

Submitted to Metropolitan State College of Denver

**PROMISING PRACTICES IN UNIVERSITY-
SCHOOL DISTRICT URBAN TEACHER
PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

November 2008

R. Carrie Harris

Charles C. Igel

Trudy L. Clemons

About McREL

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) is a nonprofit education and research organization based in Denver, Colorado. For more than 40 years, McREL has been helping educators use research to improve student achievement. As a national leader in research, school improvement, standards-based education, balanced leadership, professional development, and scenario planning, our highly respected experts provide services to educators in 50 states and 18 foreign countries. McREL's client list includes federal, regional, and state agencies; school districts; institutions of higher education; foundations; private organizations; and international entities.

McREL operates the Central Region Educational Laboratory, providing field-based research, evaluation and policy studies, and information services to state and local education agencies in Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. McREL also houses the North Central Comprehensive Center, a U.S. Department of Education-funded program that provides research-based services to state education agencies in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota to implement the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

Our Web site (www.mcrel.org) offers hundreds of reports, tools, guides, and services designed to improve school and student performance. If you have a question about McREL, contact us at 303.337.0990 or info@mcrel.org.



Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL)
4601 DTC Blvd., Suite 500
Denver, CO 80237-2596
Phone: 303.337.0990
Fax: 303.337.3005
www.mcrel.org

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	2
Addressing the need.....	2
Defining the urban district.....	2
What makes a successful urban teacher?	3
Multicultural education and program structure.....	4
Practicum/Field experience.....	5
Role of the teacher educator	8
Social justice	9
Comparable urban-teacher partnerships	9
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	11
REFERENCES	12

List of Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of large districts with urban teacher preparation programs.....	3
Table 2: Approaches to multicultural education.....	5
Table 3: Characteristics of the teacher preparation program in Graham (2006).....	7
Table 4: University/school urban teacher preparation partnerships.....	10

Introduction

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) was commissioned by Metropolitan State College of Denver (MSCD) to prepare the following benchmarking study, *Promising Practices in University-School District Urban Teacher Preparation Programs*. This work is designed to support the efforts of MSCD and Denver Public Schools (DPS) in the redesign, alignment, and evaluation of their collaborative work on a federally-funded Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant.

The purpose of this benchmarking study is 1) to review research on programs that are effective in preparing teachers for the urban classroom setting, 2) identify common best practices across the set of programs, and 3) describe these practices so MSCD and other teacher preparation institutions may take advantage of this knowledge. This study focuses on the components of effective university-school district partnerships in preparing urban educators. Specific components include multicultural curriculum, field placement practicum, and characteristics of cooperating teachers. At the conclusion of this study are recommendations that can be used to refine the MSCD/DPS Urban Teacher Preparation program and ultimately result in the capacity to create replicable programs.

Review of the Literature

This study focuses on benchmarking best practices in teacher preparation programs in university-school district partnerships as measured by teacher attitudes toward urban education, numbers of teachers entering urban education, and numbers of teachers entering urban school settings. Benchmarking is the process of finding, describing, and sharing best practices (American Productivity and Quality Center, 2005) so that they can be implemented by others. The strategy used in this study for benchmarking is to locate articles and documents relevant to defining effective urban teacher preparation programs and synthesize the findings into a set of promising practices.

Key search terms included “urban” combined with “teacher preparation”, and “secondary education” among others. Sources included but were not limited to: Education Policy Analysis Archives, MDRC, ERIC, Teacher Quality Research (TQR) Center, and the U.S. Department of Education. Screening criteria for the review included rigor of the design, relevance of the questions answered, and results of the study. Relevant and rigorous studies were coded to capture key variables and outcomes.

Addressing the need

The student population in public schools is becoming more diverse with estimates that White/Non-Hispanic children will, by 2020, comprise 46 percent of the student population (Banks, 2001). The teaching population, however, consists of mostly White/Non-Hispanic (86%) teachers (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). The difference between students and teachers is not just reflected in numbers, but in their biographies, which may influence student-teacher interactions. For example, Villegas and Lucas (2002) have found teachers tend not to have the same cultural frames of reference as their students, which may impede their function as role models, cultural brokers, or cultural agents to help bridge home-school differences. Additionally, teachers with different “biographies” may have difficulty developing culturally responsive curriculum and have decreased expectations of their minority students (Gay & Howard, 2000). Given this “demographic imperative” (Banks, 1995; Dillworth, 1992) there is a great need to better prepare teachers to effectively work in diverse classroom settings.

Defining the urban district

The urban district is traditionally defined through quantitative indicators such as the size of the population. Urbanized areas are defined as any centralized population hub containing more than 50,000 residents with a density of 2,500 persons per square mile. Denver, for example, has a population estimate of 567,000 with 3,620 persons per square mile.¹ To serve this number of individuals, urban districts inevitably need more schools and a larger bureaucratic structure to coordinate their efforts.

For school districts, the characteristics of the population may be more important than the size of the population. Urban school districts typically serve high minority/ low income populations. Table 1 reports figures from a cross-section and overall averages of demographic characteristics from a select set of districts from the one-hundred largest school districts in the nation. On average in these districts, 51percent of students are eligible for free/reduced lunch programs and 71percent are non-white minority (Garofano & Sable, 2008).

Denver Public Schools faces some extraordinary challenges when compared to other urban districts. Poverty indicators of DPS students—Title I eligibility and percentage qualifying for free/reduced lunch—are considerably higher than national averages. Furthermore, over one-third of DPS students are classified as English-language learners, twice the national average of urban districts (Garofano & Sable, 2008). The vast majority of DPS English-language learners are Hispanic children who constitute just over 56% of the student population (DPS Communications Office, 2008). As population characteristics

¹Figures based on U.S. Census Bureau 2006 population estimates.

evolve, so must our approach to preparing the teachers who serve those populations. Preparing a cadre of teachers to face these new challenges requires a reexamination of the content, scope and sequence of teacher preparation.

Table 1:
Characteristics of large districts with urban teacher preparation programs

	District Size		STUDENT POPULATION		COMMUNITY INCOME	
	# of schools	# students per school	% ELL students	% Minority	% Title I Eligible Schools	% Free/ Reduced Lunch Eligible
Denver	148	513	36	80	72	64
New York City	1,408	728	13	86	60	74
Los Angeles	768	1,033	40	91	81	77
Houston	307	729	28	92	89	80
District of Columbia	177	360	7	95	80	61
Milwaukee	235	412	7	84	95	72
Average of Largest 100	166	735	14*	71	60	51

Source: Institute for Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics (Garofano & Sable, 2008). All figures are for the 2005/06 academic year and are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Figure based on the 94 out of 100 largest districts for which data was available.*

What makes a successful urban teacher?

Student teacher training should include self-analysis, self-reflection, cultural understanding (Gibson, 2002) and immersion in diverse cultures (Follo, Hoerr, & Vorheis-Sargent, 2002) through internships, practicum, or other field experiences (Cannella & Reiff, 1994; Clark, Nystrom, & Perez, 1996; Englert, 1997; Payne, 1980; Russo & Talbert-Johnson, 1997; Weiner, 1993). Additional opportunities for community service (Havas & Lucas, 1994) and dialogue with peers and supervisors on multicultural experiences in urban settings are also important for facilitating the skills cited as characteristics of effective urban teachers (Ooka Pang, 1994).

The subsequent review is set within the specific context of university-school district partnerships focused on teacher preparation. A promising structure for supporting the preparation of teachers for work in diverse settings is the university-school district partnership model. Communication and collaboration between school practitioners and university educators has the potential to promote social justice in future educators through partnerships that occur in diverse settings. Student teachers prepared in partnership schools have greater retention of the practices from their university training than students who did not

teach in partnership schools (Narode, Rennie-Hill, & Peterson, 1994). Research findings confirm that beginning student teachers in traditional preparation programs can become engaged in field experiences that are in opposition to their training, and instead focus their teaching on the technical skills of survival, and become re-socialized into the existing, conservative culture of teaching (Narode et al., 1994).

The effectiveness of these school-university partnerships varies depending upon the structure of the programs. Factors that have been examined in relation to the effectiveness of the teacher preparation program include, course sequence, university faculty characteristics and engagement, location of field experience, duration of the field experience, and engagement of the cooperating teacher and school.

The following review examines components of university-school district teacher preparation programs that have been shown to be effective for preparing urban educators. First, definitions of multicultural education and course structure are presented. Next, components of the university-school partnership are reviewed, such as field placement, characteristics of cooperating teachers and university faculty, and other key components of effective urban teacher preparation programs. Finally, future directions in teacher preparation research are discussed as well as recommendations for urban teacher preparation programs.

Multicultural education and program structure

Teacher preparation programs that focus on preparing teachers for urban settings generally include “multicultural education” in their curriculum. The following three components of multicultural education training have been cited in the literature as most relevant to preparing effective urban teachers: 1) transferring cultural knowledge of different groups, 2) addressing beliefs and attitudes of pre-service teachers, and 3) providing training in culturally-relevant pedagogical skills (Gibson, 2002). Transferring cultural knowledge is important because lack of knowledge about different cultures leads to stereotyping (Clark et al., 1996). Addressing beliefs and attitudes of pre-service teachers is necessary because developing a deeper understanding of different cultures requires that student teachers learn how to reflect and analyze their own beliefs and attitudes about cultural differences (Clark et al., 1996; Gunzenhauser, Adams, & Paulding, 1996; Scott, 1995). Finally, it is important for student teachers to have instruction in pedagogy that investigates and draws from the social contexts of the lives of urban youth (Sheets, 1996). For example students are more engaged when a lesson relates to their cultural experiences as opposed to ignoring cultural differences, which can increase student resistance (Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995).

Teacher preparation programs that offer multicultural curriculum vary in the length and the extent to which multicultural training is infused throughout the program. Studies evaluating the effectiveness of multicultural education curricula alone have found mixed results on teacher outcomes. Case studies have yielded positive outcomes on teacher practices, while pre-post designs have shown multicultural education courses to make little impact on student teacher attitudes toward teaching in urban settings. Fry & McKinney (1997) suggest that multicultural courses can in fact perpetuate stereotypical thinking. Likewise, McDiarmid & Price (1993) examined the experience of 17 student teachers from 5 different universities and found when multicultural education was presented poorly the classes actually perpetuated stereotypical thinking and prejudice toward certain groups of people and failed to impact the attitudes and beliefs of student teachers toward diverse students. Though research has demonstrated infusing multicultural education throughout coursework is the most effective means for teacher preparation, one review found that many teacher preparation programs isolate multicultural education curriculum to foundations courses or electives (Hood & Parker, 1994).

Multicultural education has been defined inconsistently across programs. Early definitions of multicultural education treated it as a specialty or focus of a single part of education, as opposed to a more integrative form of education that is multicultural (Grant, 1977). Table 2 displays the different approaches to multicultural education that have been used by teacher preparation programs (Grant & Sleeter, 1993).

Table 2:
Approaches to multicultural education (Grant & Sleeter, 1993)

Form	Definition
Teaching the exceptional and culturally different	Prepares student teachers to fit K–12 students into the existing social structure. Stress is on techniques for building a bridge between K–12 students and the schools they attend, and helping the students adapt to the norms of the dominant culture. Problem of cultural discontinuity remains that of the students.
Human relations	Prepares student teachers to honor diverse student backgrounds and to promote harmony among students; real conflict among groups is often “glossed over” and a critical examination of race, class, and gender oppression does not take place.
Single group studies	Seeks to raise consciousness concerning an identified group (e.g., Native Americans) by teaching K–12 students about the culture and contribution of that group, as well as about how it has been oppressed by and/or has worked with the dominant groups in our society.
Multicultural education	Teaches student teachers how gender-biased socialization, race, and social class oppression are transmitted through their own teaching practices; instructs teachers to pay attention to how males and females from different ethnic backgrounds are socialized. Curriculum promotes social structural equality and cultural pluralism. Organized around the contributions and perspectives of different cultural groups.
Education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist	Prepares student teachers to teach their K–12 students to critically analyze inequality and oppression in society, particularly in their own life circumstance. Promotes social structural equality and cultural pluralism and prepares graduates to work actively toward social structural equality.

Practicum/Field experience

In general, teacher preparation programs should provide frequent, structured, field experiences in urban, culturally diverse settings (Coballes-Vega, 1992). The importance of these experiences for teacher preparation is not a new concept. Student teachers’ ability to use many skills learned during university courses depends on both the quality of the training and the environment in which they practice their skills (Copeland, 1979).

Carefully structured field experiences in conjunction with supportive course work may be the most effective means for instilling cultural sensitivity in students (Gomez, 1996; Pohan, 1996). Field experiences in diverse cultural settings provide student teachers with opportunities to develop greater intercultural teaching competence. However, in cases where field experiences are not carefully designed in coordination with course work, these experiences may actually reinforce stereotypes and prejudices held by student teachers (McRiarmid & Price, 1993). Additionally, some field experiences have been criticized for being fragmented, lacking curricular definition, and appearing disconnected from other components of teacher preparation programs (Guyton & Byrd, 2000; NCTE, 1996).

Factors of the field experience that have been suggested to influence student teachers' ability are careful planning and monitoring of the experience, careful preparation of students for the experience, and placement of prospective teachers in schools and with cooperating teachers that are in the process of working toward more culturally responsive and multicultural teaching.

Grant and Koskela (1986) examined the content and effectiveness of field experiences. They found that student teachers received very little or no information on education that is multicultural during the time of their student teaching (Grant & Koskela, 1986). Student teachers reported that they learned about education that is multicultural (EMC), but were not taught how to incorporate it into lesson plans and daily curriculum. Similar studies have found that the student teachers received multicultural information or curriculum related mostly to improving awareness and understanding, and very little attention was given to application and integration of the concept into the classroom curriculum (Grant, 1981).

Role of the cooperating teacher

One component that has been shown to influence the effectiveness of the field experience is the quality of the student teacher interaction with the cooperating teacher (Haberman, 1983). In order to promote the transfer of campus learning to the classroom, students must be shown how to put that information into practice in the daily curriculum by the cooperating teacher (Joyce & Weil, 1972). Grant (1981) found that during the field experience, students' awareness of multicultural concepts learned at the university greatly depended upon the attention given to these concepts by their cooperating teachers. Grant and Koskela (1986) conclude that instructors and cooperating teachers must show student teachers how to implement EMC concepts into the daily curriculum and offer a field placement that supports and encourages their efforts. These results suggest that student teachers need to be placed with cooperating teachers who have a thorough knowledge of multicultural education, accept a multicultural focus as a classroom need, and advocate multicultural education throughout their teaching.

Several studies have examined the impact cooperating teacher training has on the outcomes of student teachers. For example, McIntyre and Killian (2001) examined student teachers participating in the first level of a three-level field experience sequence. Cooperating teachers in this study received training that consisted of a 3-hour graduate course in the supervision of student teachers. They were taught skills in observing and providing critical feedback, skills generally reported to be lacking in cooperating teachers' interactions with student teachers (Zumpler, DeVoss, & Nott, 1980). Cooperating teachers in training also learned communication skills needed for supervising students. Additionally, as part of the course, cooperating teachers produced a resource file to orient student teachers to the community, school district, building, and classrooms of their assigned cooperating teacher. These resource files included school calendars, lesson plan formats, maps of the building, and disciplinary and truancy guidelines. Cooperating teachers also produced a sequence of activities and corresponding timelines to orient student teachers and aid in the transition to working with students (McIntyre & Killian, 1987).

The study found that student teachers who were placed with trained cooperating teachers practiced more group teaching and spent more time interacting with students. In general, it was found that training the cooperating teachers had a positive influence on the early field experience of student teachers. Additionally, it was found that the areas emphasized in the cooperating teacher training were also the ones seen more in their student teachers. Furthermore, objectives covered in the cooperating teacher courses were evident in their interactions with their student teachers. Trained cooperating teachers had significantly more interactions with their student teachers related to planning and preparation and provided more feedback concerning student teachers' progress (McIntyre and Killian, 2001).

Graham (2006) examined how cooperating teachers contribute to the process of learning to teach in a secondary Professional Development School (PDS). Results of this study found that there were four conditions for successful internships; 1) the program had a strong organizational structure with clearly

articulated expectations for all participants, 2) the program created affective engagement among participants, 3) there was cognitive involvement with the complex intellectual tasks of teaching, and 4) cooperating teachers provided professional mentoring. Table 3 details the characteristics of the PDS program.

The results of Graham’s research highlight the need for future studies to examine the organizational and communication structures between university-school district partnerships. Specifically, the frequency of visitations by the university liaison to the school, the selection procedures for interns and cooperating teachers, and the opportunities for feedback and discussion between cooperating teacher and student teacher.

Table 3:
Characteristics of the teacher preparation program described in Graham (2006)

PDS Program Characteristics
Hiring substitutes so that teachers and department chairs could be released from their teaching duties to interview the prospective student teachers. Interviews included discussions of content knowledge, academic standards, instructional approaches, and school policies and procedures.
Placing student teachers with two cooperating teachers to provide a variety of opportunities for classroom observation and guided practice.
Matching student teachers with cooperating teachers with similar professional interests.
Providing a handbook that describes the roles and responsibilities of people connected with the PDS, explains evaluation criteria and identifies levels of professional competence that the student teachers are expected to attain.
Collaborating with university liaison—this individual teaches at the graduate level in pedagogy and curriculum at the school. They serve on school and district curriculum and professional development committees with teachers and administrators. Their presence helps link the school with the university. Liaisons hold weekly seminars with student teachers and the school coordinator to discuss progress, curricular requirements, and dilemmas of practice; cooperating teachers are also invited to attend these seminars. Seminars serve as important opportunities to learn about each others’ expertise.
Providing regular feedback sessions with mentors, offering professional opinions about: classroom events, lesson planning, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and management.
Offering seminars jointly led by the university supervisor and cooperating teachers and providing additional opportunities for interns to connect their classroom experiences to the theoretical understanding of course work.

Research on cooperating teachers is important because we know that student teachers pay close attention to the pedagogy of their cooperating teachers. Therefore, if cooperating teachers offer student teachers a view of multicultural education at odds with the university’s perspective, it is likely that the cooperating teachers’ perspective will bear greater influence in how the student teacher teaches in his or her own classroom. In effective university-school partnerships it is optimal for the cooperating teachers to be chosen based on the cooperating teacher’s adoption of equity pedagogy and multicultural curriculum implementation (Graham, 2006). Additionally, research on effective programs highlights the importance of matching the student teacher with the right cooperating teacher in terms of subject area and grade level. Unfortunately, teacher educators have little or no control over the selection of cooperating teachers (Blocker & Swetnam, 1999; Clarke, 2001).

Self-reflection

Effective field experiences force student teachers to examine their own stereotypes and prejudices. Early field experiences in culturally different settings with a reflective component should be an integral part of comprehensive urban teacher preparation. Banks (1995) suggests that student teachers must understand their own identities in a multicultural society. In a similar vein, Powell and colleagues (1996) suggest that if student teachers are to change their dispositions toward teaching in culturally diverse settings they need opportunities for self-reflection. Additionally, opportunities to reflect about the experiences under the guidance of teacher educators who have been successful multicultural teachers themselves are more optimal (Boyle-Baise & Sleeter, 1996; Zeichner & Miller, 1997).

Some programs approach this self-reflection component by using personal biography before and during the field experience with the intent to help student teachers develop increased sensitivity toward others (Fry & McKinney, 1997). In one such program, the teachers had the opportunity to examine the personal biographies of other culturally different peers, which increased cultural awareness and, possibly, cultural sensitivity. Student teachers need to critically examine preconceptions and attitudes toward cultural issues within a diverse community of peers. The authors suggest that reflective opportunities should be a prerequisite for field experiences (Fry & McKinney, 1997).

Community-based immersion experiences

Urban teacher preparation practica may also include a community-based component in which student teachers become immersed in the community in which they are teaching. Villegas and Lucas (2002) suggest that teacher preparation programs should include ways for student teachers to gain an understanding of the lives of students of diverse backgrounds (Morales, 2000). Extending school-based field experience into the community and utilizing other community members as adjunct teacher educators may improve the ability of field experiences to prepare teachers for diverse settings (Erickson & Anderson, 1997; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996). Several methods have been employed to instill an understanding of community in student teachers. These include providing training in ethnographic research skills, having pre-service teachers tutor children in cultural contexts that are not primarily white and middle-class, and even having pre-service teachers live in the community in which they are student teaching. These types of practica can increase student teachers' awareness of culture, knowledge of a context different from their own, and awareness of their own stereotypes (Fry & McKinney, 1997).

Though much of the research suggests that school and community-based immersion experiences combined with multicultural education curriculum are more powerful than stand-alone multicultural education courses, little is known about what happens when teachers move beyond the teacher education program. As such, it is important that research efforts be extended so that graduates of teacher education programs are followed into the classroom, thereby linking student teacher preparation with school and community-based learning and ongoing professional development and school reform.

Role of the teacher educator

Characteristics and practices of faculty at the university level may also relate to the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs to train student teachers. The little research that has examined the role of the teacher educator has shown that effective university-school partnerships in preparing urban educators also require faculty to be in the classrooms, with high visibility, so that they are viewed as competent classroom teacher educators (Colbert & Wolff, 1992). Given the importance of experience in shaping the ability to adequately address multicultural education, it seems important that teacher educators have effective methods for connecting with diverse community members' perspectives so that they can communicate these findings to student teachers (Narode et al., 1994). However, Haberman (1987) found that a low percentage of faculty at universities actually have urban teaching experience. More research is necessary to ascertain what characteristics of the teacher educator and what types of relationships between

the teacher educator and school personnel are most effective in maintaining a successful partnership to prepare urban teachers.

Social justice

Effective teacher preparation programs also connect pedagogy with social justice. Such programs help student teachers develop the skills to be change agents to promote equity and social justice in their schools and greater society. These programs work to encourage teacher education students to play an active role in the governance and operation of their own teacher education programs through service on program policy and advisory committees. Traditional teacher education programs may serve to reinforce isolated, conservative teaching practices and fail to disrupt the unequal conditions which make urban schools damaging places for many students (Kozal, 1991; Oakes, 1985, 1990b). Students who go through teacher education programs that connect pedagogy with social justice programs often become actively engaged in community service (Erickson & Anderson, 1997) and political activities that seek to promote a more humane and just society.

Comparable urban-teacher partnerships

A number of university-urban district partnerships have developed in response to the need for effective urban teachers. Table 4 presents a crosswalk of five such programs, highlighting the overall model, participants, and general components to include the manner in which field study is conducted. Two of these programs, distinct in their focus and makeup are Center X at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) and the Observation & Participation Program at the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater.

Center X at UCLA began in the mid 1990s as a response to deteriorating retention rates and quality among teachers in the Santa Monica and Los Angeles Unified School District. Teacher preparation was transformed from a one year program into a two year clinical model wherein candidates spend their second year in “residency” within a partner school that shares the university’s focus of social justice and preparing teachers to become change agents within schools. Here candidates are immersed in the “dailyness” of the urban environment to prepare them for the challenges they will face during their teaching careers.

A different approach is taken by the Observation & Participation Program which faces the challenge of training urban teacher candidates from a local rural population with the nearest urban center over an hour away. In response to this challenge, an advisory board of university faculty, K–12 teachers, and district administrators was formed to oversee a tightly structured, slow-immersion urban teacher preparation program with the goal of enculturating candidates to the urban environment. Candidates spend two years in a program that scaffolds their level of responsibility within the schools so as not to overwhelm the nascent urban teachers.

Although these two programs are quite distinct, they, and the others presented in Table 4, share a number of common features. First, each has forged a strong and genuine relationship with partner schools that share similar philosophies regarding urban teacher preparation. To varying degrees, each program also places social justice as a central theme of their candidate preparation, and all programs use extended field placements.

**Table 4:
University/school urban teacher preparation partnerships**

University/ School System	Model	Participants	Field Study	Components
Hofstra University/New York City Public Schools	4 year co-major; education and subject courses alongside progressively involved field experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University faculty • Preservice teachers • New graduates 	Classroom observations begin in year 1 and continue throughout; final field placement during last year	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mentoring while learning 2. Collaborative teaming 3. Univ./school partnerships 4. Professional collaboration
George Washington University/ D.C. Public Schools	Intensive graduate program designed to help preservice secondary teachers juggle the “daily-ness” of urban teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University faculty • Preservice teachers • One (primarily) urban school in Washington D.C. 	Most work within a single school (Cardozo H.S.) and must co-teach a literacy class, observe cooperating teachers, and participate in school activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rigorous candidate screening 2. Summer Institute 3. Develop change agents 4. Continual field experiences
University of Wisconsin/ Milwaukee Public Schools	Introduce (primarily) rural undergraduates to an urban teaching environment with an emphasis on observation & reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University faculty • Preservice teachers • School-level personnel • District personnel 	Minimum of 100 hours (50 in a racially diverse setting), part of which occurs concurrently with relevant coursework	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong collaboration (Advisory Board) 2. Observation & Reflection 3. Tightly structured program
UCLA/ Los Angeles Public Schools	Clinical model-two year graduate program with strong ties to local urban “partnership schools”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University faculty • Preservice teachers • School-level personnel • District personnel 	Year 1 combines field placement (in a partner school) with coursework; year 2 is a residency (clinical model) with faculty mentoring	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Partnership schools share similar philosophies 2. Focus on social justice theory 3. Full participation in school community
York University/ Toronto Public Schools	One year post-bachelors emphasizing a service learning (community involvement) approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University faculty • Preservice teachers • School-level personnel 	Observational practicum in partner school followed by teaching field experiences + 6 hours/month of community practicum	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recruitment of diverse candidates 2. Integration of social justice and diversity issues into curriculum 3. Training in culturally appropriate behavior management

Conclusion and Recommendations

University-school partnerships have the opportunity to effectively align and reinforce university multicultural education curriculum through application during carefully planned field experiences. From the literature several factors emerged as important for effective partnership teacher preparation programs. Based on these results the following recommendations are suggested for strengthening the MSCD/DPS UTP partnership as well as other university-school district partnerships aimed at preparing urban educators.

1. Finding: A comprehensive approach to teacher preparation programs that integrates aspects of multicultural education into all components is best. Isolated instances are not as effective for preparing teachers to teach in urban classrooms (Grant & Koskela, 1986).
Recommendation: Multicultural education curriculum should be infused throughout the teacher preparation program.
2. Finding: To change their attitude toward teaching in culturally diverse schools, student teachers need opportunities for self-reflection (Powell, Zehm, Garcia, & 1996). Teacher preparation should encourage social justice as well through activities such as being active in community service and political activities (Erickson & Anderson, 1997).
Recommendation: Student teacher multicultural education curriculum should include components of self-reflection and social justice.
3. Finding: Carefully structured field experiences in conjunction with supportive course- work may be the most effective means for instilling cultural sensitivity in student teachers (Gomez, 1996; Pohan, 1996).
Recommendation: Field experiences should be aligned with multicultural education curriculum.
4. Finding: Trained cooperating teachers have more interactions with their student teachers related to planning and preparation and provide more feedback concerning student teachers' progress (McIntyre and Killian, 1987).
Recommendation: Cooperating teachers should receive training in the supervision of student-teachers.
5. Finding: In effective university-school partnerships, cooperating teachers are chosen based on their adoption of equity pedagogy and multicultural curriculum implementation (Graham, 2006)
Recommendation: Cooperating teachers should have a multicultural education pedagogy perspective.
6. Finding: Extending school-based field experience into the community and utilizing other community members as adjunct teacher educators may improve the ability of field experiences to prepare student teachers for diverse settings (Erickson & Anderson, 1997; Zeichner & Melnick, 1996).
Recommendation: Urban teacher preparation programs should include a component that allows student teachers to be involved in their students' community.
7. Finding: Effective university-school partnerships require faculty to be in the classrooms so they are viewed as competent teacher educators who are able to make genuine connections between theory and practice (Colbert & Wolff, 1992).
Recommendation: Teacher educators should have an active and frequent presence in the partnership schools.

References

- Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 3–24). Tappan NJ: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Blocker, L. S., & Swetnam, L. A. (1999). The selection and evaluation of mentor teachers. *The Teacher Educator*.
- Boyle-Baise, L., & Sleeter, C. E. (1996). Field experiences: Planting seeds and pulling weeds. In C. Grant & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Making schooling multicultural* (pp. 371–388). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cannella, G. S., & Reiff, J. C. (1994). Teacher preparation for diversity. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 27, 28–47.
- Clark, E. R., Nystrom, N. J., & Perez, B. (1996). Language and culture: Critical components of multicultural teacher education. *The Urban Review*, 28, 185–197.
- Clarke, A. (2001). Characteristics of cooperating teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 26(2), 237–256.
- Coballes-Vega, C. (1992). *Considerations in teaching culturally diverse children*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Colbert, J. A., & Wolff, D. E. (1992). Surviving in urban schools: A collaborative model for a beginning teacher support system. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(3), 193–199.
- Copeland, W. (1979). Student teachers and cooperating teacher: An ecological relationship. *Theory Into Practice*, 18, 194–199.
- Denver Public Schools Communications Office (2008). Facts and Figures. Retrieved October 2, 2008, from <http://communications.dpsk12.org/newsroom/73/55/>
- Dillworth, M. (Ed.). (1992). *Diversity in teacher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Englert, R. M. (1997). The university's role in the improvement of inner-city education. *Education and Urban Review*, 29, 373–402.
- Erickson, J. A., & Anderson, J. B. (Eds.). (1997). *Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Follo, E., Hoerr, B., & Vorheis-Sargent, A. (2002). Where will urban high school teachers for the 21st century come from? *American Secondary Education* 30, 2–12.

- Fry, P. G., & McKinney, L. J. (1997). A qualitative study of preservice teachers' early field experiences in an urban, culturally different school. *Urban Education, 32*(2), 184–201.
- Garofano, A. & Sable, J. (2008). *Characteristics of the 100 Largest Public Elementary and Secondary School Districts in the United States: 2005–06* (NCES 2008-339). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Gay, G., & Howard, T. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st century. *Teacher Educator, 36*(1), 1–16.
- Gibson, C. A. (Ed.). (2002). *Being Real: The Student-Teacher Relationship and African American Male Delinquency*. New York: LFB Scholarly.
- Gomez, M. (1996). Prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching "Other People's Children." In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Graham, B. (2006). Conditions for successful field experiences: Perceptions of cooperating teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 22*(8), 1118–1129.
- Grant, C. (1977). *Multicultural education: Commitments, issues, and applications*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Grant, C., & Koskela, R. A. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*(4), 197–204.
- Grant, C. A., & Sleeter, C. E. (1993). Race, class, gender, exceptionality, and educational reform. In G. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives* (pp. 48–68). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gunzenhauser, G. W., Adams, J. Q., & Paulding, W. (1996, February). *Assuring an appreciation for student diversity: Alternatives to teacher education field experiences*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Chicago, IL.
- Guyton, E., & Byrd, D. (2000). Standards for field experiences: Task force on field experiences standards. *Association of Teacher Education*.
- Haberman, M. (1987). Research on pre-service and clinical experiences: Implications for teacher education. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.), *The education of teachers* (pp. 98–117). New York: Longman.

- Havas, E., & Lucas, C. (1994). Modeling diversity in the classroom. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 27*, 43–47.
- Hood, S., & Parker, L. (1994). Minorities, teacher testing, and recent U.S. Supreme Court holdings: A regressive step. *Teachers College Record, 92*(4), 603–618.
- Joyce, B., & Weil, M. (1972). *Models of teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kozal, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Crown.
- McDiarmid, G., & Price, D. (1993). Preparing teachers for diversity: A study of student teachers in a multicultural program. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. O'Dell (Eds.), *Diversity and teaching* (pp. 31–59). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- McIntyre, D. J., & Killian, J. E. (1987). The influence of supervisory training for cooperating teachers on preservice teachers development during early field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 80*(5), 277–282.
- Morales, R. (2000). Effects of teacher preparation experiences and students' perceptions related to developmentally and culturally appropriate practices. *Action in Teacher Education, 22*(2), 67–76.
- Narode, R., Rennie-Hill, L., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). Urban community study by preservice teachers. *Urban Education, 29*(1), 5–21.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Digest of educational statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- NCTE. (1996). *Guidelines for the preparation of teachers of English Language Arts*: NCTE.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J. (1990b). *Multiplying Inequalities: The effects of race, class, and tracking on opportunities to learn mathematics and science*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Ooka Pang, V. (1994). Why do we need this class? Multicultural education for teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*, 289–292.
- Payne, C. (1980). The integration of multicultural education into the general preparation of teachers. *Viewpoints in Teaching and Learning, 56*, 77–78.
- Pohan, C. A. (1996). Preservice teachers' beliefs about diversity: Uncovering factors leading to multicultural responsiveness. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 29*(3), 62–69.
- Powell, R. R., Zehm, S., Garcia, J., & (1996). *Field experience: Strategies for exploring diversity in schools*. New Jersey Prentice-Hall.

- Russo, C. J., & Talbert-Johnson, C. (1997). The overrepresentation of African-American children in special education: The re-segregation of educational programming? *Education and Urban Society*, 29, 136–148.
- Scott, R. (1995). Helping teacher education students develop positive attitudes toward ethnic minorities. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 28, 69–73.
- Sheets, R. H. (1996). Urban classroom conflict: Student-teacher perception: Ethnic integrity, solidarity, and resistance. *The Urban Review*, 8, 165–183.
- Villegas, A. & Lucas T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 20–32.
- Weiner, L. (1993). *Preparing teachers for urban schools: Lessons from thirty years of school reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsberg, M. B. (1995). A framework for culturally responsive teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53, 17–21.
- Zeichner, K., & Melnick, S. (1996). The role of community field experiences in preparing teachers for cultural diversity. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick & M. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 176–198). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K., & Miller, M. (1997). Learning to teach in a professional development school. In M. Levine & R. Trachtman (Eds.), *Building professional development schools: Politics, practice, and policy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Zumpler, N. I., DeVoss, G. G., & Nott, D. I. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(4), 11–15.