin, Polly, McGee, Wang, Lambert, & Pugalee, 2014), and gains in student learning outcomes (Polly, McGee, Wang, Martin, Lambert, & Pugalee, 2015). No formal data was collected from teacher candidates in these classrooms, but anecdotally they were encouraged and supported to use reform-based mathematics pedagogies through co-planning and close work with the classroom teachers. As one of the professional development facilitators, I (the author) benefited from the integrated work supporting classroom teachers, spending time in mathematics classrooms, and working with teacher candidates in coursework. As a university faculty member, a project that connects service to practicing teachers, work in classrooms, as well as courses for teacher candidates truly is a beneficial experience.

Future evaluations and research are needed to look more closely at the influence of this type of PDS work on teacher candidates and teachers. Specifically, there is a need to see how candidates are influenced by working with teachers who have had intensive professional development projects. Data could be collected simultaneously from candidates and school faculty member to understand how teachers' involvement in professional development influences them, candidates in their classroom, and student learning outcomes.

Table 2 provides an overall summary of both PDS Projects described in this article. In the next section we detail implications and recommendations for those individuals involved in PDS work at institutions that have adopted the 2013 CAEP Standards.

Table 2
Summary of PDS Projects

Components of Project	PDS Focusing on Tutoring Students	PDS Project Focusing on Elementary Mathematics Teaching
Involvement of Candidates	Candidates completed 10 hours of tutoring and 40 hours of tutoring, teaching, and observations in a clinical experience.	Candidates completed clinical experiences during courses and full-time student teaching in classrooms of teachers who had participated in the project.
Involvement of Partner School Faculty	Partner school faculty provided candidates with instructional resources and materials to use for tutoring. Partner school faculty members were also in the classroom or building to talk to candidates on a regular basis.	Partner school faculty participated in 78 hours of professional development including school-based experiences and district-wide workshops. Faculty provided support and mentorship to candidates who completed clinical experiences and student teaching in

		their classroom.
Alignment to CAEP Standards and NAPDS Nine Essentials	CAEP Component 2.2 and NAPDS Essentials 1 and 3.	CAEP Component 2.3 and NAPDS Essentials 1, 2, and 4. CAEP Component 2.2 was indirectly related due to candidates working with teachers who had participated in the PDS project.
Influence of PDS Project	Candidates reported learning more about low-performing, urban schools and being a part of the partner school environment. School faculty reported that tutoring influenced positive student growth and that they had positive experiences working with candidates.	Increase in school faculty members' use of reform-based pedagogies, increase in student-centered beliefs in mathematics, and gains in student learning outcomes on state-wide assessments in Grades 3 and 4.

Implications and Future Directions

Addressing Both the Nine Essentials and CAEP Standards

The 2013 CAEP Standards in light of the NAPDS *Nine Essentials* require educator preparation programs (EPPs) and their PDS partner schools to consider how to best design, implement, and analyze partnership work and projects. The CAEP Standards specifically address the creation of comprehensive partnerships (CAEP 2.1, NAPDS 1), the development of clinical faculty committing to candidate preparation (CAEP 2.2, NAPDS 2 and 4), and the creation of innovative rich clinical experiences for candidates (CAEP 2.3, NAPDS 2).

In this article I described two distinctly different PDS partnerships that align to aspects of the CAEP Standards and NAPDS *Nine Essentials*. The first focused on an intensive tutoring clinical experience for candidates (CAEP 2.3) and clinical faculty intensively with candidates (CAEP 2.2). The second emphasized professional development of partner school clinical faculty (CAEP 2.2) and involved indirectly some clinical experiences for candidates (CAEP 2.3). In both of these vignettes innovative partnerships had been formed to strengthen teaching and learning in for both partner school faculty and candidates. There is a natural alignment between the *Nine Essentials* that are focused on candidate preparation and CAEP Components 2.1 and 2.3. Meanwhile, the *Nine Essentials* focused on developing clinical or partner school faculty aligns directly to CAEP Components 2.1 and 2.2. In response to the call for articles for this themed issue of *School-University Partnerships*, PDS partnerships need to comprehensively address the Nine Essentials as well as the substandards that make up CAEP Standard Two.

Looking Forward

The purpose of this article was not to advocate for throwing the baby out with the bath water by redoing PDS partnerships just to fit the CAEP Standards. Rather, due to the strong

alignment between the NAPDS *Nine Essentials* and the 2013 CAEP Standards, my goal was to demonstrate through vignettes how high quality PDS work is already aligned to the recommendations of CAEP. As we look to the future of PDS work, it is critical to continue to revisit within our own context, as well as in national and international contexts, what constitutes an *effective* PDS.

Perhaps the answer is as easy as a school-university or PDS partnership examining their work in light of the alignment between CAEP Standards and recommendations in the *Nine Essentials* from NAPDS. However, it may not be that easy or cut and dry. In the case of the vignette on tutoring, we entered the partnership wanting to provide service to students by having teacher candidates tutor, yet there was a clear need to support clinical teachers in the partner schools about what instructional materials to provide and how to support the tutoring program. Likewise, the second project focused on mathematics professional development was started to support students' mathematics by working closely with teachers to deepen their mathematics knowledge and skills. In that case, there was a need to deliberately place candidates in teachers' classrooms, yet also ensure they were prepared and well equipped to be involved in classrooms with reform-based mathematics pedagogies.

The two vignettes provide different ways that PDS projects can align to the 2013 CAEP standards and support the learning of students in partner schools. This addresses the question of this themed issue about "What is a PDS?" by highlighting the need for universities using the CAEP Standards for accreditation must ground their work in both the *Nine Essentials* and CAEP Standard Two. Optimistically, there is strong alignment between the NAPDS *Nine Essentials* and Standard Two from CAEP. As PDS partnerships continue to navigate the waters of the CAEP Standards and other accreditation processes, the beacon should always be on the simultaneous support of students' learning in the partner schools, and the development of partner school faculty, candidates and university faculty (Polly, Spooner, & Chapman, 2015).

Standard 2:
CLINICAL PARTNERSHIPS AND PRACTICE

The provider ensures that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development.

Partnerships for Clinical Preparation

2.1 Partners co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements, including technology-based collaborations, for clinical preparation and share responsibility for continuous improvement of candidate preparation. Partnerships for clinical preparation can follow a range of forms, participants, and functions. They establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation, and exit; ensure that theory and practice are linked; maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation; and share accountability for candidate outcomes.

Clinical Educators

2.2 Partners co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development. In collaboration with their partners, providers use multiple indicators and appropriate technology-based applications to establish, maintain, and refine criteria for selection, professional development, performance evaluation, continuous improvement, and retention of clinical educators in all clinical placement settings.

Clinical Experiences

2.3 The provider works with partners to design clinical experiences of sufficient depth, breadth, diversity, coherence, and duration to ensure that candidates demonstrate their developing effectiveness and positive impact on all students' learning and development. Clinical experiences, including technology-enhanced learning opportunities, are structured to have multiple performance-based assessments at key points within the program to demonstrate candidates' development of the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, as delineated in Standard 1, that are associated with a positive impact on the learning and development of all P-12 students.

Figure 1. CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice (CAEP, 2013).

The nine required essentials of a PDS are:

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
2. A school–university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;
8. Work by college/university faculty and P–12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.

Figure 2. Nine Essentials of PDS Partnerships (NAPDS, 2008).

References

- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (2013). CAEP Standards. Retrieved from: http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf
- Field, B. E., & van Scoy, I. J. (2014). The challenges never stop! Two decades of reaching for the best in clinical practice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89(4), 436-452.
- Heafner, T., McIntyre, E., & Spooner, M. C. (2014). The CAEP standards and research on educator preparation programs: Linking clinical partnerships with program impact. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89(4), 516-532.
- Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Martin, C. S., Polly, D., McGee, J. R., Wang, C., Lambert, R. G. & Pugalee, D. K. (2015). Exploring the relationship between questioning, enacted tasks, and mathematical discourse in elementary school mathematics. *The Mathematics Educator*, 24(2), 3-27, <http://tme.journals.libs.uga.edu/index.php/tme/article/view/308/266>
- McGee, J. R., Wang, C., & Polly, D. (2013). Guiding teachers in the use of a standards-based mathematics curriculum: Perceptions and subsequent instructional practices after an intensive professional development program. *School Science and Mathematics*, 113(1), 16-28. DOI: 10.1111/j.1949-8594.2012.00172.x
- National Association for Professional Development Schools (2008). What it means to be a professional development school. Retrieved from: <http://napds.org/9%20Essentials/statement.pdf>.

- National Council for the Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) (2010). Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3d&tabid=715>
- National Council for the Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) (2001). Standards for professional development schools. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=FcHbf2B%2B670%3D&tabid=610>
- Polly, D., McGee, J. R., Wang, C., Martin, C., Lambert, R., Pugalee, D. K. (2015). Linking professional development, teacher outcomes, and student achievement: The case of a learner-centered mathematics program for elementary school teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 72, 26-37.
- Polly, D., Smaldino, S., Brynteson, K. (2015). Developing a rubric to support the evaluation of professional development school partnerships. *School-University Partnerships*, 8(1), 20-23.
- Polly, D., Spooner, M. C., & Chapman, M. W (2015). Developing a more systematic approach to Professional Development School partnerships: The case of PDS efforts at a large urban university. In D. Polly, T. Heafner, M. C. Spooner, & M. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Professional Development Schools and Transformative Partnerships* (pp. 22-29). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-6367-1.ch002
- Polly, D., Wang, C., McGee, J.R., Lambert, R.G., Martin, C.S., Pugalee, D.K. (2014). Examining the influence of a curriculum-based elementary mathematics professional development program. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 28(3), 327-343. DOI: 10.1080/02568543.2014.913276.
- Smaldino, S., Luetkehans, L. (2015). Transformative partnerships. In D. Polly, T. Heafner, M. C. Spooner, & M. Chapman (Eds.), *Professional Development Schools and Transformative Partnerships*. (pp. 74-82). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi: 10.4018/978-1-4666-6367-1.ch006.
- Steel, S., Shambaugh, N., Curtis, R. & Schrum, L. (2015). In D. Polly, T. Heafner, M. C. Spooner, & M. Chapman (Eds.), *Professional Development Schools and Transformative Partnerships*. (pp. 1-21). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi: 10.4018/978-1-4666-6367-1.ch001
- van Scoy, I. J., & Eldridge, D. B. (2012). NCATE's Blue Ribbon Panel Report and NAPDS: Working Together. *School-University Partnerships*, 5(1), 7-12.
- Wang, C., Polly, D., LeHew, A. J., Pugalee, D. K., & Lambert, R. (2013). Supporting teachers' enactment of an elementary school student-centered mathematics pedagogies: The evaluation of a curriculum-focused professional development program. *New Waves-Educational Research and Development*, 16(1), 76-91.
- Zeichner, K. (2007). Professional development schools in a culture of evidence and accountability. *School-University Partnerships: The Journal of the National Association for Professional Development Schools*, 1(1), 9-17.

Drew Polly is an associate professor in the Elementary Education program at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. His work examines how to support teachers' enactment of learner-centered pedagogies.