

2016

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership in an Urban Teacher Residency

Jori S. Beck
Old Dominion University, jbeck@odu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/teachinglearning_fac_pubs



Part of the [Educational Methods Commons](#)

Original Publication Citation

Beck, J. S. (2016). The complexities of a third-space partnership in an urban teacher residency. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 43(1), 51-70.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Teaching & Learning at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Teaching & Learning Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.



The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership in an Urban Teacher Residency

By Jori S. Beck

Theoretical Framework

Urban teacher residency (UTR) programs have been widely endorsed (National Education Association, 2014; Thorpe, 2014) yet the body of literature on these programs has not definitively identified the benefits of UTRs over and above traditional teacher education programs—if any exist. The current study explored how faculty and staff working in one UTR program recruited, prepared, and supported residents within their program. A secondary goal of the study was to explore stakeholder perspectives on this model of teacher preparation. This study was situated within the literature on third-space teacher preparation programs which endorses school-university partnerships as a value-neutral political space for fostering preservice teacher learning.

The notion of the Third Space comes from the work of Homi Bhabha (1994; Rutherford, 1990) in hybridity theory. To Bhabha, the Third Space “displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom” (Rutherford, 1990, p. 211). The Third Space is at once political and value neutral, it is a space in which “we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 39). In teacher education, Zeichner (2010) noted

Jori S. Beck is an assistant professor of teacher education in the Department of Teaching and Learning of the College of Education at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. jori.beck@unlv.edu

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

the potential for third-space programs to collapse hierarchies between university faculty and school personnel and to reject traditional notions of power, privilege, and knowing in these spaces. This notion was embodied in the work of Miller and Hafner (2008) who studied a community-based teacher education program that was specifically rooted in the work of Paulo Freire on dialogue and collaborative relationships. Despite the explicit mission of the program to promote mutual dependence and benefits, community partners still felt disenfranchised within this program—a testament to the persistence of power dynamics in school-university partnerships and the complexities of creating a third space in teacher education.

The notion of third-space teacher education has been applied directly to early research on UTR programs. In their study of the Newark Montclair Urban Teacher Residency (NMUTR), Klein, Taylor, Onore, Strom and Abrams (2013) identified this program as a deliberate instantiation of the third space. They investigated the development of their UTR program through qualitative methods, and they uncovered the challenges and successes of developing a third-space teacher education program. Because of the situation of the program within a school district, the authors could work closely with school personnel such as administrators to ensure that mentors and teachers had sufficient planning time to foster resident learning. However, this third-space model also provided challenges such as garnering support from university personnel, sustaining the residency post-grant funding, locating intellectual tools for reform work, and encouraging residents in this STEM-focused residency to implement inquiry learning. The authors concluded that, “third-space work is utopian work...It is improvisational in the sense that there are no pre-set meanings, roles, and responsibilities to be filled” (p. 52). I add that these improvisational spaces are enacted differently within respective urban areas because UTRs are responsive to context; therefore, more needs to be learned about how UTR programs operate in these different urban environments.

UTR programs prepare candidates for urban schools during an intensive, year-long experience working in an urban school with a master teacher (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2006). The term “residency” is appropriated from the medical residency model and is a reference to the situated learning that is intended to occur in these programs as a result of their apprenticeship structure and preparation of candidates in cohorts. After their residency year, graduates commit to three years or more of teaching in a specific district while receiving induction support. UTRs are one of the few types of teacher education programs that mandate yearlong, well-supervised student teaching experiences despite calls for implementation of this model that span two decades (Berry, 2001; Darling-Hammond, 2006; NCATE Blue Ribbon Panel, 2010; Sykes, Bird, & Kennedy, 2010; Van Roekel, 2011; Zeichner, 2010; Zimpher & Howey, 2005). Furthermore, UTRs’ commitment to rigorous recruitment processes that aim to identify teachers specifically for urban districts sets them apart from many other teacher education programs. In 2012, the Urban Teacher Residency United (UTRU) Network boasted 400+ residents enrolled in

the 2011-2012 cohort; 100+ training sites in P-12 public and charter schools; and a resident retention rate of 85% after five years for program graduates. Moreover, 86% of residents noted that their residency prepared them to teach in an urban school; 89% of mentor coaches reported that taking on this role improved their own teaching; and 79% of principals felt that being a host school made a positive improvement in school culture. UTRs are a relatively new phenomenon in teacher education and research on UTR programs is an emerging area. Of the studies conducted to date, it is possible to distill a few observations on the structure and processes within some of these programs.

Literature Review

Research on UTR programs has focused on four residencies in the Northeast and Midwest regions of the United States: the NMUTR; the Boston Teacher Residency (BTR), the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL) in Chicago, and the University of Chicago Urban Teacher Education Program (UChicago UTEP). It is important to note the significance of context in each UTR program and how it shapes the learning of teacher candidates. Boggess (2010) studied this contextual preparation in depth in the BTR and the AUSL. Specifically, he questioned how stakeholders in each program defined “teacher quality” and how the organizational structure of each program influenced those meanings. Although both programs required candidates to maintain high expectations for urban students, participants from the BTR and the AUSL cited other qualities that were important for candidates in their programs. For example, because of the BTR’s focus on activism, stakeholders in this site privileged race awareness and teaching for social justice. As a program, the AUSL was more focused on reform and turnaround schools and participants at this site professed a preference for candidates who were accountable and persistent. Thus, exceptional licensure requirements may be appropriate for special settings such as urban education, and the political context may drive the dispositions and skills needed to teach in a particular environment.

Matsko and Hammerness (2013) further explored the notion of specialized teacher preparation in the UChicago UTEP program—another residency. The authors uncovered a layered program in which levels of context were nested, overlapping, and interrelated. The outermost layer was the federal/state policy level which candidates were afforded the opportunity to learn about through their participation in the program. Successive layers included the public school context, the local geographical context, and the local socio-cultural context. The latter two layers, although distinct, sometimes overlapped. The next layer was the district context, and the final layer—at the core of the program—was the school context. Within the UTEP program, a deep understanding of all of these layers was necessary for successful teaching within Chicago Public Schools and UTEP and it was fostered within this residency program. This work provides

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

additional insight into specialized teacher preparation that occurs within UTRs. Other researchers have investigated the outcomes of UTR programs, thus providing another lens for evaluating residencies.

Papay, West, Fullerton, and Kane (2012) explored the effectiveness of BTR graduates by comparing these individuals to their peers teaching in Boston Public Schools (BPS) who did not graduate from the BTR on the measures of students' test scores in reading and math. Because the sample size in this study was small (n=50) the results are not generalizable, and the measures were limited to student performance in two subject areas; however, this study provides a contextualized picture of how this residency program influences a district. Controlling for years of teaching experience in their regression analysis, the authors found no statistically significant difference among BTR and non-BTR graduates in the content area of English-Language Arts (ELA). In math, however, the results were more nuanced. BTR graduates underperformed in comparison to their non-BTR counterparts by 9% of a standard deviation during their first year as teachers of record. However, by their fourth and fifth years of teaching the BTR graduates were predicted to catch up to and outperform their non-BTR peers and even more veteran colleagues. Thus, the benefits of residency preparation may take years to surface.

In addition to these findings, researchers have discovered that residencies are meeting other needs of urban districts in recruitment and retention. Papay and colleagues (2012) found that the BTR hired a disproportionate share of the district's math and science teachers (62% and 42% respectively), and that BTR candidates tended to be more ethnically diverse—specifically, BTR teachers were 52% less likely to be White than their non-BTR counterparts. In their study of the BTR and the AUSL, Berry et al. (2008) found that in the 2007-2008 cohorts almost 60% of BTR and 32% of AUSL candidates were being prepared to teach in high-need subject areas. Furthermore, 55% of BTR and 57% of AUSL candidates in this cohort were minorities, thus supporting Papay et al.'s findings about the diversity of these teacher candidates. Perhaps most significant for a hard-to-staff, urban school, Papay et al. found that BTR graduates remained in the district at a rate that exceeded that of other hires by 20% after five years. Urban schools may experience up to a 15% annual attrition rate due to teachers moving to other schools or leaving teaching entirely (Ingersoll, 2003). Although BTR graduates commit three years of service to BPS, this study demonstrated that candidates were staying beyond this contractual commitment and thus becoming fixtures in the district. Berry and colleagues' study confirmed these findings as well, and demonstrated that 90% of BTR graduates and 95% of AUSL graduates were teaching after three years in their respective districts. These studies provide evidence that residency preparation may foster teacher retention in urban schools.

Some UTR programs were designed to compete with higher education (Solomon, 2009) while others were specifically created as partnerships between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and school districts (Matsko & Hammerness, 2013). Thus,

UTR programs are interesting for their place in the teacher education continuum between alternate route and traditional teacher education programs (Berry et al., 2008). These innovations warrant deeper investigations into methods and outcomes. The current study sought to explore the following research questions in an effort to provide a rich description of a particular residency program's methods of teacher preparation: (1) How do faculty at one UTR program prepare residents for the classroom? (2) What do faculty identify as the unique elements of the Residency that separate it from traditional teacher preparation programs? (3) How were these elements designed for the Residency? and (4) What do these elements look like in action?

Methods

Research Context

I chose the Lewistown Teacher Residency¹ (LTR) as the unit of analysis for this study because it adhered to various criteria for UTR programs including providing residents with yearlong experiences; tying theory to practice; and building relationships between an IHE and a school district (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2006). Many of these criteria, such as relationship-building between a university and a school district, are also an embodiment of third-space ideologies because of their implicit mission to collapse hierarchies in teacher education and privilege knowledge outside of the university (i.e., practitioner knowledge).

Like all UTR programs, the LTR is a partnership between multiple entities; UTR programs often connect not only IHEs and school districts, but sometimes community agencies and teachers unions as well. The premise behind these partnerships is twofold: not only does it require multiple stakeholders to fortify teacher preparation and retention, but—because learning to teach is a long, complex process—these partnerships are essential in supporting this ongoing learning as well (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2006). The LTR is a partnership between Lewistown Public Schools (LPS), Sinclair University (SU), and the Center for the Development of Education Talent. LPS is predominantly Black (80%) and the majority of its students come from low socioeconomic backgrounds (approximately 76% of K-12 students qualify for free or reduced lunches). SU identifies as an urban, research-intensive university and is located within the city limits of Lewistown. The Center for the Development of Education Talent cultivates teacher leaders and is affiliated with SU.

Because the focus of my study was on the methods of faculty and staff preparing residents for LPS, anyone working within the LTR who had such contact with residents was eligible for participation in my study. However, LPS would not allow me access to schools, administrators, faculty, or staff for this investigation so my unit of analysis was truncated because I was unable to gather data from coaches

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

(i.e., cooperating or mentor teachers) who are an integral element of any residency program. This is problematic in a study of a UTR program that explicitly aims to build relationships between a school district and an IHE. My status as an outsider likely caused suspicion and warranted this restriction. However, this outsider status afforded me a degree of objectivity—which is particularly important in studying UTR programs because much of this research has been conducted by stakeholders within these programs (e.g., Klein et al., 2013; Solomon, 2009). As in any research, there are tradeoffs (Patton, 2002) and the inability to access LPS was one limitation of the current study.

At the time of this study, the LTR was preparing its third cohort of residents, and produced only secondary teachers. The LTR is a master's-degree granting program, and recruitment targets candidates who have undergraduate degrees in one of four content areas: English, science, math, or social studies. SU operates a traditional master's-degree granting program alongside the LTR. This program is traditional in the sense that preservice teachers completed only one semester of student teaching rather than a yearlong, clinical experience. Furthermore, these preservice teachers do not commit to teaching specifically in LPS either during their student teaching experience or as teachers of record. SU teacher candidates and LTR residents sometimes completed coursework together; for example, residents took their content-area methods coursework with these teacher candidates. However, because the LTR operated on a cohort model, residents completed 18 credit hours of coursework in this cohort between May and August in ethics and policy; content-area literacy; secondary curriculum; human development and educational psychology; and classroom management. The latter course also continued throughout the year as a seminar for residents. Residents were not in LPS schools on Fridays and they used these days to complete SU coursework and to participate in the classroom management seminar. As a result of this structure, my participants taught both traditional candidates and LTR residents and often compared the two programs and the two types of preservice teachers even though the design of my study was not intentionally comparative.

Research Design and Data Collection

I employed a case study design (Yin, 2009) for this investigation because my research questions focused on learning more about the unit of analysis in depth: the LTR. I defined the case as LTR faculty and staff perspectives on their program; there were 12 individuals who were eligible for participation in my study and 11 elected to participate. My participants worked in various aspects of the LTR including recruitment and marketing; residency coursework; content-area methods coursework; and field support.

I began to collect data for this study in May 2013 and this process concluded in October 2013. I collected interview data, observation data, and documents in order

to explore my research questions. I designed my interview guide (see Appendix A) around my research questions and goals for this study and used a semi-structured approach to these interviews (Patton, 2002). The interviews ranged from 20 minutes to 86 minutes in length—some participants had just begun working in the LTR and thus were not able to provide as much information as their veteran peers. In all, I collected 11 hours and 52 minutes of audio data, which resulted in 274 pages of transcript data. I included member checks in interviews by summarizing to participants what I thought I heard them relating and asked for their confirmation, elaboration, or correction (Sandelowski, 2008). I also wrote short narratives about each participant based on my data analysis and shared them with participants to elicit this feedback as well. Eight of my 11 participants returned these member checks.

I also conducted observations of an ethics and policy class, Residency workshop, classroom management seminar, Residency seminar, and a content-area methods class. My role in each observation changed but fell along a spectrum from observer to participant (Patton, 2002). For example, during the Residency workshop residents and LTR graduates candidly discussed their classroom management and instructional struggles so I participated by sharing my own struggles from when I taught middle school. In my observation of the content-area methods course, I was strictly an observer who sat in the back of the room. I collected 15 pages of field notes from these observations, and three of my participants reviewed my summaries of these observations and confirmed their accuracy. Finally, I collected 117 pages of documents from the LTR including recruitment materials, candidate selection rubrics, syllabi, and course handouts.

Data Analysis

I conducted four rounds of data analysis. The first part of this process was an initial round of coding, or “pre-coding” (Layder, 1998 cited by Saldaña, 2009), that occurred during verbatim transcription. Pre-coding mainly involved highlighting significant words and phrases. After transcription was complete, I organized data by participant (e.g., interview, observation, and syllabus from a particular participant) and conducted a line-by-line coding of these data in which I used three types of codes: attribute, descriptive, and in vivo coding (Saldaña, 2009). I used attribute codes for background information about each participant because this type of code is useful at this level of organization. Descriptive codes allowed me to locate basic topics in the data that sometimes evolved into larger themes for a particular participant. Finally, in vivo codes² were used to identify particular words or phrases used by participants to capture significant ideas. For example, one participant described the program as lacking “synergy” which became a recurring theme in the data. I used these codes to synthesize the data for each individual and compile them into a short narrative that I shared with the appropriate participant for member checking.

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

After these two initial rounds of data analysis and member checks, I conducted a cross-case analysis of these narratives for recurring themes (see Table 1). Finally, using the three major themes that emerged from this round of analysis as lenses I returned to the raw data to conduct another round of analysis. I created Word documents for each theme and organized data into each document in order to see how robust each theme was, to aid in further refining explanations within each theme, and to facilitate reporting of my findings. In all, three major themes emerged from the analysis: (1) the ongoing development of the LTR; (2) lack of coherence within the LTR; and (3) the potential of the LTR.

Findings

The current study was part of a larger case study on the LTR and other findings will be reported elsewhere. Here I will relate three themes—(1) the ongoing development of the LTR; (2) lack of coherence within the LTR; and (3) the potential of the LTR—with illustrative quotes from participants.

Ongoing Development: The Evolution of a UTR

Perhaps due to the novelty of UTR programs, faculty and staff noted that the development of the program was ongoing work and that the LTR was constantly being evaluated and revised through a process of evidence-based decision-making. This theme addressed my first and third research questions, (1) How do faculty at

Table 1
Recurring Themes from Cross-Case Analysis

LTR faculty or staff member name	Cohort model is appropriate for residency	Lack of coherence in the LTR	Social justice	Trouble with dual admission process	Ongoing development	Critical pedagogy	Residency hasn't proven itself yet	Selection day is robust	Residency model has its place in teacher preparation	The LTR builds relationships with LPS	Residency can inform traditional teacher preparation
Patrick	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X
Michael	X	X		X	X			X	X		
Susan	X					X	X				
Sarah	X	X	X	X	X			X			
Lori	X				X		X	X			
James		X	X							X	X
Jessica	X	X	X			X					X
Erica			X			X					
Diana		X	X	X	X		X		X	X	
Barbara		X			X					X	X
Lauren								X			X

one UTR program prepare residents for the classroom? and, (3) How were these elements [those that are unique to the LTR] designed for the LTR? This ongoing development was a priority that was explicitly conveyed by the administration at the LTR and it pervaded the program. Barbara, an SU professor, explained this culture of development and responsiveness,

I'm always impressed at the extent to which the people at the top of that organization...are sincerely interested in continual improvement, are reflective and open to criticism from the outside... We're not always going to agree on the problem, or what the problem is, or what the solution might be, but I know that when I bring something that it'll be followed up on, and that we'll have an honest conversation about it where people are speaking openly and that both sides will walk away rethinking things and considering the other position.

Faculty and staff regularly collected data from program stakeholders including residents and coaches in order to improve the program. Specifically, development was evident in negotiations around candidate admission and coursework as well as essential program elements such as the Community Project. Another explicit area of development was nurturing the nascent relationship between SU and LPS.

Diana, a veteran faculty member at SU, provided some background information regarding why this third-space partnership had been difficult to navigate from a university standpoint,

[T]here's been a *huge* amount of adjustment, because you've got a university structure: credits, hours, procedures. And then you've got a school system. And I really think that the people downstairs in administration have done an excellent job trying to figure out how we can jam our system into what the students need. (original emphasis)

Because it did not identify as an alternate route program, the LTR was not only bound by state requirements for candidate licensure, but also SU requirements for admission and coursework. Thus, this element of the program had to be negotiated in order to accommodate the 14-month, expedited schedule.

The Community Project was an essential element of the LTR that was developed to facilitate residents' entrée into the Lewistown community and LPS. Patrick and James, SU faculty members, spearheaded the Community Project and made major revisions to it after each of the three iterations employed with the cohorts. James described this process, "That's been a lot of trial and error. Which I think that's to be expected in programs like this." Due to the dearth of empirical research on how to support preservice teachers' assimilation into a community, the two faculty members had tried a variety of approaches to this project and relied on resident feedback to amend these efforts. The first cohort of residents did not complete the project because it had been rushed and a partnership with a community organization did not come to fruition. The second cohort of residents balked at their task to conduct home visits. Thus, Patrick and James chose a different approach for the third cohort of residents.

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

The third iteration of the project was steeped in community, social justice, and critical ethnography. Patrick described the revamped project as, “a wider acceptable range of more modest as well as ambitious experiences in the community.” Residents would be provided with a “menu” of options such as riding the city bus or visiting a local supermarket in order to learn more about Lewistown. The culminating project would be individual resident presentations to the cohort about their school culture. This project would be facilitated by a clear rubric as well as anchoring it into a weekly seminar for the residents. James summed this developmental process, “I feel like we’re stumbling towards something, and then I hope that’s right.”

The final area of development in the LTR was the burgeoning relationship between SU and LPS which was an intentional element in the creation of this residency program. Diana explained one of the functions of this relationship, “*You* [LPS] need prepared teachers, we need to know that we are preparing teachers” (original emphasis). Although all faculty and staff contributed to this relationship-building process, some faculty and staff members were more instrumental in facilitating these relationships than others. Lori, a former LPS teacher and administrator, helped other faculty and staff at the Residency to navigate the sometimes-tricky relationship with a defensive urban school district. Michael, who worked with Lori to provide field support to residents, described how Lori helped him to work with these schools,

[S]he was my cultural attaché. *Literally*. When we went out to the schools, I totally let her take the lead on everything and I learned the ropes. And because she did such a great job at that I’m welcomed in the schools. (original emphasis)

Lori also knew the hierarchy of LPS and how to work within this system to effect change—knowledge that she shared with other faculty and staff at the LTR, “And in [Lewistown] I think it’s probably the most rigid when it comes to hierarchy. You go through the right channels. They don’t appreciate anything less than that.” Thus, human resources such as Lori facilitated some of the relationship building that occurred within this third-space partnership. Regular meetings between program stakeholders were another method that the LTR used to foster these relationships as well. Patrick expressed his thoughts on the LTR’s growth, “I think we *should* become more critical as we grow with it. I think it would be very bad if we didn’t” (original emphasis). It was not merely development and growth, but also critical reflection that spurred innovation in the LTR.

Lack of Coherence Within the LTR: Complexities of a Third-Space Teacher Preparation Program

Although the LTR was an opportunity to build relationships between LPS and SU, the third space was also an area of discord—partially due to the number of players involved. This theme answered my fourth research question, What do these elements [those that are unique to the LTR] look like in action? Patrick summed

participant consensus when he explained, “[S]ometimes it just feels like we’re all just doing our little pieces and it doesn’t add up to a whole... I don’t feel always that there’s synergy.” James concurred, “The idea of the program is that we’d be kind of seamlessly integrated and we’re not. And I don’t know that it’s the structure or if it’s just in our implementation, it’s probably a little bit of both.” This dissonance was a result of both organizational barriers as well as conflicting viewpoints within the program.

An SU faculty member, Barbara, addressed the first organizational barrier: institutional differences between a public school system and a university:

When you’re a professor you just have different things that you deal with every day. You’re institutionalized into a different institution. And so it’s hard, but important, to maintain that connection with the struggles of classroom teachers every day. I think it makes us better methods instructors. I mean there’s always this weird kind of gulf between the abstract and the practical, but the gulf isn’t always as big as people perceive it to be.

Discord within the LTR was thus sometimes due simply to perceptions about differences between academics and teachers. Furthermore, even at the SU level there were difficulties in getting faculty members to work in harmony due to scheduling conflicts. Those faculty who taught LTR classes did not all work within the same department and there was not always consistency in communication about the program because they did not attend the same meetings. This program dissonance was further evident in conflicts regarding the dual-admission process and duplicated efforts among faculty and staff.

Because the LTR was bound by both state and SU requirements, candidates had to meet licensure and admissions requirements on assessments such as Praxis I and II (Educational Testing Service, 2014), Graduate Record Examination (GRE; Educational Testing Service, 2014) or, alternatively to the GRE, the Miller Analogies Test (MAT; Pearson Education, Inc., 2011). SU requirements for admission to the teacher licensure program also mandated a minimum grade point average of 3.0 in a particular undergraduate content area. Because the LTR had the explicit mission of preparing teachers for LPS and a social justice focus it was also difficult to find candidates who had appropriate dispositions for this work, and a performance assessment process, called Resident Selection Days, was designed to tease out this temperament. Candidates traveled to Lewistown to participate in these performance assessments which included teaching a mini-lesson to LPS students, a two-on-one interview, a writing activity, and a group discussion activity. Faculty and staff were divided in their feelings about this plethora of admissions requirements, and the crux of the argument seemed to lie in whether academic abilities or non-academic abilities were more important in selecting candidates for the program.

Diana noted that the GPA requirement was a minimum standard and she felt that many of the LTR candidates simply did not meet these requirements despite

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

the mission of the program to attract the most academically talented candidates to teach in Lewistown. However, other faculty and staff saw the performance assessments as rigorous. Patrick related his feelings on the process,

I do really believe in that many-step process. The teaching and then the peer thing [group discussion], I love all of that. And every time you learn some whole different things coming out of folks when they're with their peers...Honestly I would say that it's the best recruitment process I've ever known...I think it's *so* well thought out... I like the fact that you observe them teaching and then you get that reflection afterward, I do think it's *really* important. (original emphasis)

Other participants, such as Michael and Sarah, expressed similar, positive views of the performance assessments. Other faculty were more tempered in their evaluations. Jessica, an SU professor, expressed, "I love that they teach the few minutes because it's the most *inauthentic* thing...*but* you really get a snapshot of how they improv[ise]" (original emphasis). She felt that the process was helpful despite its somewhat inauthentic nature. James noted a disconnect in the mission of the LTR and the performance assessments,

I applaud the effort to think about what they'll be like in the classroom context, but given that the whole point of the program is that we're set up to take people who have no background in education, I don't know why we evaluate them as teachers.

Barbara noted that the LTR vetting process was "extensive" but did not guarantee an optimal outcome, "You never know who's going to be good." She felt that both the SU and LTR requirements had merit but neither was a surefire way for selecting candidates. This adherence to two sets of admissions requirements resulted in a 2% selectivity rate for LTR admission and cohorts had not exceeded 20 residents at this point in the program—a testament to the difficulty of navigating this dual-admission process.

The third-space partnership also provided the opportunity for faculty and staff to duplicate efforts. For example, as part of an ethics and policy class, the instructor, James, required residents to read about and discuss the history of desegregation in Lewistown. This summer coursework was compressed, and thus time was valuable, and James carefully chose the content to include in this course. During this same time, staff at the LTR coordinated a seminar on the topic of desegregation in Lewistown with a panel of speakers who had experienced these events as teachers and students. James was frustrated by this duplication of efforts,

[I]t's an exciting, weird, and problematic thing that there's two added layers, or partners...that SU and then LPS and [LTR], and it's the [LTR] layer. The SU part's fine, it's the [LTR] layer that, for this kind of stuff, like the kind of bureaucratic part, that gets difficult. Like about who's doing what, and there's duplication of efforts, and I'm sure they're [staff] frustrated. I'm sure they are frustrated with what the professors are doing. And I sometimes feel my toes get stepped on. Everybody's trying to do the best they can.

He further noted that this overlap was unique to the LTR because there were no seminars in the traditional SU program. Thus, the residency model posed new challenges because of its third-space structure.

The Potential of the LTR

The final theme answered three of my research questions: (1) What do faculty identify as the unique elements of the LTR that separate it from traditional teacher preparation programs? (2) How were these elements designed for the LTR? and (3) What do these elements look like in action? The consensus among faculty and staff was that the partnership between SU and LPS was a distinguishing feature of the program. Furthermore, faculty and staff at this residency thought that they could learn from the innovative structure and mission of their program, but they were uncertain about the efficacy of the model based on their own implementation.

Diana was just one participant who explained that the partnership between her IHE and a public school was a unique aspect of the LTR. She explained, “We’re not adjuncting this out. These are our full-time, tenure-eligible [and tenured] people who are teaching in the program.” For this participant, who had held leadership roles within the university, it was important that the LTR utilized tenure-line faculty to teach in the program because it conveyed their dedication to this relationship and to teacher education. She summed, “It’s a moral commitment.” Barbara also described this aspect of the program as unique and professed SU’s dedication to teacher education generally,

And this is an institution that really cares about teacher education *still*, we’ll see how long we can maintain that with our current pressures to produce academic work, but we do really care about it and we care about improving practice and it gives us an opportunity to try things differently which is great. (original emphasis)

Thus, SU valued both scholarly work as well as teacher preparation and this reward structure afforded faculty the opportunity to be recognized for their work in the LTR. Thus, an important benefit of the third-space partnership was the relationship between a public school district and an IHE.

Faculty and staff were tempered in their views about their program. James noted that it was a “fool’s errand” to identify the best model of teacher preparation, that there were benefits to traditional models of teacher education as well as apprenticeships, and faculty and staff supported this view by elaborating on various innovations and challenges in both of their programs. First of all, faculty and staff expressed the idea that the residency model afforded them opportunities to try out new techniques and structures. Lauren thought that the yearlong apprenticeship model was exemplary and expressed, “I think this is a fantastic program. I would like to see us as a *whole*, in terms of our teacher prep[aration] program, move in that direction” (original emphasis). Barbara was more measured in her response, and noted specific areas of the program that were promising,

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

I also think the [LTR] program, because we can do some things differently, another hope for the program [traditional SU teacher preparation program] is that it helps us inform how we do things and maybe think about some ways to do some things differently—especially the summer program that they have with them [residents]... It shakes things up a little bit and allows people to do different things and explore things a little differently.

Thus, the expedited summer program was one facet of the LTR that this faculty member saw as novel and potentially informative to the traditional program. Patrick noted that activities and assignments that he used in the LTR program bled over into his teaching in the traditional program at SU—thus indicating the influence of the program at the individual level. For example, he used readings and discussions about race and privilege in his LTR course and he transferred these into his teaching in his traditional SU courses. He expressed, “I am *absolutely* adamant that this [social justice and critical pedagogy] needs to be for everybody” (original emphasis).

Indeed, faculty and staff hoped that the social justice mission of the LTR program would begin to inform their traditional program. Jessica was one proponent of a more pervasive social justice mission in the college of education,

Patrick told me about the LTR, that got me really excited because I was like, “Oh good, social justice, urban, that’s what the whole program needs to be.” So maybe we could look at the [LTR] and bring some of those elements into the whole teacher ed[ucation] program.

Because SU identified as an urban institution, many faculty saw an explicit social justice mission as not only suitable, but essential to their programs. However, feelings about the efficacy of the program overall were inconclusive.

Aside from the innovations which the LTR had introduced to program scheduling and mission and vision, faculty and staff expressed that the LTR was an expensive program that had not yet proven itself to outperform their traditional teacher education program. Susan estimated that it cost approximately \$50,000 to prepare each resident. She noted, “But at least with a *good* regular program, which I think [SU] has, you know that those guys going through that regular program are going to stay twice as long as people going through alternative, shorter programs. So that’s something” (original emphasis). Lori summed participant consensus on the value of the program when she noted, “Right now it’s up in the air to be honest with you.” It seemed as though having two teacher preparation programs, a traditional program and the LTR, was an effective approach for SU and Lewistown.

Limitations and Implications

What are absent from this study are the voices of school personnel working in the LTR: the teachers who played a critical role in fostering resident growth and the administrators who could testify to the benefits and challenges of a third-space

partnership. These perspectives are vital in teacher education research on third-space teacher education programs, and this case study is truncated without their funds of knowledge. The perceptions of veteran teachers on their own growth as a result of their experiences as mentor teachers has been explored elsewhere (Arnold, 2002) and should be taken up within the UTR literature since these programs have an explicit mission to differentiate roles for veteran teachers (Urban Teacher Residency United, 2006). Access to schools is vital in supporting teacher education research and the implications of this access will be discussed in another article. Here, it serves as a limitation of this study.

The current study illuminates the practices, challenges, and successes of one UTR program reinforcing the notion that third-space teacher preparation is improvisational and utopian (Klein et al., 2013). The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (2013) has mandated that teacher education programs track their own impact regarding P-12 student learning, completer (i.e., graduate) effectiveness, employer satisfaction, and completer satisfaction. The findings of the current study show how such data collection can contribute to ongoing improvement and revitalization of a teacher education program, thus testifying to the importance of regular data collection and evidence-based decision making in teacher education. Specifically, the LTR had systems in place for collecting data from stakeholders such as residents and coaches that informed how they structured their program and provided scaffolding for these individuals. Moreover, this study illuminates the importance of adopting a posture of growth and development in a teacher education program to enable the collection of feedback and to build buy in and support from program members.

Another finding from this study was how the specialized elements of the LTR—such as the Community Project—were piloted and refined throughout the course of the program in an effort to make a contextualized curriculum for the residents. Although the elements of successful field work have been uncovered elsewhere (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Koerner, Rust, & Baumgartner, 2002), UTR programs warrant special considerations since program graduates are specialized to serve specific, urban populations and this specialized teacher preparation is slowly being uncovered and defined (Bogges, 2010; Matsko & Hammerness, 2013). The current study conveys how another UTR program struggled and succeeded in carving out its own specialized preparation for an urban context. It also supports the findings of these researchers by showing the need for unique program elements to encourage resident assimilation into a city and school district. In the case of the LTR, Lewistown had a specific history of massive and passive resistance to desegregation that warranted special consideration. However, more generally, a specific curriculum for UTR programs may be necessary to foster resident growth and perseverance in urban classrooms and should continue to be investigated and considered.

The current study conveyed that the challenge of coherence in teacher education is still prescient after more than two decades of research on this topic (Ham-

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

merness, 2006). Indeed, the third-space structure of the LTR seems to introduce new problems for coherence in teacher education because of the number of stakeholders involved in these programs who come from a variety of epistemological backgrounds. Other researchers conducting investigations on coherence in teacher education have found that coherence can be confronted, but not resolved, through program evaluations and corresponding action to address identified weaknesses (Hammerness, 2006). Initial actions include identifying a vision of good teaching and designing coursework and key assignments around this vision (Hammerness, 2006; Matsko & Hammerness, 2013).

The LTR lacked a vision of quality teaching, and what qualified a candidate to teach in LPS. Although Boggess (2010) found that the BTR and the AUSL in Chicago had specific visions of candidate quality based on disposition this was not the case in the LTR. The research on teacher candidates suggests that it is important for program stakeholders to define the outcomes that they would like to see in program completers. For example, it has been found that those candidates who profess a commitment to urban teaching tend to stay in these schools longer than those who do not (Taylor & Frankenburg, 2009). Retention in urban schools has also been tied to demographic information; specifically, Ronfeldt, Reininger, and Kwok (2013) found that Hispanic and Latino teachers professed a greater commitment to working with underserved student populations, and that African American candidates planned to spend fewer years in teaching than their White counterparts. Regarding student learning, Rockoff, Jacob, Kane, and Staiger (2011), in their study of New York City math teachers, found that students learned math best from a teacher who majored in that subject area. Thus, both academic and non-academic abilities may be significant in vetting for quality candidates for UTR programs and “quality” should be clearly defined in order to facilitate candidate selection and may include P-12 student learning as well as candidate retention.

Issues of power, equity, and community in UTR programs should continue to be investigated in order to improve these relationships for all stakeholders—including fostering P-12 student learning. Specifically, of interest to the field may be avenues for facilitating collaboration between teacher educators who work within schools (i.e., veteran teachers) and those who work within university settings (i.e., professors). It is also important to facilitate this collaboration at both the inter-institution and intra-institution levels.

Finally, faculty and staff’s emphasis on their program as a teacher education program—not an alternate route—conveys an innovative structure for teacher preparation that emphasizes the importance of tenure-line faculty as teacher educators. University faculty viewed the program as a commitment to serving the students of LPS and the university structure in this program rewarded faculty for their roles in the LTR. In 1990, Goodlad found that university reward structures did not privilege teaching in colleges of education—a finding that Zeichner (2010) has recently echoed. It is time to restructure teacher education so that faculty in these

programs are rewarded not only for their research, but their work with preservice teachers as well.

The findings from this study on the LTR have implications for practice and research—specifically, the need for a portfolio of pathways into licensure (Berry et al., 2008) as well as a portfolio of research. This variety in licensure routes provides a degree of flexibility that may attract candidates. Regarding a portfolio of research on teacher education, the structure of teacher preparation at SU allowed for comparative studies to be conducted because the LTR operated alongside a traditional program which is an exemplary model for teacher education research. Although the purpose of this study was not to compare traditional teacher education to a UTR program, this site is ripe for research that can inform the field and I suggest that other programs consider operating innovative designs alongside traditional programs in order to facilitate these comparisons and generate knowledge about effective teacher preparation. For decades, teacher educators have failed to compile a body of knowledge that gives insight into the effects and effectiveness of practices. Residency models, operating in the third space, are rare opportunities to uncover the “black box” in teacher education. Yet the complexity of teacher education must be respected in this research and not reduced to simple, linear solutions (Cochran-Smith et al., 2014). Indeed, the findings reported here are a testament to the complexity of teacher education and the importance of continual evaluation and growth. Other researchers (e.g., Cochran-Smith et al., 2014) have put forward frameworks for privileging this complexity which should be applied to teacher education research in earnest. We need to strengthen teacher education by making it more rigorous and complex (Lampert et al., 2013), while simultaneously conveying the wealth of professional knowledge that is needed to be successful in the classroom. UTRs are a bridge in this goal, and we should continue to refine and hone these programs so that we can create a new teacher education profession that serves P-12 students, teacher candidates, community stakeholders, and teacher educators.

Notes

¹ All names of people and places are pseudonyms.

² In vivo codes were originally developed by Strauss (1987).

References

- Arnold, P. (2002). Cooperating teachers' professional growth through supervision of student teachers and participation in a collegial study group. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 123-132. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478296>
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: Student teacher perceptions. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 81-98. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23478294>

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

- Berry, B. (2001). No shortcuts to preparing good teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 58(8), 32-36. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may01/vol58/num08/No-Shortcuts-to-Preparing-Good-Teachers.aspx>
- Berry, B., Montgomery, D., Curtis, R., Hernandez, M., Wurtzel, J., & Snyder, J. (2008). *Creating and sustaining urban teacher residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare, and retain effective teachers in high-needs districts*. The Aspen Institute and The Center for Teaching Quality. Retrieved from <http://www.utruncated.org/about-us/research-and-publications>
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bogges, L. B. (2010). Tailoring new urban teachers for character and activism. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 65-95. doi: 10.3102/0002831209358116
- Cochran-Smith, M., Ell, F., Ludlow, L., Grudnoff, L., & Aitken, G. (2014). The challenge and promise of complexity theory for teacher education research. *Teachers College Record*, 116(5), 1-38. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP 2013 standards for the accreditation of educator preparation*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/standards/>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(3), 300-314. doi: 10.1177/0022487105285962
- Educational Testing Service. (201). *Home page*. Retrieved from <http://www.ets.org>
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hammerness, K. (2006). From coherence in theory to coherence in practice. *Teachers College Record*, 108(7), 1241-1265. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org>.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2003). *Is there really a teacher shortage?* Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Retrieved from <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Shortage-RI-09-2003.pdf>
- Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. (2013). Finding a third space in teacher education: Creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education*, 24(1), 27-57. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.711305>
- Koerner, M., O'Connell Rust, F., & Baumgartner, F. (2002). Exploring roles in student teaching placements. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(2), 35-58. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=EJ651378>
- Lampert, M., Franke, M. L., Kazemi, E., Ghouseini, H., Turrou, A. C., Beasley, H., Cunnard, A., & Crowe, K. (2013). Keeping it complex: Using rehearsals to support novice teacher learning of ambitious teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(3), 226-243. doi: 10.1177/0022487112473837
- Matsko, K. K., & Hammerness, K. (2013). Unpacking the "urban" in urban teacher preparation: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(2), 128-144. doi: 10.1177/0022487113511645
- Miller, P. M., & Hafner, M. M. (2008). Moving toward dialogical collaboration: A critical examination of a university-school-community partnership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 66-110. doi: 10.1177/0013161X07309469
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Blue Ribbon Panel. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/>
- National Education Association. (2014). *Teacher residencies: Redefining preparation through*

- partnerships*. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Teacher-Residencies-2014.pdf>
- Papay, J. P., West, M. R., Fullerton, J. B., & Kane, T. J. (2012). Does an urban teacher residency increase student achievement? Early evidence from Boston. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 34(4), 413-434. doi: 10.3102/0162373712454328
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearson Education. (2011). *Clinical assessment*. Retrieved from <http://psychcorp.pearson-assessments.com/haiweb/Cultures/en-US/site/Community/PostSecondary/Products/MAT/mathome.htm>
- Rockoff, J. E., Jacob, B. A., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2011). Can you recognize an effective teacher when you recruit one? *Education Finance and Policy*, 6(1), 43-74. doi: 10.1162/EDFP_a_00022
- Ronfeldt, M., Reiningger, M., & Kwok, A. (2013). Recruitment or preparation: Investigating the effects of teacher characteristics and student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(4), 319-337. doi: 10.1177/0022487113488143
- Rutherford, J. (1990). Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community culture, difference* (pp. 207-221). London, UK: Lawrence & Wishart Limited.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sandelowski, M. (2008). Member check. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2, pp. 501-502). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston Teacher Residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 478-488. doi: 10.1177/0022487109349915
- Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sykes, G., Bird, T., & Kennedy, M. (2010). Teacher education: Its problems and some prospects. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 464-476. doi: 10.1177/002487110375804
- Taylor, A., & Frankenberg, E. (2009). Exploring urban commitment of graduates from an urban-focused teacher education program. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 42(3), 327-346. doi: 10.1080/10665680903032344
- Thorpe, R. (2014). Residency: Can it transform teaching the way it did medicine? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 96(1), 36-40. doi: 10.1177/0031721714547860
- Urban Teacher Residency United. (2006). *Core principles and synthesis of conceptual grounding*. Retrieved from <http://www.utrunited.org/about-us/research-and-publications>
- Urban Teacher Residency United. (2012). *Overview of Urban Teacher Residency United*. Retrieved from <http://www.utrunited.org/about-us/research-and-publications>
- Van Roekel, D. (2011). *Leading the profession: NEA's three-point plan for reform*. Retrieved from http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CE4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nea.org%2Fassets%2Fdocs%2FNEA_3point_plan_for_reform.pdf&ei=gFfqT_z3HuLy2QX78MXUAQ&usq=AFQjCNG0ZzoN Pw2QhR77s1yCgNkinr4ObA&sig2=39haqXCM-w8JWq-iZ-zHg
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and Methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 89-99. doi: 10.1177/0022487109347671
- Zimpher, N. L., & Howey, K. R. (2005). The politics of partnerships for teacher education
-

The Complexities of a Third-Space Partnership

redesign and school renewal. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 266-271. doi: 10.1177/0022487105275922

Appendix A

Interview Guide

1. Tell me a little bit about your background and how you ended up at SU.
2. Why did you decide to teach in the LTR?
3. What do you see as the unique features of the LTR that separate it from traditional teacher preparation?
4. What is your role within the LTR?
5. How do you design your class and/or seminar/family study project for the residency?
6. How do the residents you work with compare to traditional preservice teachers at SU?
7. What are your thoughts on the candidate selection process?
8. How does the cohort aspect of the program contribute to the overall residency experience? Specifically, does the requirement to live in the loft apartments contribute to the camaraderie of the cohort?
9. Have you worked with and/or met any of the CRCs? What are your thoughts on these individuals?
10. What are your thoughts on the residency in general? The partnership with LPS?
11. What are your thoughts on the partner consortium of urban teacher residencies?
12. If applicable: How have you seen the residency change during the first three years?
13. Demographic information: Doctoral work, years teaching in other programs, age, etc.