NCATE
The Standard of Excellence in Teacher Preparation

CTQ CENTER FOR TEACHING QUALITY
Teacher Leadership · Research · Policy

Urban Teacher Residency Models and Institutes of Higher Education

Implications for Teacher Preparation

Barnett Berry and Diana Montgomery
Center for Teaching Quality

Jon Snyder
Bank Street College

August 2008

A paper commissioned by
the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
with funding from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations and the MetLife Foundation

NCATE

The Standard of Excellence
in Teacher Preparation

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is a professional accrediting body for educator preparation in the United States. The NCATE accreditation process determines which schools, colleges, and departments of education meet demanding standards for the preparation of teachers and other school specialists.

CTQ CENTER FOR TEACHING QUALITY

Teacher Leadership • Research • Policy

The Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ) seeks to improve student learning and advance the teaching profession by cultivating teacher leadership, conducting timely research and crafting smart policy around what must be done to ensure that every student in America has a qualified, well-supported and effective teacher. Over the past ten years, CTQ's work has sought to promote a coherent system of teacher recruitment, preparation, induction, professional development, compensation and school-design policies that could dramatically close the nation's student achievement gap. (www.teachingquality.com)

Urban Teacher Residency Models and Institutes of Higher Education: *Implications for Teacher Preparation*

Barnett Berry and Diana Montgomery, CTQ
Jon Snyder, Bank Street College

Why Urban Teacher Residencies

The Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ), in partnership with the Aspen Institute and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE),[1] has been investigating the urban teacher residency (UTR) — an innovative response to the longstanding challenges of how to recruit, prepare, and retain bright and capable teachers for high-needs urban schools. Chicago's Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) and the Boston Teacher Residency (BTR) Program are two of the nation's most promising UTRs. In some respects UTRs represent a "third way" — addressing the weaknesses as well as incorporating the best of both traditional and alternative approaches to teacher education and certification. In brief, UTRs recruit teaching talent aggressively, with the supply and demand needs of local districts in mind. They also insist on extensive preparation, whereby recruits are paid a stipend while learning to teach in a full-year residency, under the watchful eye of expert K-12 teachers. Because the Residents are not fully responsible for teaching children, they have more quality time to take relevant pedagogical coursework "wrapped around" their intense student teaching experience. While both AUSL and BTR are relatively new programs, early studies on their graduates' effectiveness and their high retention rates of 90 to 95 percent suggest these models hold great promise for preparing and supporting teachers in high-needs urban schools.

We believe the time is now for the teacher education community to embrace UTRs — supporting the development of them while also using them to improve their current programs. The struggles of both traditional and alternative pathways to certification are well known. For example, many traditional university-based programs are challenged by:

- Difficulty in attracting high academic achievers and teacher candidates of color;
- Too few opportunities for prospective teachers to be taught by exemplary classroom teachers;
- Failure to meet shortage area needs in subjects such as math, science, and special education, as well as the need for English Language Learners teachers;
- Limited resources and structures to provide induction support for their graduates in a systematic way once they begin teaching; and
- Lack of accountability for the effectiveness of their graduates.

On the other hand, alternate pathways, which often are touted for their ability to recruit high academic achieving candidates and to prepare teachers for specific districts, face challenges as well. These include:

- An abbreviated curriculum that leaves too few opportunities to learn how to teach diverse learners;
- Insufficient clinical experiences prior to becoming the teacher of record;
- Too few opportunities to learn content and how to teach it simultaneously;
- An overemphasis on preparing teachers for a singular context (e.g., a particular district) or a limited, prescriptive curriculum; and
- Lack of accountability for the effectiveness of their graduates.

In fact, in a survey of both "prominent" alternative certification recruits — including Teach for America, the New Teacher Project, and Troops to Teachers — and traditionally prepared novices, several stark findings have surfaced:

- 84 percent of traditional recruits rated their preparation in *managing classrooms* as excellent or good, compared to only 60 percent of the alternative certification recruits;
- 71 percent of traditional recruits rated their preparation in *helping struggling students* as excellent or good, compared to only 38 percent of the alternative certification recruits; and
- 77 percent of traditional recruits rated their preparation in *providing individualized instruction to students* as excellent or good, compared to only 49 percent of the alternative certification recruits.[2]

In addition, 34 percent of the alternative recruits who are teaching in high-needs schools reported they were planning to leave teaching within two years. In comparison, only 4 percent of the traditional recruits noted they were going to leave within the same time frame. These survey data do not suggest that traditional university-based preparation programs "do teacher education right," but for the most part, they are doing a better job than even the highly regarded Teach for America program in getting new recruits ready for the immense challenges of teaching in high-needs schools. Researchers have shown teachers increase in effectiveness with teaching experience[3] and high turnover among new recruits harms school improvement efforts.[4]

Nevertheless, criticisms of traditional teacher education programs, promulgated by growing numbers of think tanks (e.g., Aspen Institute, National Council for Teacher Quality, Center for American Progress), escalate when policymakers learn that universities continue to prepare teachers who have little desire to teach where they are most needed, and administrators from our nation's high-needs school districts lament the quality of recruits that they hire. Universities do prepare high-quality teachers for high-needs school and some — like UCLA, Stanford University, Bank Street College, and Alverno College — have received public accolades for doing so. However, the evidentiary base on the effectiveness of the nation's 1,200-plus education schools is thin,[5] and it is generally recognized by "friends of so-called traditional preparation programs" that universities are not sufficiently recruiting and developing teachers for high-needs schools.[6]

Hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on preparing approximately 200,000 new teachers each year. Little is known about the cost effectiveness of the different approaches to teacher preparation, but one thing is certain: Higher education and alternate routes combined are not supplying teachers in sufficient quality or quantity for where they are most needed. Schools are not being provided the teachers they need, new teachers are especially ill-prepared to meet the needs of students in high-needs urban schools, and schools are not retaining sufficient numbers of the teachers they do recruit. UTRs are designed to address each of these problems and offer an important alternative to better meet the needs of traditionally underserved urban children.

The recent re-authorization of the Higher Education Act provides a path for developing UTRs — calling for partnerships among university-based teacher education and arts and sciences programs, high-needs schools and districts, and community-based organizations to transform the preparation of a new generation of teachers. The legislation places a premium on building one-year paid, clinical training for pre-service teachers and developing induction programs for support after they begin teaching.

Over the last several decades, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has promoted and developed standards for professional development schools (PDSs) as a way to promote long-term, serious clinical learning experiences for teacher education students, created in partnership with local schools and districts.[7] In fact, a recent NCATE report concluded that PDSs could drive "a major shift from induction and professional development as collections of ad hoc programs offered by a variety of providers for new teachers, to a system of programs and structures collaboratively designed, developed, and implemented by universities, schools, and the profession."[8] Driven in part by the important work of the Holmes Group over two decades ago,[9] over 250 of NCATE's accredited institutions have PDS partnerships, involving more than one school partner. Several place all of their teacher candidates in PDSs — clustering them under the supervision of specially-selected seasoned teachers and university faculty who work in the K-12 schools. Maryland and Louisiana have mandated PDS partnerships, while West Virginia has passed a legislative appropriation to support PDS development statewide. Despite unevenness in implementation, several studies have shown that PDSs have produced greater student achievement gains, when compared to similar schools without university investments in teacher development.[10]

In some respects, PDSs serve as pre-cursors for UTRs. However, these partnerships — driven primarily by universities — have been unevenly implemented and no state has put into place the funding, governance, and accountability systems that could ensure quality and sustainability. Most PDSs do not attend to the needs of new teachers once they begin teaching. In addition, many programs claim the name of "professional development school" but do not include the structures and processes defined by the NCATE standards. Like other past reform efforts, PDSs demonstrate how innovations can take on a life of their own — often changing in character from the original model, yet carrying the same name. This can result in confusion about the components of the model considered "non-negotiable" and legitimate variations to accommodate different needs and contexts. The result can be a loss of integrity for the model and inappropriate conclusions about its effectiveness.

In an earlier paper, *Creating and Sustaining Urban Teacher Residencies: A New Way to Recruit, Prepare, and Retain Effective Teachers in High-Needs Districts,*[11] we describe the Chicago and Boston programs' respective histories and how their guiding principles play out in action, as well as budget structures and realities and preliminary evidence of their effectiveness.[12] In this paper, we highlight some of these issues, but focus in more depth on the relationship of UTRs with institutions of higher education and their implications for informing and improving university policies and practices.

The UTRs

The Chicago and Boston programs were designed with a common set of seven principles that define the components of high quality residency programs.[13] These include:

1. Weaving education theory and classroom practice tightly together in a *year-long* residency model of highly relevant teacher education;

2. Focusing on Resident learning alongside an experienced, trained and well-compensated mentor;

3. Preparing candidates in cohorts to cultivate a professional learning community, foster collaboration, and promote school change;

4. Building effective partnerships and drawing on community-based organizations to promote a "third way" for teacher preparation;

5. Serving school districts by attending to both their teacher supply problems and curricular goals and instructional approaches;

6. Supporting Residents for multiple years once they are hired as teachers of record; and

7. Establishing incentives and supporting differentiated career goals to retain Residents and reward accomplished and experienced teachers.

Nevertheless, UTRs can look quite different in terms of how they are designed and implemented. For example, Chicago pays its Residents about three times more than Boston does ($33,000 versus $11,000) — meaning that the former can recruit more mid-career switchers. Yet they both are very selective, accepting only 18-25 percent of their applicants. Almost 60 percent of the BTR and 32 percent of the AUSL recruits are prepared to teach in the high-needs areas of math, science, special education, and second language learners. In addition, 55 percent of BTR and 57 percent of AUSL recruits in the 2007-08 cohorts were people of color.

While the programs are small — preparing from 50-85 candidates a year — they are planning to expand. In a few years, BTR plans to prepare one-third of all new teachers for Boston Public Schools. AUSL soon will be preparing 200 new teachers. Both offer master's degrees, underwritten by a loan that is forgiven if they teach for three (BTR) or four (AUSL) years.

Both programs rely on their state's professional teaching standards, with BTR and its "dimensions of effective teaching" driving major changes in how Boston Public Schools actually evaluates all of its teachers. Both programs also rely heavily on expert K-12 teachers as mentors but have different strategies for recruiting, training, and paying them. For example, BTR pays its mentors $3,000 annually, while AUSL offers a 20 percent salary supplement. The mentors, trained in a cognitive coaching model, offer substantial support — working with the novices several times a week (and supplemented by grade level and subject area coaches). Chicago Public Schools, which has supported National Board Certification for its teachers, provides a

fertile ground for AUSL to find quality mentors, while Boston has had some difficulty finding sufficient numbers of quality mentors.

The UTRs are full-year programs and the Residents co-teach generally four days a week, with one full day (and some evenings) set aside for coursework. Each UTR requires a teaching portfolio, consisting of performance-based assessments aligned with program and district standards. (See Appendix A for a detailed description of these UTR principles in action and Appendix B for additional details about key elements and components of the BTR and AUSL programs.)

Each UTR has had very different relationships with IHEs that reflect differences in their contexts and their approaches in program design and implementation. This context, and the programs' launch stories, are critical in understanding the lessons learned, with implications for higher education.

The Boston Teacher Residency

In Boston, then-Superintendent Tom Payzant, facing growing teacher shortages and under-prepared teachers, realized that Boston Public Schools needed its own method of recruiting and preparing teachers. With an urgent need for more math, science and special education teachers and more teachers of color, Payzant knew he could no longer solely rely on local universities and their teacher education programs. Recognizing the limitations of his own bureaucracy and the district's limited capacity to prepare teachers on the job, Payzant and other district leaders collaborated with the Executive Director of the Boston Plan for Excellence (BPE), Ellen Guiney, to develop a new approach to recruiting and preparing teachers with the skills and qualities needed for its high-needs schools. The new program was deliberately housed at the private, non-profit BPE. As one community leader told us:

> Tom Payzant wanted the BTR to be outside the system so it would not be subject to the district bureaucracy, which can suppress innovation as well as the annual district budget cutting process. It needed insulation.

Founded in 2003, BTR has a kind of "one-foot-in, one-foot-out" structure that enabled the program to act efficiently and independently of the district. The program's founding was aided by several factors: Payzant's long tenure and successful reform efforts in the district, and his strong long-standing relationship with BPE — one of the nation's most effective local education funds.

Initial financial support came from outside funders who were essential in starting the program. But BTR's founders knew they could not rely on outside funding into perpetuity, and so the residency program was built on the premise that BPS would take on increasing fiscal responsibility for BTR until it ultimately became the majority funder by reallocating its professional development funds from a wide variety of local, state, and federal sources. (Today, approximately 60 percent of BTR's operating funds are provided by BPS.)

Importantly, BTR was created eight years into Payzant's tenure when a clear instructional strategy was in place — one on which the residency program could be built and

organized. School districts typically are not well-suited for or successful in preparing teachers because superintendents come and go every few years, making it difficult for a district to develop and implement a coherent instructional strategy. But, in this case, the district was prepared.

Today, BTR has changed the traditional consumer-producer relationship between school systems and institutions of higher education by giving BPS an alternative source of new teachers and ensuring quality control — an issue that has been extremely important to Payzant and Guiney as well as Director Jesse Solomon. There are advantages to preparing teachers in and for a single district. As Guiney noted:

> Universities have to prepare teachers for more than one district … this is their reality; but in doing so, they do not prepare teachers adequately for Boston. How they are prepared has very little to do with what they need to teach.

Short-cut alternate approaches to university-based teacher education were not acceptable either. As Guiney noted, "One cannot learn all that you need to know in a few years, much less in a few weeks like (what is offered in a number of alternative pathway programs)." With BTR in place, BPS is no longer totally dependent on institutions of higher education and alternative certification routes for its new teachers; thus, creating an additional level of accountability and press for change.

Each year, BTR has grown in both numbers of Residents and staff, while maintaining its inside-outside status with the district. It is able to be responsive as well as independent and flexible enough to alter curriculum and delivery in ways that most universities and districts cannot imagine.

As BTR completes its fifth year, it is working on several key program areas in particular:

- Working in greater depth with fewer host schools (which are "model schools" that house many Residents and mentors during Residents' preparation year) and placement schools (where Residents teach upon completion of their residency), which BTR leaders believe is essential to achieve classroom-by-classroom impact and to support transformation in BPS schools;

- Partnering in BPS's long-term human capital strategy by sharing learning from the BTR core model and supporting district-wide change;

- Recruiting and developing more highly skilled mentors and teacher educators, and

- Measuring BTR teacher effectiveness and impact on student achievement.

BTR is affiliated with the University of Massachusetts for awarding the master's degree to candidates who complete the UTR program. However, UMass — as an institution of higher education — has very little to do with the program. BTR draws faculty from a variety of colleges and universities within the Boston area to construct and implement a curriculum that is custom-designed for the UTR program. As the BTR was developing, program leaders could not find one

university that was willing or able to create the more customized approach. Therefore, program leaders specifically sought out faculty members who were experts in targeted content areas and paired them with program staff who have sound understandings of the needs of the candidates and the school and content contexts in which they will prepare and serve as classroom teachers. Instructors are evaluated by Residents each year and those data contribute to decisions about renewing contracts with instructors. BTR provides exclusive program control over the design and delivery of its curriculum, with all the benefits of flexibility and responsiveness to candidate and program needs that this entails.

Chicago's Academy for Urban School Leadership

In Chicago, AUSL was founded in 2001 by a group of philanthropists, led by Mike Koldyke — a retired venture capitalist who has a uniquely deep understanding of the complexities of urban schools and the skills required to teach in them. Koldyke created the Golden Apple program in 1985, which offers scholarships for traditional college students to become teachers as well as annually recognizes ten outstanding teachers in Chicago and surrounding counties. The success of Golden Apple exposed new needs to Koldyke, who learned that universities could not prepare enough qualified teachers for Chicago's 408,000 students. He also saw a need to recruit and prepare non-traditional, mid-career adults for teaching, while capitalizing on the expertise of veterans — e.g., National Board Certified Teachers — in the district. AUSL was another brainchild of his and he was able to "inspire and engage a group of business and community leaders to design a program that would significantly advance and reform the teaching profession."[14]

In running the residency, AUSL quickly realized that without sound leadership and similarly-skilled colleagues, its graduates would likely be stifled and not teach in accordance with their preparation or potential. Consequently, AUSL partnered with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to become a school management organization under the district's Office of New Schools. Through this arrangement, CPS has given AUSL authority to oversee low-performing CPS schools. AUSL hires the principals and administrative teams and is able to ensure administrative commitment to and support of teacher development and school improvement. In 2006 and 2007, the first turnaround schools run entirely by AUSL opened in Chicago. These schools are staffed with a critical mass of AUSL graduates and experienced principals and teachers (e.g., Chicago's Golden Apple Scholars and National Board Certified Teachers). A number of the principals hired for these turnaround schools are graduates of the New Leaders for New Schools program in which an internship in urban high-needs schools is an integral part of the preparation. (To date, one turnaround principal began as an AUSL Resident himself.) AUSL aims to have a total of 20 turnaround schools up and running in Chicago by 2012. Presently, AUSL functions as both a teacher preparation program and a school management organization and is considered by the district as a crucial part of its strategy to change the district's lowest performing schools.

AUSL turned to National-Louis University (NLU) as a higher-education partner — one of the few IHEs which had both structures and processes in place to accommodate AUSL's needs. NLU reworked their Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree so that Residents could earn state certification, while taking coursework that would equip them to teach in urban schools. Program leaders lament "inefficiencies" in university-based course delivery (e.g., difficulty in

finding the right faculty and developing new content based on district needs). However, they have seen National-Louis as a willing and able partner. Recently, NLU created the new position of university liaison who works specifically on fostering the partnership with AUSL.

AUSL also has begun to accept cohorts of former Golden Apple Scholars — all of whom have obtained their teaching license and many even have classroom experience as teachers. These candidates pursue their MAT degree, which is awarded by the University of Illinois in Chicago (UIC). Faculty from that university now are integrally involved with AUSL in providing the coursework and seminars for these candidates.

Lessons Learned

Our original paper concludes with "lessons learned" — focusing on both financial and policy implications for transforming teacher education so that the right candidates are recruited and then fully prepared before they begin teaching in our nation's highest-needs urban schools.

Our analyses suggest that if UTRs are to succeed there are three major lessons that policymakers as well as K-12 and university practitioners need to consider. First, teacher educators should demand, and state and local policymakers should ensure that different preparation pathways are held to the *same quality assurance standards*. Massachusetts offers a good example where school districts can certify teachers who meet or exceed the expectations held for those who matriculate through university-based programs. In order for such quality assurance standards to have any degree of integrity, however, investments must be made in performance assessments that can accurately measure candidates' performances — no matter the pathway they use to enter teaching. One tool — the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) — shows promise for universities. Developed in response to a California State mandate (SB2042) requiring teacher preparation programs to use authentic measures to determine who gets credentialed,[15] studies have shown that PACT pushes future teachers to learn more about their K-12 students, figure out how to systematically address their specific learning needs, plan a coherent progression of classroom lessons, and adapt their instruction based on more defined and sophisticated assessments.[16]

PACT — in some ways a miniature version of the advanced certification process forged by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards® — could fulfill several functions. These assessments could generate information that "proves" a beginning teacher is sufficiently prepared to work with children (i.e., meet the state's legal and ethical responsibility to children), offer teacher education programs data for continuous improvement, and provide baseline parameters for how best to support novices through their first years of teaching.

Second, policymakers should *create financial incentives* so that the "best providers" are rewarded for responding to high-needs schools and content areas. State (publicly-funded) universities currently receive the same funding for producing teacher education graduates irrespective of labor market needs or their ability to teach effectively in high-needs schools. States might consider redirecting funding currently available for post-baccalaureate teacher education toward institutions — be they universities, education non-profits, teacher organizations or others — that can demonstrate their ability to prepare high quality candidates willing and capable of succeeding in high-needs schools and content areas. (The reauthorized

Higher Education Act, if funded properly, may provide considerable financial impetus for doing so.)

Also at the same time, local policymakers could allocate more salary dollars to high-needs schools with high proportions of new teachers. These schools would then have more funds to pay novice teachers stipends so that they can afford to spend a year preparing to teach as well as invest more heavily in the on-site mentors and teacher educators needed to prepare them. While districts currently tend to spend "extra" salary dollars on reducing class size, researchers have concluded that deeper investments in recruiting and preparing more qualified teachers will yield better overall student learning results.[17] The strategic reallocation of district teacher professional development dollars, as well as changes in higher education teacher education formulas, could lead to long-term financing of UTRs.

Finally, we argue that UTRs should offer an opportunity for school districts to begin *managing a portfolio of pathways* in order to increase the odds that they can gain the mix of talent that best meets children's needs for well-prepared and committed teachers and district needs for the most cost-effective way possible. We believe there is no one best way to prepare a teacher for high-needs schools — primarily because people entering the teaching profession do not begin with the same set of strengths, interests, and needs. However, we also believe that universities must be more responsive to the labor market needs of the school districts they serve and begin to prepare teachers so they are ready to teach effectively. This will mean new thinking on how to use university funds in support of teacher preparation — not just for funding more liaisons working in schools, but perhaps for the financing of K-12 teaching experts serving as teacher educators in joint appointment roles with their school districts.

Public schools cannot expect to recruit their way out of the current teaching quality and teacher supply problems and as such, have to redefine their approach to human capital. UTRs can play a broader role in strengthening a district's human capital system (i.e., recruiting and developing a wide array of teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators); however, institutions of higher education will have to change their practices and forge new policies in order to lead the way. Often the university and district are not ready to work with each other; in some cases, their leaders just do not know how or have the policy and governing systems to do so effectively or efficiently. It is not that there is a lack of willing partners. There are just so few mechanisms to fuel and sustain their partnership. The story of Bank Street College (BSC) and its efforts to create a UTR-like program in New York City, which follows next, is informative.

The Bank Street College Partnership and High-Needs NYC Schools: A Case Study

Bank Street College, a private institution located on Upper West Side of Manhattan, prepares — at the graduate level — approximately 250 teachers annually. Its students include practicing teachers and career changers in addition to those who have just completed their undergraduate degrees. The College's leaders, as a result of its Teachers for a New Era reform efforts, recently challenged its faculty to revise its program to focus on preparing teachers for high-needs schools. Despite its well documented effectiveness in preparing teachers,[18] in establishing its Partnership for Quality (P4Q), Bank Street sought to meet the needs of schools and the life exigencies of post-graduate and second career candidates while also, and most importantly, ensuring that children would be taught by well-prepared teachers. For Bank Street

College, too many preparation pathways valued the needs of adults to enter teaching as soon as possible at the expense of the educational rights of children. As Bank Street College was in the early phases of thinking through P4Q, New York City had just begun its first re-organization following mayoral control. Ten regions — broken into groups of 10 schools — replaced 32 local community school districts. Each region had a superintendent and each 10 schools had a person responsible for those schools. While Bank Street College began to develop new approaches to preparing teachers extensively for the city's high-needs schools, the Chancellor continued his emphasis on hiring novices through rapid entry alternate certification programs, such as Teaching Fellows and Teach for America.

Region 9 of the new configuration consisted of the old District 2 (a high-performing district in Manhattan that had always hired a large number of Bank Street graduates) and Districts 4 (in East Harlem) and 7 (in the South Bronx). Districts 4 and 7 were historically low-performing districts that did not traditionally have a large number of Bank Street educated teachers in their employ. The new Assistant Superintendent of Region 9, formerly connected with District 2, wanted the same kinds of teachers she saw in District 2 in all of Region 9, especially in East Harlem and the South Bronx. Bank Street meanwhile wanted to create a pathway into the profession to provide an alternative to the more rapid entry pathways preferred by the Chancellor.

The credentialing policy mechanism to be used for Bank Street's alternate program was a New York state policy that allowed teacher candidates to become teachers of record after they had completed 50 percent of an approved program, with the promise of the college to provide on-going supervision and support. Called an internship certificate, this pathway offered something between the limited preparation of existing alternative routes and the extensive preparation provided by completing an entire program before becoming a teacher of record.

The original idea was to select a small number of "hub schools" that would become centers of learning where cohorts of prospective teachers would learn together. Over time, as the hub schools became "destination schools" (rather than hard-to-staff schools), teachers prepared in them would move in cohorts into other schools. Experienced teachers, who would develop their own practice and mentoring expertise in the hub schools, would then provide support to the new teachers in the schools where they moved. The design was explicit about the essential mutual interdependence of the strengths and needs of the key partners (the schools and communities, Region 9, and Bank Street).

The first step was to identify the original hub schools. At this point, there were no teacher candidates and there was not yet a defined "program" to be implemented. Regional and Bank Street personnel visited several schools that met several relatively basic requirements: hard-to-staff, supportive leadership, common values among district and college staff on how to teach, and a willingness to change. Despite some quite understandable confusion on the part of the schools (e.g., what exactly were they "signing up for?"), the Region and Bank Street selected four schools: three elementary schools in the South Bronx and one middle school in East Harlem. In the first year, both the Region and Bank Street committed resources to grow the relationships that would be necessary for a partnership to develop. The Region used grant funding to support their math coaches and base funding to provide professional development for selected science teachers — with Bank Street providing the services. Bank Street provided

funding from its base budget to support one day a week of a faculty member's time to work on a school improvement effort of the school's choosing. In addition to the "direct support" of the time, a conscious subtext was to identify prospective teacher leaders already working in the schools and enrich their abilities as mentors of other teachers, especially novices.

Over the course of two years, despite the loss of the regional superintendent, assistant superintendent, and leaders of the 10-school clusters in which the hub schools were embedded, the Region continued to support the partnership with a liaison who served as a go-between among the schools, the Region, and Bank Street. This role proved essential in problem-solving and trouble-shooting the inevitable complexities of a multi-institutional endeavor.

Also during the first two years, Bank Street received several grants to support the work of the partnership. The most significant one was a federal Transition to Teaching grant that provided funding for the support of novice teachers at each of the four schools. The gist of the approach was that the schools would hire, each year for four years, a Bank Street intern (i.e., a Bank Street teacher candidate who had completed at least 50 percent of the "regular" Bank Street teacher education program). The intern would have an individually crafted "sheltered entry" into the role with extensive on-going support. Time would be created with grant funds to free a teacher or teachers to become teacher leaders in the school who would mentor the novice teachers. At the end of the year, the Bank Street intern would be hired as a "regular" teacher to fill an opening in the school, while the school would hire another P4Q intern for the following year. Over time, this would create a cohort of well-prepared teachers who would remain in the school and create a culture of collaborative exemplary practice. As originally envisioned, the four schools would move from "hard-to-staff" to "destination" schools (centers of learning). The only alteration from the original plan during the first three years of enactment was that the middle school amicably left the partnership for multiple reasons, including a lack of middle school candidates from Bank Street.

> "Through P4Q, I received support and continued advisement from Bank Street faculty members who understood the context in which I was teaching. They helped me to sort out what my role as teacher was, my feelings about my school and my students, and finally, how I could purposefully help my students develop as learners. With this level of support, I learned to implement progressive pedagogy where many people thought it was neither possible nor worthwhile."*
>
> Arial Sacks,
> Partnership for Quality Graduate,
> and Teacher Leaders Network Member
>
> *Excerpt from the essay, *Portrait of a Young Teacher in an "Inner City" Public School*. See Appendix C for the full essay, which provides a window into one P4Q teacher's preparation for and experiences as a teacher in a New York City high-needs school.

In addition to the federal grant, Bank Street also received funding to provide: (a) support for their hired candidates prior to their first year of teaching (to come to know the community and school and to prepare for the first weeks of school); (b) additional material and professional development support for the school-selected school improvement effort; and (c) financial aid for Bank Street candidates working in the hub schools. Bank Street also continued funding the

weekly professional development to the schools on improvement efforts of their choosing, which has remained constant since the inception. Increasingly, however, the project coordinator and Bank Street faculty working on the school improvement efforts spent time supporting the principals of the schools. The combination of rapid annual (and often more frequent) curricular, instructional, and structural changes from the Department of Education and the hiring of first time principals (after the turnover of experienced principals in all three elementary schools) added up to difficult leadership challenges for the schools and their new principals. In the fourth year, the Department of Education again instituted a major reshuffling of the organizational guts of the system, dismantling the regions and once again totally changing the rules, roles, and relationships between the schools and the external support structures. Currently in its fifth year, the partnership has been unable to establish an intermediate level infrastructure to address the "larger than an individual school" issues that arise in partnership work (e.g., hiring of teachers, distribution of funds, joint fund raising, etc.).

Despite challenges, the partnership can point to some early indicators of success. There is some evidence that in a district with multiple changes and increasing rigidity on the use of standardized achievement test scores as the dominating goal of public education that: (a) the school climate in the partnership schools is becoming more collaborative and more focused on students and rich curriculum offerings; (b) teachers are emerging as teacher leaders and taking on leadership roles; (c) teacher attrition is decreasing; and (d) student learning is increasing.

From the Bank Street perspective, the goal was always more than the work with individual teachers in the partner schools. The goal was also to examine the college's practices, with the hope of improving them in regard to preparing candidates to enter, remain, and be successful in hard-to-staff New York City public schools. The teachers pursuing the internship certificate pathway were "regular" Bank Street candidates. They were neither specially recruited nor prepared for working in hard-to-staff schools. The theory of change was that as college faculty worked with these four particular hard-to-staff schools and with candidates and graduates in those schools, they would bring what they were learning back to Bank Street and consciously develop a pathway that combined the best of Bank Street's current exemplary programs with the particular needs of teachers in hard-to-staff schools. The college is now in the midst of designing a set of opportunities for learning (i.e., a pathway), specifically for candidates who enter Bank Street with an expressed career aspiration to work in hard-to-staff, traditionally underserved schools. The strengths, interests, and needs of those candidates, of the schools and communities, and of the children and families they serve are the starting points for that design work. Not surprisingly, the structure of the program bears great similarities to the design and principles of the Urban Teacher Residencies.

Essentially, Bank Street attempted to grow a "residency-like" program from the starting point of a college. The process provides several lessons for others who might wish to undertake the same process and policymakers who might wish to support such processes. First, there must be some kind of district involvement for structure and support. Districts (or some infrastructure larger than the individual school) hire, fire, set expectations, and establish the "rules of the game." Therefore, no matter how well intentioned or successful at what they do, colleges simply cannot do this work on their own.

Second, there must be some semblance of stability in the schools for which the programs will be preparing candidates. It is quite difficult to prepare people to work in a particular setting when what the people are being asked to do changes often within the midst of preparation. Initial findings from the on-going teacher pathways studies underway in New York City suggest that when teachers have experience in their preparation with the actual curricular materials used in their jobs, their students score higher on standardized tests than do candidates who do not. If a district changes those materials between preparation and hiring, it becomes quite difficult for a preparation program to provide those experiences.

Third, programs must provide sufficient financial compensation for post-graduate teacher candidates. Alternate pathways to certification may compete with other alternate preparation models that pay full salaries — often, prior to any significant preparation requirements — and must offer at least basic subsistence to its candidates. Funds are required to subsidize tuition as well as living expenses and health insurance among other basic needs. While these expenses will require new investments in teacher education, financing for preparing and supporting Residents can be derived from district coaching/mentoring dollars as well as university faculty lines.

Fourth, preparing non-traditional teacher candidates — who are absolutely essential to meeting teacher workforce requirements — requires specialized, carefully crafted opportunities for learning. Teacher education programs that prepare traditional college age students for teaching in a high-needs school will not be the same as readying the 45-year old mid-career switcher for the same teaching assignment. IHEs have not always readily adapted their teacher education programs to different constituencies and customers. New solutions, such as more customized programs, virtual learning tools, and better (and more valued) use of expert K-12 experts as teacher-educators are needed. "One-size-fits-all" preparation programs can no longer be the modus operandi of IHEs.

Implications of UTRs for Teacher Preparation in IHEs

The core principles of UTRs reflect research-based effective practices in teacher preparation and retention (e.g., tightly integrating education theory and practice and learning alongside an experienced, trained mentor). IHEs must consider in their program design the importance of creating clear conceptions of quality teaching and deepening relevant clinical experiences, as well as the role that third-party organizations can play in the preparation and induction of new teachers. We close with financial implications of UTRs for IHEs and suggestions for future actions.

Creating Clear Conceptions of Quality Teaching for High-Needs Schools. If colleges and universities are going to remain relevant in teacher education reform, their administrators and faculty must be clearer about their conceptions of quality teaching and how they fit with the needs of the communities they serve. NCATE institutions have built their programs on conceptual frameworks — and are judged accordingly. However, more needs to be done to design frameworks for teaching in high-needs schools, with graduating teachers skilled in teaching specific subjects as well as working with second language and special needs learners and high-needs families. Universities should consider developing programs that endorse new teachers who have learned these skills and are prepared to lead. But universities cannot develop

these programs themselves; school districts, local education funds, and other community-based organizations are essential.

For some IHEs with little track record of successful collaborative work, developing, enacting, and sustaining such a conception will most likely prove more difficult than it sounds. There are, however, numerous starting points for such jointly agreed upon conceptions of quality teaching, including NCATE's *Unit Standards* on candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions, the INTASC standards, the National Board Standards as well as the many states who have developed teaching standards based upon those national models. But if universities are going to play a leadership role in their communities, then their representatives must use more than rhetoric and theoretical justifications for their conceptual frameworks. In the future, documenting how university-based programs are preparing teachers effectively for high-needs schools and assembling data on the effectiveness of their graduates will be the coin of the realm. A number of colleges and universities — including Bank Street College — have been part of Carnegie's Teachers for New Era initiative, surfacing key strategies and tools for using evidence for program improvement and accountability. As districts become more adept at managing their portfolio of pathway options, universities need to provide *clarity* on the kinds of teachers they produce and how they can be effective where they are most needed. To do so, they must have evidence to demonstrate the "value-addedness" of their programs. There is no question that many teacher education programs do so now, but the clarity of what they do and the evidence that they make a difference are not well known.

Deepening and Sustaining Clinical Experiences. UTRs highlight the importance of both the length and the nature of the clinical experience. The research literature from Dan Lortie's (1975) three-decade old analysis of the teaching profession to the current studies (including the NYC teaching pathways studies and the recent AERA review of teacher education) consistently points to the importance of student teaching as the most influential component of professional education. The full school year (not university calendar) residency emphasizes, yet again, the importance of the length of the clinical component of professional preparation. Ten to twelve weeks somewhere near the end of one's preparation is simply not sufficient time for the quality preparation teachers need and their students deserve.

How well one is prepared profoundly influences the caliber of one's ability to work well with pupils in the early years of one's career.[19] Given the importance of the school (not solely the classroom) as a site of professional learning, IHEs need to hire, support, and reward university-based educators who have sustained and knowledgeable interactions with schools and have working relationships with some of the best K-12 teachers available who can serve as both teacher educators and mentors. Effectively rewarding such educators may very well mean revising privilege and tenure regulations — not to devalue scholarship, but to elevate the importance of professional preparation and support of teachers for high-needs schools. In addition, as previously suggested, universities will need to alter their hiring practices and priorities to include staffing positions with expert teachers from local schools.

Universities must begin to serve the needs of a particular set of students in a particular set of schools and communities — much in the way that Bank Street is attempting to do. This means that the work of college-based teacher educators must include work with the faculty and administration in the schools that will serve as the sites of learning for their candidates. This

does not mean serving the status quo of the district or of those schools, but it also does not mean "taking over" the school and re-making it in the image of the college or university. It does mean working with school and college administration to help figure out ways to arrange time and people so that residents, K-12 mentors, and university-based instructors can collaborate on their shared tasks of educating children and teachers. It also means financial remuneration for the additional roles and expectations that school-based teacher educators are assuming. And finally, it means a true partnership, where status (e.g., who gives grades) and power (e.g., who determines content and process) are shared — not hoarded by one group.

The "Third-Party" Organization. For a multitude of reasons, institutions of higher education and districts combined have not been able to educate sufficient numbers of quality teachers in particular content and contextual shortage areas. In addition, most IHEs have been unable to establish the kinds of relationships with districts and schools required to provide the clinical experiences and clear, sustained conceptions of quality teaching that UTRs place at the center of their programs. Third-party organizations — like the Boston Plan for Excellence — can provide both a vehicle for building the relationships and more effectively and efficiently getting the job done. Neither school districts nor universities are necessarily adept at quickly creating coalitions, launching a new program, or making timely mid-course corrections.

Third-party organizations can serve as boundary spanners, helping to facilitate the finding of common ground conceptually, linguistically, culturally, and logistically between the parties of the partnership. Both IHEs and districts have their own politics, financial processes, cultures, and organizational structures. If a partnership between the two is housed in either one, the tendency is for decisions to be held ransom by those issues. A "one-foot-in" and "one-foot-out" organizational structure can serve to protect the partnership from both institutional constraints, while also providing independence and often greater efficiency in operations. In addition, these third-party organizations can serve as an incubator and broker of new ideas.

UTRs and Financial Implications for IHEs. Given multiple accounting systems and funding streams, it is difficult to pinpoint precisely the cost of educating a teacher. For instance, while the per student cost might appear higher in a private institution than a public institution, the state subsidy of public institutions tends to place both in a similar range. Or, in the case of comparing alternate routes where one's clinical experience occurs when one is a paid instructor of record with a "traditional" student teaching clinical experience, the expense of the clinical experience is borne by the candidate in the latter and by the employing district in the former.

Still, the per candidate cost of district-serving residency programs seem to be in the same ballpark of other teacher education program costs. The differences of "when, for what, and who pays," however, do have implications for IHE-based teacher education programs. Residencies allocate resources earlier and later in the teacher development process than IHEs traditionally do. For instance, residency programs (as well as other well-known alternate routes such as TFA and the Teaching Fellows in New York City) spend a larger actual dollar figure and larger percentage of their entire expenditure on recruitment than do most university-based programs. While still not as much as a college might spend on recruiting a quarterback for the football team, residencies spend more on "courting" candidates than do most IHEs. The issue is not so much that if IHEs are going to "compete" with residencies or more traditional alternate routes

that they will have to spend more on recruitment, but rather if IHEs are going to do their part in identifying and attracting high quality candidates for shortage areas, they might do well to learn from the residencies.

Later in the teacher development continuum, residencies also spend more on post-credentialing support than do IHEs. IHEs might argue they have no funding streams for such work and perhaps even that it is not their responsibility. Both would be historically accurate arguments. However, new virtual tools (like those used by the Center for Teaching Quality and its Teacher Leaders Network) could be used in strategic ways so that universities connect with and support their graduates once they begin teaching. In addition, IHEs could enhance their contribution to meeting the educational rights of all children if they focused resources more on recruiting and preparing teachers for where they are needed. Perhaps if universities did so then more funds could be available for deepening clinical training and supporting residencies.

In any case, we believe that IHEs can take a major lead in developing new local and state policy proposals that focus on recruiting and preparing "high-needs" teachers (e.g., math, science, special education, second language learner instructors) and using new approaches (both technological and personal) to continue to assist their graduates once they begin teaching. A system of institutions sharing responsibilities could clearly provide greater cohesion than the current approach of separate institutions dropping candidates off at the doorstep of the next chronological institution.

In addition, residencies differ from other pathways with regard to the question of "who pays?" In most IHE-based pathways the candidate bears the cost of professional education (with some state contribution in public institutions). Costs include the instruction (course work and clinical experience), the cost of living while preparing, and the opportunity cost of lost income while completing unpaid student teaching. In New York City's Teaching Fellows Pathway, taxpayers bear the vast majority of the cost of professional preparation as the district pays a full teacher salary and heavily subsidizes the cost of course work and clinical experience. In the Boston residency model, the candidates bear some of the opportunity cost (the difference between a full teacher's salary and the stipend they receive) with the rest being covered by soft money from public and private donors and, over time, an increasing district contribution. In Chicago, soft money pays for the bulk of the professional preparation, with the candidates responsible for less expense than those in IHEs or the Boston model.

These differences greatly influence candidate decisions not just about what pathway to follow but whether to pursue the profession at all. For instance, private institutions in New York City (without state subsidy) typically charge around $45,000 in tuition for a complete credential/master's degree program. If it takes two years to complete the program (not unlikely given the need to work while pursuing professional preparation in order to pay the tuition), an additional $45,000 per year in lost income is accrued, as compared to a candidate who enters a pathway where one is paid as a beginning teacher while preparing to teach. The total cost ($135,000) is a substantial one for anyone (regardless of their age) entering a new career. Undergraduate programs face a different set of financial challenges and market conditions. IHEs, to be competitive and meet their responsibilities to provide quality teachers for all children, must have financial incentives in place as well. Ultimately, this remains an issue no matter the pathway. Currently the Boston and Chicago residencies depend heavily on soft

money. Without sustained base funding, they too, along with the benefits they bring to children and communities, face an uncertain future. But both the Boston and Chicago programs are taking the hard stand that they are going to prepare teachers for high-needs schools — a goal that traditional teacher education programs need to meet as well.

Conclusions

UTRs offer another model for preparing teachers for high-needs urban schools that applies the best thinking from research and practice in program design and implementation. UTRs fill many of the gaps created by most university-based, traditional and alternative certification programs (i.e., they offer preparation for teaching in well-functioning high-needs schools where recruits can see good teachers teach effectively in challenging settings). They offset some of the opportunity costs created by additional preparation, while saving school districts hundreds of thousands of dollars by reducing teacher attrition. As such, the UTRs represent a new effort to reform teacher preparation, perhaps in ways never achieved in past efforts such as professional development schools and the Holmes Group (now the Holmes Partnership). The core principles of UTRs call for partnerships and long-term induction support that require increased coordination among institutions, which prepare and hire new teachers, and strong capacity and support within the schools and districts where Residents and program graduates are placed.

Our analysis has pointed to the importance of taking very different approaches to recruitment, selection, preparation, and induction of new teachers; recognizing the need for advanced professional development that prepares experienced teachers for new roles as teacher leaders; creating different structures in schools for enhanced support and teacher collaboration, with profound implications for teachers' roles, compensation, and daily schedules. By design, UTRs have the potential — and perhaps the necessity — for long-term success to point the way not just to another pathway for teacher certification, but a comprehensive teaching development system. The Bank Street College example as well as the story told by Ariel Sacks (see Appendix C) reveal a great deal about the obstacles universities face in deepening teacher education, but also demonstrate the potential they have in recruiting and preparing outstanding teachers.

The capacity of the UTR model to leverage comprehensive reform within a district is an integral part of its design. But how can the UTR model with its potential for enhancing the capacity and effectiveness of the human capital systems of public school systems, avoid the pitfalls encountered by previous teacher preparation reforms? Those with interest in this new model must consider how to maintain the integrity of the model, while also allowing for the wide range of differences in approach that are represented by the two UTR programs examined in this study and suggested by the very different context encountered by Bank Street's NYC-based partnership.

As a result of this investigation into UTRs, we have drawn attention to the strengths and liabilities of current university-based teacher education and alternative certification models. We hope that the issues raised herein — and in our original paper — will promote conversation and action on the part of university administrators and faculty, both inside and outside of education schools. Importantly, UTRs represent an approach to teacher preparation that can shift the focus from the needs of preparing and employing organizations to the strengths, interests, and

needs of teachers and the students they serve. Policymakers and the public are questioning the ways teachers for high-needs schools are recruited, prepared, and retained. Will IHEs be part of the answer? We hope so. Our nation's public school students deserve well-prepared and supported teachers who know how to teach and are willing and able to remain in teaching long enough to make a difference for them.

Appendix A:
Defining Principles of Urban Teacher Residencies

One way to understand the Boston and Chicago residency programs is to look at them through the lens of the Urban Teacher Residency Institute's principles for school residencies. What follows are excerpts from the Institute's guiding principles and examples from the programs that illustrate the principles in action.

First, *UTRs tightly weave education theory and classroom practice together*. Residents practice what is taught in courses and continuously test, reflect on, and improve their skills. They demonstrate their proficiency not only through course grades, but through performance-based assessments and projects that are informed by research and theory but grounded in actual classroom experiences. For example, a Resident teacher in Chicago studies lesson plan development in her University classes and then works with her Mentor to create a lesson plan for class. After the lesson plan is implemented, the Mentor reviews the lesson and possible improvements with the Resident.

Residents and university professors often compare their coursework with their classroom experience and report back the following week on how suggested strategies worked when implemented in their classroom settings. In Boston, course assignments include bringing in student work or videotaping classroom implementation of an instructional technique learned at the university. To support the tight integration of theory and practice, many of the professors are outstanding, experienced teachers in the district.

In Chicago, National-Louis University modified its traditional two-year teacher education program to integrate its coursework with the year-long AUSL teacher residency. Some changes were structural and logistical in nature. For example, all Residents attend classes on Fridays and sometimes after their school day. Other changes were more substantive. For instance, the university's format for lesson plans was revised based on input of AUSL staff and Mentors. There is also a university liaison who works with the Residents' Mentor to collaboratively assess the Residents' work. In addition, NLU has modified course content and sequencing to better meet the preparation needs of Residents preparing in and for an urban school context.

Second, *UTRs focus on learning alongside an experienced, trained Mentor*. Residents work side by side with Mentors in a full-year classroom apprenticeship before taking on their own classrooms and becoming the "teacher of record." In Boston, each Resident is paired one-on-one with a Mentor. Chicago pairs one (and sometimes two) Residents with a Mentor. Mentors go beyond a focus on the technical aspects of teaching to cultivate a disposition of inquiry, focus attention on student thinking and understanding, and foster disciplined talk about problems of practice. For BTR, the minimum requirement for consideration as a Mentor is three years' teaching experience. Both programs look for Mentors who are reflective and able to talk about their practice, are collaborative, and are committed to their own continuous growth and improvement. AUSL has looked to National Board Certified Teachers — who have a proven track record of knowing how to analyze their classroom practices and improve student learning.

Demonstrated success as a teacher as indicated by students' standardized test results is also a key indicator.

In Chicago, Residents spend four days a week in their Mentor's classrooms, plus frequent coaching sessions after school. The fifth day is dedicated to their own coursework and seminars. In addition, BTR Mentors spend at least two hours per week with their Residents working one-on-one with structured protocols to guide and focus their work together. Boston Residents also spend four days a week in their Mentor's classroom, and one day per week engaged in coursework and seminars. In both programs, mentors participate in summer professional development sessions and continue to meet monthly for on-going professional development during the school year. Comments of Mentors themselves confirmed that their work with Residents has improved their own teaching practices. One Mentor, for example, shared this reflection:

> I didn't realize how much thought I put into my practice until I had to verbalize it. I also realized how little thought went into other things and how I need a clear reason for what I'm doing and why I'm doing it. … (Mentoring) has definitely improved my practice and makes me feel proud of what I've done.

Residents identified the power of a full-year mentoring program and noted consistently the valuable support they received from their Mentors and program directors. Residents experience a full-year school "lifecycle" from setting up classrooms to closing of the school year. They learn first-hand how to build culture and community, organize long-term instructional goals, create formative assessments, and use data to reflect upon their teaching practices. The depth of the relationships Residents and Mentors build over the year cements a strong bond of trust and respect. In recognition of the tremendous commitment of time and energy Mentors make, BTR pays its Mentors a $3,000 stipend, while AUSL provides Mentors with a 20 percent annual salary supplement.

Lessons Learned

"An important lesson AUSL has learned is the importance of professional development that is specifically focused on the knowledge and skills necessary to be an effective Mentor. A teacher who takes on this dual mission must be willing to divide equal attention between their students and their Resident. They also must be prepared to supervise and manage adults, which for many Mentors can be a surprising aspect of this job. The quality of our UTR rests in many ways on the skills, capacities, and commitment of our Mentor teachers."

- AUSL Mentor

Third, UTRs organize teacher candidates in cohorts to cultivate professional learning communities and foster collaboration among new and experienced teachers. Unlike many university-based and alternative teacher education programs, Residents engage in a tightly prescribed sequence of coursework and clinical experiences together. Learning to teach is no longer a solo activity. The cohorts meet regularly and form an intellectual community that connects practice with coursework, as Residents work together in the same school "carry[ing] the conversation from place to place." Residents cite the cohort model as one of the reasons they chose a UTR over another preparation program.

The cohort model extends beyond the residency year as an effort is made to place residency graduates together as they assume teaching positions. In Chicago, clustering UTR Residents and graduates together in schools is an integral part of their school change strategy. One administrator explained:

> AUSL has set the standard in terms of recognizing the importance of linking the training of teachers and school redesign. You need to put a cluster of (Residents) in one building. … There need to be enough new transformative teachers to create a transforming environment.

Fourth, *UTRs build effective partnerships* — recognizing that no single district, university, or community organization alone can solve the problem of preparation and retention of high quality teachers for urban schools. UTRs build partnerships that bring together diverse organizations for the common goal of improving student achievement through high quality teaching. UTR program staff believe that their partnerships are absolutely crucial to supporting teacher learning over time and to impacting long-lasting reform in urban schools.

For a district, partnering with a program like BPE or AUSL is critical because as non-profits, these programs are nimble. Faculty and consultants can be hired in timely ways, contracts can be executed efficiently, programming can be quickly adapted, and institutional turf can be mediated. Both BTR and AUSL exercise an entrepreneurial, can-do attitude and market their respective programs in sophisticated ways. Both act like small start-ups, less encumbered by the constraints experienced by the large bureaucracies of universities and school districts.

Fifth, *UTRs serve school districts*. UTRs exist to address community and school district problems while maintaining their independence from school systems so they are not beholden to district vagaries, internal politics, and bureaucratic dicta. As one program leader noted, admissions goals and priorities for UTRs are "consistent with the hiring objectives of the district" and the district "commits to hire graduates from the program." Residents learn the district's instructional initiatives and curriculum while they come to understand the history and context of the community in which they will teach.

The Importance of Like-Minded Colleagues

The importance of clustering UTR graduates as well as Residents was apparent in one BTR graduate's experience. BTR had introduced the strategy of taping lessons and watching with colleagues to examine and reflect on teaching. But, as she says, "not all teachers have that mindset" and "it's hard to find people with that lens." The graduate had embraced this BTR norm, explaining, "When something goes wrong, I now know what to do. I ask someone to videotape or observe the lesson."

AUSL and BTR place a priority on recruiting in the areas of science and mathematics, and BTR Residents graduate with a dual licensure in special education, all of which meet specific needs of the districts. In the 2007-08 cohort, almost 60 percent of BTR and 32 percent of AUSL recruits were being prepared to teach in high-needs subjects. In addition, 55 percent of BTR and 57 percent of AUSL recruits in the 2007-08 cohorts

were people of color. For administrators in Boston, BTR is the district's primary recruitment strategy for ensuring a diverse teaching force.

UTRs can also serve districts by informing them and pushing them to improve their practices. For example, BTR's work on new teacher screening and induction has spurred BPS to revamp the way it screens candidates and supports all of its novices.

BTR's Selection Day

The culmination of the recruitment process for BTR is Selection Day, held at one of the Boston public schools. This is a day-long event that brings together representatives from the schools (teachers, Mentors, and principals), the district (human resource personnel), BTR staff, and members of the community to engage with BTR program applicants in an intensive process. Applicants participate in a variety of activities and interviews, including working with fellow applicants to solve a group problem, a five minute segment of teaching students, writing and math assessments, and one-on-one or team interviews. One Resident described the selection process as "overwhelming, but effective in helping applicants understand the program they were applying to." She described the day in this way:

"We spent an entire day at one of the Boston public high schools, working in small groups to discuss scenarios, having one-on-one interviews with BPS staff, and teaching a mini-lesson to a group of students. Each part of the day helped me understand what the different parts of my year would look like in BTR. When I was working with the small group to solve a dilemma, it was a great experience to start thinking about how as colleagues I would be working with other teachers to think about the best way to teach students. While interviewing with staff from BPS I got a better sense of what it was like to teach in an urban school setting, as well as what schools I would be interested in teaching in. The mini-lesson portion of the interview day was the most nerve-wracking! Being in front of a group of teenagers and presenting a five-minute lesson was a bit daunting. I had five minutes to grab their attention and impart information. Now that I have been teaching 8th graders for almost seven months, I realize how important those five minutes can be. Some days it can set the tone for the entire lesson."

- BTR Resident

BTR's development of teacher competencies informed the district's development of its Dimensions of Effective Teaching.[20] BTR, district professional development and teacher evaluations are all now being aligned to these teaching competencies. Chicago Public Schools, observing the success of AUSL's training academies and turnaround schools, plans to open its own turnaround schools in fall of 2008.

Sixth, *UTRs support Residents once they are hired as teachers of record.* UTRs recognize that even well prepared novices in high-needs schools demand long-term support and have only begun to embark upon a continuum of professional growth. Residents are surrounded

by support at every step, including Mentors, principals, university professors, university liaisons, and UTR staff members. For many it is this intense level of support that attracted them to the program.

UTRs work in partnership with school districts to continue to support Residents once they graduate and become teachers of record in their own classrooms through mentoring, professional development, and networking opportunities. UTRs have increasingly offered more sophisticated induction programs than found elsewhere. For example, in Chicago, after graduating from the residency program, individualized coaching and induction support continues through year two of teaching and additional professional development support is provided for graduates in years three and four. An induction coach works with the new teacher once or twice a week; new teachers are assigned a grade partner and cluster leader; there is common preparation time with grade level partners; and other preparation time is used for observations. Coaches are trained in using the cognitive coaching model. Because these teacher supports are all rooted in a common definition of quality teaching, they are beginning to pay dividends for the schools and the students served.

This support for beginning teachers is critical, particularly in the high-needs schools in which graduates are placed. As one university faculty member noted:

> AUSL is okay with putting teachers into low-performing schools, because AUSL believes teachers have to learn … what it's like to teach in those environments. But what AUSL does is the second half of the equation — which has to be addressed. It provides strong support for teacher candidates in those low-performing schools. And you can't have one without the other.... Support in place for alt cert people needs to be very intentional and very careful and then they can succeed.

Seventh, *UTRs establish and support differentiated career roles for veteran teachers*. The UTRs have begun to "create opportunities for excellent veteran teachers to take on roles as Mentors, supervisors and instructors while still holding positions as K-12 classroom teachers." With AUSL Mentors earning a 20 percent salary supplement (and if they are NBCTs they earn even more), these experts can be recognized and rewarded substantially. Also, they can be offered meaningful leadership opportunities without becoming administrators. Both BTR and AUSL are beginning to see their most successful Residents become Mentors. As described earlier, AUSL is working with UIC to prepare Residents as instructional leaders and is forming an informal partnership with Chicago's New Leaders for New Schools in order to introduce excellent graduates to their school leadership program.

Leadership Opportunities for UTR Graduates

"As AUSL has grown, we have recognized the enormous talent that exists within our Mentor teachers. Three of our current Mentor coaches are past Mentor teachers. We have also tapped Mentor teachers to create writing and math benchmark assessments and curriculum to be used across our network schools. AUSL is working to increase leadership opportunities for our Mentor teachers while not taking them away from their important work of educating students and training Resident teachers."

- AUSL Mentor

APPENDIX B:
Key Elements and Components of the BTR and AUSL Programs

Urban Teacher Residency Program Elements and Components 2007-2008		
	Boston Teacher Residency	***Academy for Urban School Leadership***
Residents, Mentors, and Director Staff		
Total residents AY '07-08	84	53
Applicants	450	219
Acceptance rate	18%	24%
Total number of teachers in district	4,979 (FY 07)	24,664 (FY 2006-07)
Target population	Recent college graduates from top universities, career changers from other professions, and people who have demonstrated a commitment to Boston	College graduates and mid-career professionals
Percent of residents in high-needs areas: math, science, special education, ELL	57% of middle/high school Residents; all Residents get dual licensure in special education	32%
Retention rates	90% (after 3 years)	95% (after 3 years)
Resident Financial and Employment Agreement		
Resident compensation	$11,100 stipend & health insurance	$32,000 stipend & health insurance (Residents sign a contract to teach four years or repay their stipend.)
Resident expense: Tuition for program	$10,000 (one-third forgiven for each year as a BPS teacher)	None
Tuition for master's degree	$3,700 (AmeriCorps funds used to reimburse U-MASS this amount)	$11,500 (Students may take out loans through the university financial office)
Employment commitment to districts	Four years: one year of training and three years teaching in the BPS	Five years: one year of training and four years teaching in the CPS

Urban Teacher Residency Program Elements and Components 2007-2008		
	Boston Teacher Residency	***Academy for Urban School Leadership***
Program Components		
Length of residency	13 months	12 months
Assessment tool for residents	BPS Dimensions of Effective Teaching + Massachusetts Professional Teaching Standards	Illinois Professional Teaching Standards
Program components	**Year 1: July-August**: Classroom management and lesson planning courses, work in summer school classes or take content classes, depending on need. **September-June**: Four days a week in host school with mentor teacher; continue graduate level coursework; develop a teaching portfolio, consisting of performance-based assessments aligned with program and district standards. **July (2nd summer):** Residents complete coursework for master's degree and work toward Special Education Licensure. **Year 2:** Graduates have a full-time, paid teaching position with induction support from BTR and BPS. Complete Special Education licensure.	**Year 1: June-August:** Full-time graduate level coursework delivered by university partners **September-June**: Four days a week in training academy; continue graduate level coursework at training sites and university sites one day a week; develop a teaching portfolio, consisting of performance-based assessments aligned with program and district standards. **February**: Elementary Residents switch training academies and are assigned to a new mentor teacher. **Year 2**: Begin teaching in AUSL turnaround school or affiliate and receive coaching and induction from AUSL field coaches. **Year 3**: Coaching continues through AUSL coach
Resident weekly schedule	Four days a week with a mentor teacher; classwork all-day on Fridays and one afternoon a week.	Four days a week with a mentor teacher; graduate classes held one day a week
Certification Requirements and Licensure		
State certification requirements	BA, pass Massachusetts Test for Educator Licensure (MTEL): Communication and Literacy Skills and Subject Matter Tests, complete approved program	BA, pass Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS): Basic Skills Test and Stat Content Area Test (for secondary teachers)
University Partnerships		
University affiliate	University of Massachusetts/Boston	National-Louis University (NLU) and University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC)
Degree earned	Master's in Education (after one year)	NLU: Master's of Arts and Teaching (MAT); UIC: Master's in Educational Studies

Appendix C:
Portrait of a Young Teacher in an "Inner City" Public School
By Ariel Sacks

Four years ago, after a full year of supervised fieldwork in three middle school classrooms across New York City, and numerous courses on curriculum, pedagogy, and educational theory through Bank Street College's Middle School General Education program, I was ready to be leader of my own classroom. I was still a graduate student, but had completed half of my course work, which enabled me to obtain an internship certification from the state of New York through Bank Street College. I couldn't wait to meet my students and do a smashingly good job as their first year English teacher.

Finding a job was somewhat more stressful than I imagined. School administrators grilled me in interviews about what exactly I was going to do once I was in the classroom. I spoke enthusiastically about my vision of student-centered teaching and described some of the things I had tried out as a student teacher with great results; but there was a point at which my vision became vague and I betrayed my lack of experience. Other times, my obvious commitment to progressive pedagogy sounded risky to my interviewer.

I found surprisingly few job listings for positions in high-needs public schools, where I was committed to working. I came across ads from private schools or high-functioning public schools, which were generally selective in their student admissions processes. Finally, I went to a small recruitment fair at Bank Street College for a new program called Partnership for Quality with Region Nine Schools. I did not fully understand what this program was about, but I found there four low-performing public schools interested in hiring new teachers from Bank Street. There was one middle school represented there. I quickly scheduled a day to visit, after which I was invited back to do a demo lesson, and then hired on the spot.

As it turned out, I could not have been more fortunate to begin my career as a teacher in a Partnership school. The Partnership for Quality, known as P4Q, was a program, designed specifically for Bank Street teachers who wanted to teach in high-needs New York City schools. Through P4Q, I received support and continued advisement from Bank Street faculty members who understood the context in which I was teaching. They helped me to sort out what my role as teacher was, my feelings about my school and my students, and finally, to begin to understand how I could purposefully help my students develop as learners. With this level of support, I learned to implement progressive pedagogy where many people thought it was neither possible nor worthwhile.

As prepared as I felt, the reality of being a fulltime, head teacher in a high-needs school was a shock to my system. Every morning at 6:45 am, unlike most of my peers, I left my New York City apartment and entered a public school that had been labeled "failing." The basic needs of the school and its community were often not met from one day to the next, creating a constant sense of instability. Students, teachers, parents, and principals all had reason to be angry over what often felt like an unworkable situation. These undercurrents of anger, even violence, were constantly begging to be overcome.

There were so many parts of my job that could not be fully anticipated through pre-service work. In my preparation, I learned the importance of planning engaging, appropriate curriculum for my students, of creating long-range, in depth studies as well as detailed daily lesson plans with objectives that build toward the long-range goals. And yet, I found that no matter how good the plan was I had to be flexible and expect the unexpected. The school year, for example, often started without a permanent schedule or class rosters due to ongoing vacancies and late student enrollment. On any given day, copy machines might not have paper, leaving me without important resources for my lessons. Alternatively, a new mandate from the district could suddenly require that I abandon my carefully thought out plans in favor of a new standardized curriculum effort that may or may not meet the specific needs of my students. The unexpected could also come in the form of a new student, delivered to my classroom in the middle of a lesson with no warning and no indication of that student's needs. The school may not receive copies of IEPs for students requiring special services until months later, if at all. And one morning that I'll never forget, I entered my school building and learned that one of our eighth grade students had been shot to death the night before. In fifteen minutes, I would have to share the news with my homeroom students and help them to grieve.

Though I never quite get used to the ups and downs of group life in a high-needs urban school, through persistence on a number of levels, I make progress with my students. Ahead of all else, my priority is creating a structured, inclusive environment through which I may get to know them and earn their trust. Every year, at least one student (and sometimes a whole class) asks me, "Are you going to leave this school?" or "Are you going to lose your temper?" or "Are you going to start crying?" My students are accustomed to disappointment, especially from adults. They anticipate possible rejection and — preferring that it come sooner than later — they test me to see if I will fold under the pressure. Two lessons I had to learn quickly to survive are: (1) don't give up, no matter what … I must demonstrate persistence, especially if I hope to see it in my students; and (2) don't take it personally when students exhibit what I interpret as negative behaviors … most of the time, it's not about me, so my job is to understand the reasons for my students' behaviors and find ways to help.

My persistence was supported in my first few years through the Partnership for Quality on three different levels. First, I was able to work with a faculty advisor from the college, who observed me teach during the year. I was often overwhelmed as I faced the endless complexity of teaching. My advisor always directed the conversation toward what had worked and how to address the things that hadn't.

In the summers, we planned. Before my first year, we mapped out a setup for my classroom that would accommodate the functions I wanted it to have. The setup revolved around a U-shaped meeting area in the front of the room made up of three large benches and a rug. This area would provide a space for meetings, lessons, and discussions. Behind the meeting area were round tables for students to work independently or in collaborative groups. This was an unusual setup for a middle school classroom, but many of my colleagues and administrators came to like it. Each summer, I reflected with my advisor on how it was working and what needed further development.

Four years later, I believe my structure is sound. Class begins with five minutes of defined social time for the students, complete with rules of appropriate social conduct. Then I

ring a Tibetan meditation bell, signaling for students to sit in the meeting area. I go over the day's agenda and answer any questions the students may have. On a normal day, I proceed with the day's lesson in the meeting area and send students to tables for independent or group work. Toward the end of the period, the bell calls students again to the meeting area, where we share and reflect on the work. Finally, the students assess how the whole class did in each of four categories: agenda completion, quality of work, student jobs, and following the Golden Rule. We record a number for each category on a chart that hangs on the front wall, an ongoing reflection of our process.

This classroom practice also helps accommodate the unexpected. On many a day, the meeting becomes a place to discuss issues or occurrences that interfere with our regular schedule. Some days, it provides opportunities for students to negotiate how class time will be used. If a disruptive incident occurs during class, I often call a meeting to discuss it as a whole group. Not only is this structure practical, it also teaches students to participate in the life of the group, make decisions for themselves, learn from experiences, and begin to take responsibility for the well-being of the class. Day after day, I maintain this solid routine that offers enough flexibility for students to voice their ideas and be heard. As we weather the various storms around us, my students and I develop trust.

The second way P4Q supported my developing practice was through carving out unprecedented time in our schedules for groups of teachers at my school to meet professionally. A Bank Street faculty member collaborated with my assistant principal to facilitate meetings that focused on developing interdisciplinary connections across curriculum. Motivated by this work, I designed a study of the school's neighborhood of East Harlem, where I combined what I'd learned in my social studies curriculum course at Bank Street about hands-on investigative studies with my school's need for students to have experience reading and writing nonfiction in preparation for the content they would encounter on the statewide ELA exam.

The East Harlem study allowed my students and me to get to know one another beyond the classroom walls, a key component to successful teaching in a high-needs urban public school. Students got to see their neighborhood through a new lens after field trips, interviews, surveys, and readings. They saw aspects of themselves in the study and shared ideas that had lingered just below the surface of their consciousnesses, untapped by school. They wrote journalistic pieces, and by the end, were visibly amazed by the vast diversity and vibrant history of the East Harlem community, which was reflected in our classroom. In our concluding discussion, a student excitedly blurted out, "We, like, make history — here — in East Harlem."

The teachers on my floor and I shared many aspects of our teaching in these meetings and slowly, it seemed, made collective progress. Morale improved despite constant challenges, and so did teacher retention. Our students' test scores also rose substantially. As I gained strength in my practice, I began working with student teachers from Bank Street, two of whom then took permanent positions at my school.

On the third level, P4Q kept me connected to Bank Street College through my first years of teaching, which was more valuable than I may have realized. First, I was still a student, and my course work, though not context specific, was quite practical. After each session I had a new strategy or idea I was eager to try out in the classroom. The coursework and my master's thesis

also invited me to bring my teaching experiences into the academic arena, pushing me to connect theory with practice. Additionally, P4Q coordinated meetings for all of the new teacher participants across the four partnership schools. These meetings were the only time I got to talk with other new teachers who, like me, had come from Bank Street and decided to teach in struggling public schools. We vented our frustrations and offered advice; but most importantly, coming together gave us the sense that we were part of something important, something bigger than each of us individually.

After three years as a fulltime teacher in a Bank Street Partnership school, despite visible progress my small cohort of teachers was making with the students, the unexpected happened. The state called for a restructuring of the entire school because it had failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress for a number of years in a row. Our program was abandoned in favor of a standardized curriculum directive that promised faster, large-scale results. The three of us, who were former interns from Bank Street College, all migrated to a new public school in Brooklyn that also serves a high-needs population. We collaborate regularly and share aspects of our work with other teachers at our school. As we reach the four-year mark at which many young teachers decide to leave the profession, I can say with some confidence that we will not be leaving. We are here, in high-needs public schools, and we have learned to grow as teachers against the odds.

Endnotes

[1] CTQ acknowledges the support of the Arthur Vining Davis Foundations and the MetLife Foundation in their funding of NCATE's exploration into the promise and possibilities of UTRs for transforming teacher education.
[2] Rochkind, J., Ott, A., Immerwahr, J., Doble, J. & Johnson, J. (2007). *Working without a net: How new teachers from three prominent alternate route programs describe their first year on the job*. New York: Public Agenda Foundation. http://www.publicagenda.org/citizen/researchstudies/education
[3] The costs of teacher attrition average $15,000 to $20,000 for each teacher who leaves.
[4] Kane, T.E., Rockoff, J.E. & Staiger, D.O. (2006, March). *What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? Evidence from New York City*. Working Paper 11844. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research; Darling-Hammond, L., Holtzman, D., Gatlin, S.J. & Heilig, J.V. (2005). Does teacher preparation matter? Evidence about teacher certification, Teach for America, and teacher effectiveness. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(42). http://epaa.asu.edu/epa//v13n42/
[5] Wilson, S., Floden, R. & Ferrini-Mundy. J. (2001). *Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations*. Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
[6] Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). Developing Powerful Teacher Education: What Do We Know and What Can We Do? Keynote presentation to the Urban Teacher Residency Institute Symposium. July 22. Boston, MA
[7] National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2001). *Standards for professional development schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
[8] Levine, M. and Trachtman, R. (2007). Professional Development School (PDS) Pathways to Teacher Quality in Urban Areas: Linking PDSs to Improve Teacher Induction and Alternate Routes to Certification. Washington DC: NCATE.
[9] The Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
[10] Teitel, L. (2004). *How professional development schools make a difference: A review of research (*2nd ed., revised). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; Gill, B. (2000). *Evaluation of Benedum collaborative model of teacher education at West Virginia University*. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation. http://www.rand.org/pubs/documented_briefings/2005/RAND_DB303.pdf
[11] The full paper may be found on the websites of the Center for Teaching Quality (www.teachingquality.org) and the Aspen Institute (http://www.aspeninstitute.org).
[12] A third UTR, the Boettcher Teachers Program in Denver, Colorado, was also one of the initial members of a coalition of UTRs, now known as the UTR Initiative (UTRI). Lack of resources for this study limited the scope of the work to only two of the three original UTRI members. Information about the Boettcher Teachers Program may be found at their website at: http://www.boettcherteachers.org/.
[13]These principles were articulated by the Urban Teacher Residency Institute (UTRI): www.teacherresidencies.org.
[14] See http://www.ausl-chicago.org/ for more information.
[15] PACT assessments are subject-specific portfolios of teaching (called "Teaching Events"), with a standardized set of integrated tasks that require teachers to document their planning, teaching, and assessing of specific lessons.
[16] Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Assessing teacher education: The usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(2), 120-138.
[17] Greenwald, R., Hedges, L. & Laine, R.D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(3), 361–396.
[18] Darling-Hammond,L.(2006).*Powerful Teacher Education: Lessons from Exemplary Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
[19] Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Indianapolis, IN: Jossey-Bass.
[20] Boston Public Schools' Dimensions of Effective Teaching may be viewed at: http://boston.k12.ma.us/teach/Dimensions.pdf.