2022

Leading Through Partnership: An Examination of Longitudinal Trends in a School-University Partnership

Kala Burrell-Craft
Old Dominion University, knburrel@odu.edu

Patrick Doyle
Norfolk Public Schools

Mary Gregory
Old Dominion University, mlgregor@odu.edu

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

Peter D. Wiens
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Original Publication Citation

Burrell-Craft, K., Doyle, P., Gregory, M., & Beck, J. S. (2022). Leading through partnership: An examination of longitudinal trends in a school-university partnership [accepted manuscript]. *School-University Partnerships*, 1-29.

Accepted for publication in School-University Partnerships June 2022

Authors: Kala Burrell-Craft (Old Dominion University), Patrick Doyle (Norfolk Public Schools), Mary Gregory (Old Dominion University), and Jori S. Beck (Old Dominion University)

Abstract

The purpose of this manuscript is to detail pre- and post- changes that occurred after a principal, Dr. D, was moved from one middle school to another. Dr. D brought an established partnership with him to his new school including a teacher residency program, UTeach replication program, and an on-site course. The results of ANOVAs are presented regarding the school climate according to student and teacher perspectives. Significant results were found on a number of variables including student belonging, bullying, and teacher autonomy. This manuscript addresses the National Association for Professional Development Schools *Essential #5: Research and Results.*

Keywords: school-university partnerships, leadership, longitudinal data

Leading Through Partnership: An Examination of Longitudinal Trends in a School-University Partnership

In June 2019, [1]Dr. D., principal at Oceanside Middle School, found out he was being moved to Central Middle School (CMS) on short notice—about one week. This happens so often in education, but this move proved to be serendipitous for not only CMS, but also the local university: Commonwealth University (CU). Since that time, existing school-university partnership programs have deepened and new partnership programs have been established. A move that so often introduces instability and upheaval instead brought new opportunities.

The purpose of the current study is to examine longitudinal data to evaluate the changes that have occurred on a variety of outcome variables related to school climate as the result of building-level leadership focused on partnership work. Specifically, the current case study includes three different partnership efforts: a teacher residency program, a UTeach replication program, and a site-based university course. This approach is in line with recommendations from the field for a "portfolio of pathways" (Berry et al., 2008, p. 6) to licensure that will better serve the diverse teacher candidates entering the field. This variety of pathways has become commonplace in many colleges of teacher education today. Moreover, we believe that teacher candidates' experiences are enriched through an approach to teacher education in which many different ways of knowing and expertise are valued (Zeichner, 2010). In the current manuscript, we begin by grounding our work in the research on clinically rich teacher preparation before elaborating on each partnership program. Finally, we share the results of statistical analyses that convey some of the benefits and outcomes of this portfolio of pathways grounded in school-university partnerships.

[1] All names of people and places are pseudonyms.

Clinically Rich Teacher Preparation

Strong relationships between PK-12 school and university faculty, including common knowledge and shared beliefs, have been identified as an important feature of teacher education programs that make a difference in teacher candidate learning (Darling-Hammond, 2014). Indeed, a series of reports over the last decade have all pointed to the need to more tightly connect PK-12 schools and universities, thus weaving together theory and practice (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Clinical Practice Commission, 2017; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Blue Ribbon Panel, 2010). The importance of these relationships and shared knowledge has been recognized in accreditation as well via the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Educator Preparation's (2020) Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice. However, the teaching field is large (approximately 3.2 million in 2010; Sykes et al., 2010), and includes many different grade levels, content areas, and specializations. Thus, it is difficult to drive systematic change in a field so large and diverse. That does not mean that teacher education has not seen innovation. While it would be impossible to detail every innovation in teacher preparation, for the purposes of the current study we will describe three important models of clinically rich teacher preparation: Professional Development Schools (PDSs), teacher residencies, and site-based courses.

Perhaps most familiar among school-university partnership models is the PDS. While the 9 Essentials (National Association for Professional Development Schools [NAPDS], 2021) that guide PDSs were recently revised, what has remained central to this model is close relationships between PK-12 schools, a focus on reciprocal learning, and joint inquiry. This model is flexible, and program faculty have adapted PDSs to meet programmatic and teacher candidate needs. For example, faculty at George Mason University have used their PDS network to provide year-long

placements for teacher candidates (Castle et al., 2006) which is a central element of teacher residencies.

Like PDSs, teacher residencies were created based on the belief that teacher candidates need both theory and practice (Urban Teacher Residency United Network[2], 2006). These programs originated in Boston, Massachusetts and Chicago, Illinois as a means to home grow teachers for the city's public schools (Boggess, 2008; Guha et al., 2016). These programs follow the concept of a medical residency in that teacher candidates spend up to a year in the classroom working alongside a mentor teacher. Unlike other alternative certification programs where seeking full certification is optional, teacher candidates in residency programs are required to complete a post-baccalaureate degree at the partnering university. After completing the residency programs, teacher candidates make a commitment to teach in the partnering school districts for a certain number of years, typically three to five. While the yearlong internship embedded in these programs made them an innovation, teacher residencies do not always work in tandem with PK-12 schools. In fact, the Boston Teacher Residency was established to compete with university-based teacher preparation programs (Solomon, 2009). Teacher residencies have shown promise in retaining residents in urban schools and for recruiting more teacher candidates of color than traditional, university-based programs (Papay et al., 2012).

Site-based courses are also used to connect theory to practice for teacher candidates (Parker et al., 2019). As Parker and colleagues noted, site-based courses sit on a continuum from superficial implementation to a more robust implementation. The former might simply involve a physical move of the course to a school site, while a more meaningful implementation could include a clinical partnership site (such as a PDS), school- and university-based teacher

[2] The Urban Teacher Residency United Network changed its name to the National Center for Teacher Residencies in September 2015.

educators co-teaching the course, and meaningful field experiences at a school site. These courses are not necessarily required clinical experiences such as observations, practica, and student teaching internships. For example, in the current study, the site-based course was a classroom management course that did not have any required field experience hours. Next, we elaborate on the methods of the study.

Methods

Research Context: Partnership Approaches

Teacher Residency

The Teacher Residency program at CU prepares skilled teachers in critical shortage areas for high-need schools by placing participants in a year-long residency alongside a qualified mentor teacher, called a Clinical Residency Coach (CRC). Using a culturally relevant pedagogical approach (Ladson-Billings, 1994), the program's goal is to increase the racial diversity of the teacher workforce by recruiting and preparing teacher candidates of color. The Teacher Residency program combines a year-long residency with intensive graduate-level coursework that blends theory and practice through mentoring and full immersion in the culture and context of schools. As noted in the report from the Task Force on Diversifying Virginia's Educator Pipeline (August, 2017), 49% of PreK-12 students identify as students of color, while only 21% of Virginia teachers identify as people of color. Since the first Teacher Residency cohort in 2015-16, the cohorts have become progressively more racially diverse. The racial diversity of the cohorts has grown from 31% students of color in Cohort 1 to over 60% in the last three cohorts. Teacher residencies are more likely to be racially diverse than traditional teacher preparation programs because such programs remove the financial barriers to entry that disproportionately affect individuals of color.

UTeach Replication Program

UTeach began at The University of Texas at Austin in 1997 as an innovative way to recruit undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) majors and prepare them to become teachers. CU has its own UTeach replication program (citation withheld for blind review). UTeach programs have a high success rate in doubling mathematics and science majors who become certified to teach, a current challenge across the Commonwealth of Virginia. The replication program better prepares mathematics and science preservice teachers to enter today's classrooms. This end is achieved through a specified set of pedagogy and content courses designed specifically for mathematics and science teacher candidates. Teacher candidates still obtain the major degree in their content area, but also have a distinctive cluster of professional education courses focusing on issues unique to teaching mathematics and science content. In addition, CU students are afforded placement into schools throughout their educational experience—thus providing richer clinical experiences than students in other programs who only complete 30 hours of observation, 35 hours of practicum, and a semester-long student teaching experience. This program is strongly supported by university administration, the College of Education, the College of Sciences, and PreK-12 school divisions in the surrounding area.

On-Site Courses

Within our school-university partnership, professors have been teaching their courses on site at public schools for the last five years. On-site courses were held at CMS in fall 2019 for the first time and again in fall 2021. These courses were paused during the COVID-19 pandemic and the move to virtual learning at both CMS and CU. The classroom management course was chosen specifically to be taught on site to add field experience to a course that was not attached to a field experience. However, the content of the classroom management course is enriched by

the field experience. For example, teacher candidates have the opportunity to observe teachers building relationships with students after reading about the importance of this in class texts (e.g., Milner et al., 2019). As part of the course, students have had guest speakers including the principal, school resource officer, and counseling faculty from CU. They also take frequent field trips within the school to explore the school site, observe students in the hallways, shadow students as part of coursework, and participate in professional development offerings at CMS. In sum, CMS—including the building and the people—form the curriculum for the course.

Participants

All students enrolled at CMS and all teachers employed at CMS in the 2018-2019 and the 2020-2021 academic years were invited to participate in the survey described below. In all, 1,376 students and 139 teachers participated over two years (see Table 1).

Table 1

Student and Teacher Participant Demographics

	Students in School Year 2018-2019	Students in School Year 2020-2021	Teachers in School Year 2018-2019	Teachers in School Year 2020-2021
Number	636	740	51	88
Gender				
Female	49%	46.2%	84%	77.3%
Male	51%	48.2%	16%	22.7%
Prefer to Self Describe	Not available	5.6%	Not available	0%
Race				
American Indian or Alaska Native	8%	4.9%	0%	1.1%
Asian	5%	6.1%	0%	5.7%
Black or African American	56%	59.5%	31%	34.5%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3%	1.2%	0%	0%

White	32%	28.4%	63%	57.5%
Other	18%	14.3%	6%	2.3%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	15%	12.4%	4%	2.3%
Not Hispanic or Latino	85%	87.6%	96%	97.7%
Free and Reduced Lunch				
Yes	53%	Not available	Not applicable	Not applicable
No	47%	Not available	Not applicable	Not applicable

Data Collection

Data were collected via the Virginia School Survey of Climate and Working Conditions (Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 2022) which was administered in the 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 academic years. There were two versions of this instrument: one for students and one for teachers. There was also a staff version which was not used for the current study. Each instrument was approximately 100 items in length; however, only those items that remained the same across the two administrations were used for this survey. Each question was answered on a four-point Likert scale. Relevant items are included in Tables 2-19 below.

Data Analysis

Data were provided in the aggregate with percentages of how many participants answered a given question on each anchor of the Likert scale. This information was used to create a dataset, after which we calculated analysis of variance (ANOVA; Hinkle et al., 2001) comparing the mean scores between the two groups using cohort (e.g., students 2018-2019, students 2020-2021, etc.) as the grouping variable. Comparisons were calculated for each variable for both students and teachers using SPSS version 28.

Results

Below we provide the results of the data analysis. We grouped similar items into themes. First, we present the results of our analysis of the student surveys.

Student Results

As indicated in Table 2 below, the results of the analysis were statistically significant at the .001 level for four items related to how students felt about the school including their sense of belonging. Table 3 shows the differences in the mean scores of the student groups. In each of the four significantly different questions, the 2020-2021 group had more favorable feelings about their school.

Table 2

Students' Sense of Belonging

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. I like this school.	Between Groups	56.290	1	56.290	94.618	<.001
	Within Groups	817.419	1374	.595		
	Total	873.709	1375			
2. I am proud to be a student at this school.	Between Groups	29.824	1	29.824	54.772	<.001
	Within Groups	748.176	1374	.545		
	Total	778.000	1375			
3. I feel like I belong at this school.	Between Groups	16.169	1	16.169	26.474	<.001
	Within Groups	839.177	1374	.611		
	Total	855.346	1375			
4. I want to learn as much as I can at school.	Between Groups	.217	1	.217	.486	.486
	Within Groups	612.966	1374	.446		
	Total	613.183	1375			
	Between Groups	6.376	1	6.376	12.558	<.001

5. I get along well with other students at this school.	Within Groups	697.578	1374	.508		
	Total	703.953	1375			
6. I care about other students at this school.	Between Groups	.309	1	.309	.480	.488
	Within Groups	883.086	1374	.643		
	Total	883.395	1375			
7. Other students at this school care about me.	Between Groups	.609	1	.609	.935	.334
	Within Groups	895.341	1374	.652		
	Total	895.951	1375			

Table 3

Group Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
1. I like this school.	2018-2019	2.7673	.85992
	2020-2021	3.1730	.68609
	Total	2.9855	.79714
2. I am proud to be a student at this school.	2018-2019	2.8412	.80838
	2020-2021	3.1365	.67149
	Total	3.0000	.75221
3. I feel like I belong at this school.	2018-2019	2.7799	.83164
	2020-2021	2.9973	.73571
	Total	2.8968	.78871

4. I want to learn as much as I can at school.	2018-2019	3.3978	.68085
	2020-2021	3.4230	.65661
	Total	3.4113	.66780
5. I get along well with other students at this school.	2018-2019	2.9324	.76549
	2020-2021	3.0689	.66366
	Total	3.0058	.71552
6. I care about other students at this school.	2018-2019	2.9497	.84218
	2020-2021	2.9797	.76519
	Total	2.9658	.80154
7. Other students at this school care about me.	2018-2019	2.6997	.86547
	2020-2021	2.7419	.75361
	Total	2.7224	.80722

The next group of themed items related to students' self control. Two items were statistically significant at the .001 level (see Table 4). Both items were focused on disagreements between students. Students in the 2020-2021 cohort had more positive views on their ability to manage conflict as shown in Table 5.

Table 4

Students' Self Control

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	1.456	1	1.456	1.846	.174
	Within Groups	1083.370	1374	.788		

8. I stop and think before doing anything when I get angry.	Total	1084.826	1375			
9. I work out disagreements with other students by talking with them.	Between Groups	9.059	1	9.059	13.053	<.001
	Within Groups	953.534	1374	.694		
	Total	962.593	1375			
10. I can disagree with others without starting an argument or a fight.	Between Groups	17.995	1	17.995	27.784	<.001
	Within Groups	889.900	1374	.648		
	Total	907.895	1375			
11. I know how to decide right from wrong.	Between Groups	.069	1	.069	.168	.682
	Within Groups	568.296	1374	.414		
	Total	568.366	1375			
12. I can control myself when I am upset.	Between Groups	2.509	1	2.509	3.340	.068
	Within Groups	1032.171	1374	.751		
	Total	1034.680	1375			

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
8. I stop and think before doing anything when I get angry.	2018-2019	2.8050	.92372
	2020-2021	2.8703	.85604
	Total	2.8401	.88824
9. I work out disagreements with other students by talking with them.	2018-2019	2.6305	.85681
	2020-2021	2.7932	.81209

	Total	2.7180	.83670
10. I can disagree with others without starting an argument or a fight.	2018-2019	2.8679	.88104
	2020-2021	3.0973	.73294
	Total	2.9913	.81258
11. I know how to decide right from wrong.	2018-2019	3.3506	.67673
	2020-2021	3.3649	.61277
	Total	3.3583	.64293
12. I can control myself when I am upset.	2018-2019	2.9387	.91583
	2020-2021	3.0243	.82219
	Total	2.9847	.86746

The next group of items were related to students' behavior. Two out of three items related to behavior were statistically significant at the .001 level. Students in the 2020-2021 cohort were more likely to feel that discipline is fair as shown in Table 7.

Table 6

Students' Behavior

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
13. I know the consequences if I break a school rule.	Between Groups	.200	1	.200	.406	.524
	Within Groups	676.770	1374	.493		
	Total	676.970	1375			
14. The consequences for breaking school	Between Groups	40.854	1	40.854	48.541	<.001
	Within Groups	1156.402	1374	.842		

rules are the same for all students.	Total	1197.256	1375			
15. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they get a chance to explain	Between Groups	35.291	1	35.291	49.125	<.001
	Within Groups	987.055	1374	.718		
	Total	1022.346	1375			

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
13. I know the consequences if I break a school rule.	2018-2019	3.2799	.76146
	2020-2021	3.3041	.64620
	Total	3.2929	.70167
14. The consequences for breaking school rules are the same for all students.	2018-2019	2.7909	1.03268
	2020-2021	3.1365	.80527
	Total	2.9767	.93313
15. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they get a chance to explain	2018-2019	2.5991	.94307
	2020-2021	2.9203	.75594
	Total	2.7718	.86228

The fourth and final set of themed items related to bullying. All five of these items were significant at the .001 level. As Table 9 illustrates, across all five items, students in the 2020-2021 cohort reported fewer issues with bullying.

Table 8

Bullying

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
16. Bullying is a problem at this school.	Between Groups	45.517	1	45.517	52.315	<.001
	Within Groups	1195.457	1374	.870		
	Total	1240.974	1375			
17. Students at this school are bulled about their race or ethnicity	Between Groups	32.109	1	32.109	35.667	<.001
	Within Groups	1236.912	1374	.900		
	Total	1269.020	1375			
18. Students at this school are bullied about their clothing or physical appearance.	Between Groups	50.696	1	50.696	56.812	<.001
	Within Groups	1226.069	1374	.892		
	Total	1276.765	1375			
19. Students at this school are bullied about their sexual orientation.	Between Groups	47.227	1	47.227	51.750	<.001
	Within Groups	1253.912	1374	.913		
	Total	1301.139	1375			
20. Students at this school are bullied about their disability.	Between Groups	26.796	1	26.796	27.234	<.001
	Within Groups	1351.918	1374	.984		
	Total	1378.714	1375			

Table 9

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
16. Bullying is a problem at this school.	2018-2019	2.9418	.94648
	2020-2021	2.5770	.92082
	Total	2.7456	.95001

17. Students at this school are bulled about their race or ethnicity	2018-2019	2.4686	1.01514
	2020-2021	2.1622	.88785
	Total	2.3038	.96069
18. Students at this school are bullied about their clothing or physical appearance.	2018-2019	2.9701	.92254
	2020-2021	2.5851	.96322
	Total	2.7631	.96362
19. Students at this school are bullied about their sexual orientation.	2018-2019	2.5959	1.01574
	2020-2021	2.2243	.90013
	Total	2.3961	.97277
20. Students at this school are bullied about their disability.	2018-2019	2.5204	1.05348
	2020-2021	2.2405	.93582
	Total	2.3699	1.00135

Teacher Results

The first group of themed items from the teacher survey were related to autonomy. All four of these items were statistically significant at the .001 level. As shown in Table 11, teachers in the 2020-2021 cohort reported substantially more autonomy than the 2018-2019 cohort. These differences on a four-point scale ranged from .783 to 1.204.

Table 10

Teachers' Sense of Autonomy

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. I am free to be creative in my teaching approach	Between Groups	19.772	1	19.772	22.166	<.001
	Within Groups	122.200	137	.892		
	Total	141.971	138			
	Between Groups	38.127	1	38.127	29.100	<.001

2. I control how I use my scheduled class time.	Within Groups	179.498	137	1.310		
	Total	217.626	138			
3. I set the grading and student assessment practices in my classroom.	Between Groups	32.072	1	32.072	24.801	<.001
	Within Groups	177.165	137	1.293		
	Total	209.237	138			
4. My role as an educator is respected under current policies.	Between Groups	46.830	1	46.830	36.121	<.001
	Within Groups	177.616	137	1.296		
	Total	224.446	138			

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
1. I am free to be creative in my teaching approach	2018-2019	4.4902	.98737
	2020-2021	5.2727	.91886
	Total	4.9856	1.01429
2. I control how I use my scheduled class time.	2018-2019	3.9020	1.28460
	2020-2021	4.9886	1.05585
	Total	4.5899	1.25579
3. I set the grading and student assessment practices in my classroom.	2018-2019	3.7647	1.36511
	2020-2021	4.7614	.98254
	Total	4.3957	1.23135

4. My role as an educator is respected under current policies.	2018-2019	3.7843	1.28552
	2020-2021	4.9886	1.04490
	Total	4.5468	1.27531

The next group of items related to teachers' perceptions of administration. All nine items were statistically significant at the .001 level. Teachers in the 2020-2021 cohort reported most positive feelings about their principals by differences as high as 1.544, as shown in Table 13.

Table 12

Teachers' Perceptions of Administration

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
5. I feel respected by this school's administrators.	Between Groups	25.099	1	25.099	21.932	<.001
	Within Groups	156.785	137	1.144		
	Total	181.885	138			
6. I feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are important to me with school administrators.	Between Groups	76.984	1	76.984	50.442	<.001
	Within Groups	209.088	137	1.526		
	Total	286.072	138			
7. I trust this school's administrators to do what they say they will do.	Between Groups	51.553	1	51.553	47.660	<.001
	Within Groups	148.188	137	1.082		
	Total	199.741	138			
8. This school's administrators communicate a clear vision for this school.	Between Groups	35.109	1	35.109	35.323	<.001
	Within Groups	136.171	137	.994		
	Total	171.281	138			
	Between Groups	52.484	1	52.484	67.619	<.001

9. This school's administrators understand how children learn.	Within Groups	106.336	137	.776		
	Total	158.820	138			
10. This school's administrators set high expectations for all students.	Between Groups	15.634	1	15.634	20.947	<.001
	Within Groups	102.251	137	.746		
	Total	117.885	138			
11. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.	Between Groups	25.686	1	25.686	27.917	<.001
	Within Groups	126.055	137	.920		
	Total	151.741	138			
12. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve their performance.	Between Groups	22.076	1	22.076	19.853	<.001
	Within Groups	152.342	137	1.112		
	Total	174.417	138			
13. The procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent.	Between Groups	17.594	1	17.594	22.480	<.001
	Within Groups	107.226	137	.783		
	Total	124.820	138			

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
5. I feel respected by this school's administrators.	2018-2019	4.4706	1.28613
	2020-2021	5.3523	.92276
	Total	5.0288	1.14804
6. I feel comfortable raising issues and concerns that are	2018-2019	3.7059	1.52701

important to me with school administrators.	2020-2021	5.2500	1.03112
	Total	4.6835	1.43979
7. I trust this school's administrators to do what they say they will do.	2018-2019	4.1569	1.30188
	2020-2021	5.4205	.85395
	Total	4.9568	1.20308
8. This school's administrators communicate a clear vision for this school.	2018-2019	4.4118	1.18620
	2020-2021	5.4545	.86979
	Total	5.0719	1.11408
9. This school's administrators understand how children learn.	2018-2019	4.1569	1.18950
	2020-2021	5.4318	.63960
	Total	4.9640	1.07279
10. This school's administrators set high expectations for all students.	2018-2019	4.5882	.85268
	2020-2021	5.2841	.87031
	Total	5.0288	.92425
11. Teacher performance is assessed objectively.	2018-2019	4.3922	1.09688
	2020-2021	5.2841	.87031
	Total	4.9568	1.04861
	2018-2019	4.4118	1.21945

12. Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve their performance.	2020-2021	5.2386	.94680
	Total	4.9353	1.12423
13. The procedures for teacher evaluation are consistent.	2018-2019	4.5686	1.13587
	2020-2021	5.3068	.70070
	Total	5.0360	.95105

The next set of items were related to student discipline. Two out of the three items were significant at the .001 level as illustrated in Table 14. As shown in Table 15, teachers in the 2020-2021 cohort had more favorable opinions of student discipline.

Table 14

Teachers' Perceptions of Student Discipline

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
14. Students know there are consequences for breaking school rules.	Between Groups	28.089	1	28.089	20.215	<.001
	Within Groups	190.357	137	1.389		
	Total	218.446	138			
15. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they get a chance to explain.	Between Groups	5.983	1	5.983	9.215	.003
	Within Groups	88.952	137	.649		
	Total	94.935	138			
16. We use data to evaluate and, if needed, adjust this school's student conduct policies.	Between Groups	29.351	1	29.351	30.163	<.001
	Within Groups	133.311	137	.973		
	Total	162.662	138			

Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
14. Students know there are consequences for breaking school rules.	2018-2019	3.8627	1.40028
	2020-2021	4.7955	1.03011
	Total	4.4532	1.25815
15. When students are accused of doing something wrong, they get a chance to explain.	2018-2019	4.7059	1.00587
	2020-2021	5.1364	.66405
	Total	4.9784	.82942
16. We use data to evaluate and, if needed, adjust this school's student conduct policies.	2018-2019	3.9216	1.09258
	2020-2021	4.8750	.91993
	Total	4.5252	1.08568

The next set of themed items were related to safety and community. As shown in Table 16, all three items analyzed were significant at the .001 level. The 2020-2021 teachers reported higher feelings of safety and community. For community, the 2020-2021 cohort's response was 1.143 higher (Question 17). For safety, the 2020-2021 cohort was substantially higher by 1.573 (Question 18) and 2.504 (Question 19) as shown in Table 17.

Table 16

Safety And Community

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	42.169	1	42.169	45.574	<.001

17. This school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement.	Within Groups	126.766	137	.925		
	Total	168.935	138			
18. I feel safe at this school.	Between Groups	79.876	1	79.876	104.433	<.001
	Within Groups	104.785	137	.765		
	Total	184.662	138			
19. I feel there is adequate security in this school.	Between Groups	202.483	1	202.483	131.104	<.001
	Within Groups	211.589	137	1.544		
	Total	414.072	138			

Table 17

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
17. This school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement.	2018-2019	4.2549	1.18056
	2020-2021	5.3977	.80999
	Total	4.9784	1.10642
18. I feel safe at this school.	2018-2019	3.5294	1.10187
	2020-2021	5.1023	.71180
	Total	4.5252	1.15678
19. I feel there is adequate security in this school.	2018-2019	2.0980	1.33049
	2020-2021	4.6023	1.18941
	Total	3.6835	1.73220

The final set of themed items were related to bullying at CMS. Three out of five items were statistically significant at the .001 level as shown in Table 18. Table 19 shows that teachers in the 2020-2021 cohort had fewer concerns about bullying.

Table 18

Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
20. Bullying is a problem at this school.	Between Groups	55.479	1	55.479	41.082	<.001
	Within Groups	185.010	137	1.350		
	Total	240.489	138			
21. Students at this school are bullied about their race or ethnicity.	Between Groups	9.528	1	9.528	6.606	.011
	Within Groups	197.609	137	1.442		
	Total	207.137	138			
22. Students are bullied about their clothing or physical appearance.	Between Groups	33.699	1	33.699	21.942	<.001
	Within Groups	210.402	137	1.536		
	Total	244.101	138			
23. Students are bullied about their sexual orientation.	Between Groups	29.695	1	29.695	19.150	<.001
	Within Groups	212.435	137	1.551		
	Total	242.129	138			
24. Students are bullied about their disability.	Between Groups	8.101	1	8.101	5.128	.025
	Within Groups	216.403	137	1.580		
	Total	224.504	138			

Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations

		Mean	SD
20. Bullying is a problem at this school.	2018-2019	4.1176	1.08898
	2020-2021	2.8068	1.20209
	Total	3.2878	1.32010
21. Students at this school are bullied about their race or ethnicity.	2018-2019	3.1569	1.28643
	2020-2021	2.6136	1.14903
	Total	2.8129	1.22515
22. Students are bullied about their clothing or physical appearance.	2018-2019	4.0784	1.21397
	2020-2021	3.0568	1.25357
	Total	3.4317	1.32998
23. Students are bullied about their sexual orientation.	2018-2019	3.6863	1.36367
	2020-2021	2.7273	1.17177
	Total	3.0791	1.32460
24. Students are bullied about their disability.	2018-2019	3.1373	1.40028
	2020-2021	2.6364	1.16641
	Total	2.8201	1.27548

Discussion

Data reported in this study showed differences in student and teacher feelings about school climate from before a school-university partnership was implemented and then again

under new administration with three partnership programs. The patterns in the data clearly indicate more positive attitudes by students following these changes. This pattern is even more stark with the teacher participants who reported substantially more positive views on school climate following these changes at the school. Purposeful and reciprocal partnerships, like in this study, are effective and the model we strive to replicate in future partnerships. Through community-based clinical preparation that is tailored to partner school districts' context, this model is a proven strategy to increase teacher diversity, effectiveness, and retention. The leadership support and collaboration provided by CMS principal Dr. D afforded him a unique opportunity to shift the culture and climate of his school by disrupting the historical educational inequities that plague most schools and leadership teams.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Clinical Practice Commission. (2017). *A pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and renewing the profession of teaching.* https://aacte.org/cpc

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. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED512419

Boggess, L. B. (2008). *Home growing teacher quality: District partnerships with urban teacher residencies* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.mutex.gmu.edu/pqdtft/docview/304507969/13CB9F6531214D18E2/1?accountid=14541

Castle, S., Fox, R. K., & Souder, K. O. (2006). Do Professional Development Schools (PDSs) make a difference? A comparative study of PDS and non-PDS teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(1), 65-80. doi:10.1177/0022487105284211

Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Educator Preparation (2020). *Standard 2: Clinical Practice and Partnerships.* https://caepnet.org/standards/2022-itp/standard-2

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The Holy Grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 547-561. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2014.939009

Guha, R., Hyler, M. E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *The teacher residency: An innovative model for preparing teachers.* Learning Policy Institute.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Milner, H. R., Cunningham, H. B., Delale-O'Connor, L., & Kestenberg, E. G. (2019). *These kids are out of control": Why we must reimagine "classroom management" for equity*. Corwin.

National Association for Professional Development Schools. (2021). *What it means to be a Professional Development School: The Nine Essentials* (2nd ed.). [Policy statement]. https://3atjfr1bmy981egf6x3utg20-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/What-it-Means-to-be-a-PDS-Second-Edition-2021-Final.pdf

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnership for Improved Student Learning (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers.* http://caepnet.org/~/media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/blue-ribbon-panel.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

Parker, A. K., Groth, L. A., & Byers, C. C. (2019). Designing and implementing site-based courses in elementary teacher preparation. *The New Educator, 15*(2), 130-155. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2019.1572255

Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston Teacher Residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 478-488. doi:10.1177/0022487109349915

Taskforce on Diversifying Virginia's Educator Pipeline. (2017). *Report from the Task Force on Diversifying Virginia's Educator Pipeline*. https://bloximages.newyork1.vip.townnews.com/richmond.com/content/tncms/assets/v3/editorial/e/f8/ef8ee954-b045-5e58-909c-9aeb4d2ecf15/5baec32029b6a.pdf.pdf

Sykes, G., Bird, T., & Kennedy, M. (2010). Teacher education: Its problems and some prospects. *Journal of teacher Education, 61*(5), 464-476. doi:10.1177/0022487110375804

Urban Teacher Residency United. (2006). *Core principles and synthesis of conceptual grounding.* http://www.utrunited.org/about-us/research-and-publications

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. (2022). *Virginia School Survey of Climate and Working Conditions.* https://www.dcjs.virginia.gov/virginia-center-school-and-campus-safety/school-safety-survey/secondary-school-climate-survey

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