

---

### **Pathways to Partnership: A Developmental Framework for Building PDS Relationships**

Audra K. Parker  
George Mason University

Seth A. Parsons  
George Mason University

Lois A. Groth  
George Mason University

Elizabeth Levine Brown  
George Mason University

**Abstract:** In the past five years, there has been unprecedented, but much needed, attention given to the role of clinical practice in teacher preparation. The calls for earlier and more robust fieldwork alongside increasingly intentional and mutually beneficial partnerships with P-12 sites are long overdue. Yet these trends are situated within challenging financial and political times for universities and their P-12 partners. Our purpose in this article is to share one approach to balancing the desire to “turn teacher preparation upside down” (NCATE, 2010, p. ii) while also being attentive to the needs of our school partners in our Professional Development Schools (PDS) network. We constructed the developmental framework presented in this article using the key tenets of a PDS while also acknowledging the need for differentiation and flexibility in our work. Through these pathways to partnership, we broaden our notions of what constitutes a PDS by recognizing that stakeholders’ participation is necessarily varied within the broader constructs of the Nine Essentials.

**KEYWORDS:** PDS Network, elementary teacher preparation

**NAPDS NINE ESSENTIALS ADDRESSED:**

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

9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structure.

### Introduction

*The core experience in teacher preparation is clinical practice.*

- Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel, NCATE, 2010, p. 5

The field of teacher education is currently focused on increasing and improving clinical aspects of teacher preparation (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, AACTE, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2014; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, NCATE, 2010; Zeichner, 2012). For example, the National Research Council (2010) presented clinical practice as one of three aspects of teacher education that have the highest potential to positively impact student outcomes. Similarly, *Teachers for a New Era*, a Carnegie Corporation of New York (2001) funded program focused on innovation in teacher preparation, listed clinical practice as one of its three essentials:

Education should be understood as an academically taught “clinical practice profession,” requiring close cooperation between colleges of education and actual practicing schools; master teachers as clinical faculty in the college of education; and residencies for beginning teachers during a two-year period of induction. (p. 12)

Zeichner (2010) explains that effective teacher preparation takes place in “hybrid spaces” where academic and practitioner knowledge is merged and equally valued (p. 89). In short, “we know from research that good clinical experience is associated with effective teaching” (AACTE, 2010, p. 4.).

But what is “good clinical experience”? Researchers have demonstrated benefits of extended clinical experiences that are (a) closely aligned with coursework, (b) under the auspices of an expert mentor teachers, and (c) carefully supervised by high quality university supervisors (AACTE, 2010; Darling-Hammond et al., 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006a, 2006b). Unfortunately, teacher candidates’ clinical experiences, especially their early field experiences, have traditionally been unintentionally designed and poorly supervised (Darling-Hammond, 2009; Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985; Valencia, Martin, Place, & Grossman, 2009; Zeichner, 2010). Clinical experiences have (a) been detached from program objectives and coursework, (b) generally involved matches with any volunteer teacher, and (c) been supervised by educators who do not have expertise in teacher preparation (e.g., graduate students or retired teachers) (Clift & Brady, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2009; Zeichner, 2010, 2012). In summary, “while new and experienced teachers repeatedly cite classroom-based experiences and student teaching as the most highly valued elements of their preparation, clinical practice remains the most ad hoc part of teacher preparation in many programs” (NCATE, 2010, p. 4).

As a result of these issues, education researchers and professional association standards are calling for earlier, more frequent, and more closely supervised clinical experiences in sites that represent strong school-university partnerships (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, CAEP, 2015; National Association of Professional Development Schools, NAPDS, 2008). For example, AACTE (2010) suggested that, “teacher candidates participate in school-embedded clinical work throughout their entire program” (p. 6). Similarly, CAEP emphasized the importance of clinical practice with Standard 2, Clinical Partnerships and Practice,

encompassing three strands: (1) Partnerships for Clinical Practice, (2) Clinical Educators, and (3) Clinical Experiences.

The Professional Development School (PDS) philosophy aligns closely to the recommendations presented above regarding high-quality clinical preparation. The PDS philosophy was first articulated by the Holmes Group (1990), a group of education school deans from across the United States devoted to enhancing the effectiveness of teacher preparation (Holmes Group, 1986). The PDS philosophy is committed to four purposes: enhancing (a) K-12 student learning, (b) teacher candidate learning, (c) practicing teacher professional learning, and (d) collaborative school-university inquiry (Holmes Group, 1990; Neapolitan, 2011). There are more than 1,000 PDSs in the United States (AACTE, 2010), and core to the PDS movement are clinical partnerships and practice. NAPDS, which was formed in 2005, is an organization committed to optimizing the four purposes of the PDS philosophy ([www.napds.org](http://www.napds.org)). In 2008, the NAPDS presented the *Nine Essentials of a PDS* (see Table 1).

Table 1

*The NAPDS “Nine Essentials”*

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

This article shares our program’s approach to answering the question, “What is a PDS?” and to addressing the NAPDS Nine Essentials. Our efforts are guided by a need to balance necessary calls for earlier and more rigorous fieldwork in teacher preparation while also being attentive to the needs of our school partners—all in the context of challenging financial times. The developmental framework for building PDS relationships that we present in this article enhances the engagement of all stakeholders and recognizes the need for differentiation and flexibility in PDS partnerships. Through these pathways to partnership, we purposefully broaden notions of what constitutes a PDS by recognizing that stakeholders’ participation is necessarily varied within the vision of the Nine Essentials.

### University Program and Contextual Challenges

George Mason University's Elementary Education program has been engaged in PDS work since 1991. Rooted in the research on effective teacher preparation and the tenets of PDSs (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; NAPDS, 2008; NCATE, 2001), our Elementary Education program collaborates with school partners to address four shared goals that are central to the PDS philosophy: PK-6 student learning, pre-service teacher education, the professional development of practicing teachers, and collaborative inquiry (Holmes Group, 1990). During its 24-year history, the program has undergone four major revisions, each driven by feedback from all stakeholders via our PDS Advisory group (see Parsons et al., in press for a comprehensive description of our program's development).

Nonetheless, several fundamental characteristics exist across program iterations: a rigorous admissions process conducted with teams of faculty and classroom teachers, coursework designed to facilitate theory to practice transfer, field experiences in our PDS sites, internships guided by trained clinical faculty, and university faculty serving in roles to facilitate the PDS relationship. Finally, teacher candidates progress through our program in a cohort model through one of two program options. Each option includes a structured course sequence with field hours requirements. Option 1 culminates in a yearlong internship, and Option 2 culminates in a semester-long internship experience. The yearlong internship experience follows the K-6 school calendar in our partner districts and is split into two placements: one primary and one intermediate. Yearlong teacher candidates receive a small monthly stipend in exchange for their availability to substitute at their school site for a limited number of days across the school year. The semester-long internship is one 16-week placement in a single grade level in the spring semester.

In this elementary PDS program's latest review cycle, the confluence of several contextual challenges drove program revisions—many of which will likely resonate with teacher preparation programs around the country. First, program faculty expressed concern that on paper our 17 elementary school partners' engagement with our PDS work appeared to be comparable across sites. However, in reality there were vast differences in their level of and interest in collaborative engagement in the shared PDS mission. In some cases, our PDS partners had changes in administration and staff turnover that negatively impacted their capacity to fully engage in PDS work. Others partners had great interest in working with interns, but limited interest in participating in shared action research.

We also faced financial constraints at the university level, particularly with regard to changes in payment for internship supervision and decreasing resources to support university faculty for their work in PDS sites. These limited resources, coupled with essentially no university-based financial support for running and managing the PDS network, resulted in the need to be more systematic in terms of the minimum number of interns assigned to a PDS site and to university facilitators. Finally, and in response to CAEP Standard 2, we needed to improve the quality of early field experiences. Needed improvements included ensuring diverse and rigorous experiences, and subsequently increasing the level of support from the university and the classroom teachers working with early field candidates.

As we engaged with stakeholders regarding each of these issues, a few “non-negotiables” emerged. First and foremost, principals wanted their school sites to be seen as “PDS” sites. They did not all necessarily have the resources, interest, or willingness to engage with all of the Nine Essentials (NAPDS, 2008), but they wanted to be engaged in “PDS” work and to be called a “PDS site.” Second, our PDS partners overwhelmingly preferred interns who were in the ‘yearlong’ internship model, in comparison with those in the more traditional semester-long model, and asked that we focus our efforts on growing the number of students in that particular program track.

Third, the existing structure mingled final interns, those teacher candidates in their final yearlong or semester-long internship, with field hours students, those teacher candidates in their early field work prior to internship, at the same school site. Our partners shared that this approach confused teachers, administrators, and university facilitators—and stretched schools’ capacities for hosting our students with high-quality placements. As a result, most field hours students felt like second-class citizens and were often not placed with the most effective teachers. At the university, faculty questioned how to balance limited resources with our commitment to rich, sustained partnerships and the Nine Essentials (NAPDS, 2008). In other words, we were faced with the question: How could we use our resources wisely to push school sites that were ready and willing to engage fully with the Nine Essentials while still honoring the varying needs, capacities, and interests of all partners? Further, to move forward we needed to find a way to balance both the contextual challenges and the non-negotiables raised by school partners.

The review cycle coincided with our planned “open application” process for the George Mason University Elementary Education PDS network. Typically, every four to five years, schools engaged in PDS work are asked to review and renew their commitment to the George Mason Elementary PDS program. In addition, schools interested in collaboration are afforded an opportunity to apply for inclusion in the PDS network. During the most recent open application iteration, we intentionally sought to expand the network by adding schools with more diverse populations to our partnership work. The application process included evidence of faculty buy-in from each elementary site, as well as responses to questions related to teacher preparation, research goals, professional development needs, and demographic information (see Appendix).

### **A Differentiated Approach to PDS**

In the sections that follow, we explain our approach to addressing the macro- and micro-level contextual issues previously described. At the core of our work was an expansion of our definition of what constitutes a PDS. With this lens, we purposefully crafted multiple pathways to varying levels of engagement between PK-6 schools and the Mason Elementary PDS program. We begin with a description of these differentiated routes to PDS participation. We then highlight strengths, challenges, and implications of multiple pathways to partnership for PDS-embedded teacher education.

In order to bring us closer to enacting each of the Nine Essentials with a large number of PK-6 school partners—purposefully grown from 17-30 in this open application period—but with very limited faculty resources, we differentiated opportunities for partnership involvement. At the heart of our PDS network is a common commitment to PK-6 student learning, teacher professional development, and preservice teacher preparation, but with varying degrees of

participation—especially in the fourth dimension of the PDS philosophy: collaborative inquiry. Therefore, within our PDS network, we created different “Pathways to Partnership,” allowing stakeholders to select the pathway that is the best fit for their individual school context at a particular point in time:

- 1) Partner sites
- 2) Clinical Practice sites
- 3) Collaborative Inquiry sites

The three pathways allow for flexibility and movement within the PDS network, thus differentiating for unanticipated changes at PK-6 sites that may necessitate a shift in the degree of engagement without having to drop from the partnership work altogether.

Before discussing the distinctions among the three Pathways to Partnership in the George Mason University Elementary Education PDS network, it is important to note the commonalities that exist across the structures. First, all schools in the PDS network have a designated school-based point of contact who serves as the liaison between the school and the university. These *site facilitators* are instrumental in organizing placements, hosting orientations to the school site, problem-solving the inevitable “speed bumps” that emerge in partnership work, and attending informational meetings with university facilitators and university faculty across the academic year. All schools in the PDS network also have access to the *clinical faculty course*. This three-credit graduate level course prepares teachers for working with pre-service teachers and for collaborating with the George Mason University Elementary Education program. We strongly encourage all teachers hosting interns to complete the clinical faculty course. Finally, to varying extents, each site has some relationship with a *university facilitator*. These university-based liaisons are points of contact based at the university, but are explicitly connected to one school site, where they spend one day a week for partnership work.

The hallmark of the differentiated Pathways to Partnership can be seen in the distinctions among them. *Partner sites* host George Mason University Elementary Education teacher candidates in their early fieldwork. Each course in the program requires a minimum of 15 hours of field work. Given our program structure, in most cases this equates to 30 hours of early field work each semester prior to internship. Typically, early field work is completed in 3-4 hour chunks across 10 weeks of a given semester. Our teacher candidates enter their early field hours with tremendous variation in their prior classroom experiences. As a result, the course requirements associated with each semester’s field hours are scaffolded such that teacher candidates begin with observations and one-on-one tutoring, and progress to small group work and whole group lesson instruction.

Having a dedicated site facilitator at partner sites creates the infrastructure necessary to support significantly more purposeful and rigorous field hours experiences for teacher candidates in sites that were relatively new to our work. The field hours students are the primary focus of the school site, and as such, they are afforded more opportunities, engaged more fully with the school staff, and are expected, when ready, to do more than observations. In addition, with one university facilitator overseeing the partner sites and serving as the communication point of contact for site facilitators at all of the partner sites, we create clear channels for communication and feedback. Each of these facets of partner sites lays the foundation for the program enhancements highlighted above.



Our intention with this Pathway to Partnership is to provide new school sites an opportunity to test out the “PDS waters.” Teachers in partner sites have access to university faculty for staff development needs and to the clinical faculty training course. This provides sites with an opportunity to build capacity via the clinical faculty course and determine if collaboration in teacher education is a good fit (i.e., something they can commit to more fully). The partner site route also provides an engagement option for schools that have experienced changes in administration, teacher turnover, capacity to support interns, and/or need a break from the rigors of more intensive partnership.

A second Pathway to Partnership in our PDS network is as a *clinical practice school*. The key element for clinical practice schools is the agreement to host five or more elementary pre-service teachers during their final internship each year. Clinical practice sites rotate from year to year in hosting semester-long candidates and yearlong candidates. This rotation addresses administrators’ concerns by equitably spreading our yearlong teacher candidates and the associated resources across our internship sites. This means that clinical practice sites must have a cadre of teachers across a variety of grade levels, all of whom have completed the clinical faculty training course. A site facilitator serves as a key point of contact for clinical practice schools and supports the teacher candidates and clinical faculty throughout the internship experience.

Clinical practice sites work collaboratively with a site-based university facilitator—typically an adjunct faculty member engaged in internship supervision and support for partnership communication. These university facilitators spend one full day at the school site every other week. In between visits, teacher candidates provide the university facilitator with a short video clip of their teaching. Using Edthena ([www.edthena.com](http://www.edthena.com)), a video coding program adopted to support teacher candidates’ professional development, the teacher candidate and university facilitator are able to dialogue about the teaching sample during the week between site visits. This process provides continuity of feedback and encourages forward progress for the teacher candidate. In addition, this model allows us to reduce the site visit responsibilities of the university facilitator—a necessity given a mandated reduction in pay for internship supervision for our program so as to align it more with average rates for traditional supervision across the college.

The third Pathway to Partnership is the *collaborative inquiry site* pathway. Collaborative inquiry schools host five or more elementary pre-service teachers during their yearlong internship experiences. Both clinical practice and collaborative inquiry sites host interns, and as such, have a critical mass of teachers trained as clinical faculty. The key distinction between the two is (a) the presence of a full-time faculty member as the university facilitator at collaborative inquiry sites and (b) collaborative inquiry sites host yearlong interns exclusively.

Collaborative inquiry sites also work collaboratively with one university faculty member who serves in the university facilitator role for internship supervision and who is engaged in service work to support organic, inquiry-based research and grant projects emerging from the collaborative work. University facilitators spend one full day each week at their collaborative inquiry site. This ongoing presence across the school year is vital in creating the relationships necessary to engage in shared professional development and research opportunities. University facilitators at collaborative inquiry sites often attend faculty meetings and leadership team

meetings, engage regularly with school administration, lead professional development at the school site, and become a fixture of the school community.

Because participation requires a commitment to ongoing, shared research, and because of the weekly presence of a faculty member, collaborative inquiry sites are often incubators and trial spots for new program ideas and innovations. For example, the university facilitator and principal at one site decided to explore a true ‘yearlong’ internship model where teacher candidates were placed in one classroom for the length of the entire school year. This shared research experience provided an opportunity to explore some of the strengths and weaknesses of the model on a small scale, and implications from the work continue to inform programmatic practices. Similarly, another university facilitator at a collaborative inquiry site wanted to embed his literacy methods course more directly within an authentic teaching environment. His PDS site hosted the course in the school’s library. Throughout the semester, the preservice teachers in the course observed the literacy instruction in each of the grades K-6 in groups of seven or eight. The observed teachers, two each week, then came to the class, which took place immediately following the school day, to collaboratively reflect on their instruction and answer preservice teachers’ questions. The very nature of a collaborative inquiry site creates small spaces in the PDS network for faculty and P-12 educators to pursue innovative practice.

### **Lessons Learned**

After a one-year cycle of using a differentiated, developmental approach to building and supporting a PDS network, a number of strengths and weaknesses emerged. Many of our initial concerns with the structure did not come to fruition. For example, we worried about how to manage a situation in which all schools wanted to be collaborative inquiry schools—something we would not be able to support because of our limited faculty resources. When we introduced the three pathways to our school partners, designed in collaboration with them, administrators were asked to rank order their preferred Pathway to Partnership. Almost all schools were able to engage in their first choice pathway. We also worried that we would need to have some tough conversations at the end of year one because we would need to shift some schools from pathways based on a decline in the number of candidates and loss of a university facilitator. In reality, though, our school partners also needed to shift roles due to changes in administration, fatigue, or loss of clinical faculty. Conversely, some schools embraced the PDS work with such gusto that they wanted to move quickly from hosting field hours students to interns. These transitions were possible because of the flexibility of the Pathways to Partnership options.

Similarly, we worried that all schools would want to host interns, and more specifically yearlong interns. Fortunately, we structured the network design in such a way that clinical practice schools would rotate between hosting semester-long and yearlong interns. Looking back, this additional layer of flexibility, built into the pathways from the outset, gave us the space to change the internship type at a PDS site as our numbers shifted. Furthermore, by having a plan in place for shifting school roles and internship types, we removed what some perceived to be a hierarchical, unfair distribution of yearlong and semester-long interns.

Choosing to focus our faculty research and service on collaborative inquiry sites allowed us to move closer to enacting each of the Nine Essentials in four sites rather than spreading ourselves thinly across 30 sites. Additionally, through several specific examples, we realized that



our schools needed and appreciated this flexibility. For example, although two of our school sites were new to PDS work and to our program, with strong leadership and exceptional faculty in place, they were able to quickly transition from working with field hours students to hosting interns, to engaging with faculty in collaborative inquiry sites. Another site that was stretched to host five interns had significant turnover during the school year and asked to move from hosting interns as a clinical practice site to hosting field hours students as a partner school site. As the administrator noted, they needed to regroup and reset. A third site, struggling with state accreditation standards, expressed relief at being able to be a part of the network in a different capacity, even though a district takeover would cause sweeping changes in the leadership and instructional methods.

With these structural elements in place, we are eager to further capitalize on our Pathways to Partnership model. We look forward to designing and implementing more structured tools that enable schools to examine the participation route that best fits their needs. Because we spent the first year building relationships in our collaborative inquiry sites, we now meet as a small team (the four principals and four university facilitators) to discuss how we can develop and refine shared research agendas. We began these conversations with a reading of the article “Generating PDS Possibility and Practicality Thinking Using a Case and Protocol Tool to Enhance PDS Development” (Yendol-Hoppey & Hoppey, 2013). Additionally, in this meeting, each collaborative inquiry school readily committed to collaborate in a U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences grant proposal. These activities, while small steps, are integral to the growth of our ongoing collaboration as well as the fulfillment of our commitment to the Nine Essentials. As we continuously reflect on these structures, we realize that engagement in PDS work does not need to be narrowly defined. Rather, our school partners help us define engagement differently, and developmentally, at their sites. When we created a flexible system to acknowledge the ever-changing K-12 context, we also created space for schools to understand the similarly unpredictable world at the university level. Candid, ongoing conversations among all stakeholders regarding capacity, needs, and expectations at multiple intervals through various communications structures served as a conduit for these shared understandings.

### **Implications**

Clinical practice for teacher candidates is, and should be, a hot topic in the field of teacher preparation given the powerful role and great potential it has in supporting teacher candidates’ development (AACTE, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2014; NCATE, 2010; National Research Council, 2010; Zeichner, 2012). However, critics have found traditional models of clinical practice to be poorly designed, which ultimately limits the full potential of teacher education. In this article, we present an example of an intentional approach to designing clinical experiences—one that moves away from a traditional approach where clinical experiences are “ad hoc” and towards clinically centered teacher preparation with PDS ideals at its core.

Our framework is built upon the belief that relationships must be differentiated for the school partners in our PDS network. This is not to say, however, that we did not adhere to national standards regarding school-university partnerships. Rather, standards play a key role in guiding our work and can be especially facilitative for others moving teacher preparation more

fully into clinical settings. School-university partnerships can use CAEP Standard 2 and the NAPDS Nine Essentials as principles that guide the structure of their clinical experiences and the nature of their school-university partnerships. Accordingly, the clinical practice structure that a school-university partnership designs can still be responsive to their respective contexts under the umbrella of these broad standards. We contend that schools and universities need to be flexible and work toward joint and mutually beneficial goals within their unique contexts in order to build sustainable partnerships.

While standards are a useful ideal for school-university partnerships, we must move away from the mindset that a PDS only exists if it adheres to them fully. Freeing ourselves from the notion that school-university partnerships have to look a certain way (e.g., fully exemplifying all Nine Essentials) is a necessary step in embracing a differentiated approach to PDS partnerships. High quality clinical practice cannot be mandated in a one-size-fits-all manner and does not need to look the same in every context. In fact, it is this mindset that often hinders innovation, halts progress toward real reform, and creates a dichotomous view of PDS—you either are or are not a PDS. Rather, we believe that schools committing to notions of mutually beneficial partnerships, with a desire to move towards fully enacting the Nine Essentials, must exist as a continuum of PDSs.

The model of pathways to partnership presented here is the approach that worked best for the George Mason University Elementary Education PDS Network. We encourage other school-university partnerships to thoughtfully and intentionally consider the clinical experiences they provide their teacher candidates to determine whether the approach is simultaneously driven by principles and responsive to their local context. In doing so, sites are answering the question “What is a PDS?” using their unique circumstances, and the responses are inherently and necessarily varied.

### References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (2010). *The clinical preparation of teachers: A policy brief*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Carnegie Corporation of New York. (2001). *Teachers for a new era: A national initiative to improve the quality of teaching*. New York, NY: Author.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2015). *Standard 2: Clinical partnerships and practice*. Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/standards/standard-2>
- Clift, R., & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith, & K. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The Report of the American Educational Research Association panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 309-424). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006a). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2006b). Constructing 21<sup>st</sup>-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57, 300-314. doi:10.1177/0022487105285962
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009, February). *Teacher education and the American future*. Charles W. Hunt Lecture presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89, 547-561. doi:10.1080/0161956X.2014.939009
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Banks, J., Zumwalt, K., Gomez, L., Sherin, M. G., Griesdorn, J., & Finn, L. E. (2005). Educational goals and purposes: Developing a curricular vision for teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond, & J. Bransford (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (169-200). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, 87, 49-65.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS). (2008). *What it means to be a professional development school*. Retrieved from <http://napds.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Nine-Essentials.pdf>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2001). *Standards for professional development schools*. Washington D.C.: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A National strategy to prepare effective teachers. Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning*. Washington, DC: Author.
- The National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Neapolitan, J. E. (Ed.). (2011). *Taking stock of professional development schools: What's needed now* (Vol. 110, Part 2). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Parsons, S. A., Groth, L. A., Parker, A. K., Brown, E. L., Sell, C., & Sprague, D. (in press). Elementary teacher preparation at George Mason University: Evolution of our program. In R. Flessner, & D. Lecklider (Eds.), *Case studies of clinical preparation in teacher education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Valencia, S., Martin, S., Place, N., & Grossman, P. (2009). Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60, 304-322. doi:10.1177/0022487109336543
- Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Hoppey, D. (2013). Generating PDS possibility and practicality thinking using a case and protocol tool to enhance PDS development. *School-University Partnerships*, 6, 59-75.
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus course and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 89-99. doi:10.1177/0022487109347671
- Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63, 376-382. doi:10.1177/0022487112445789

*Audra Parker, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor and Program Coordinator in the College of Education and Human Development at George Mason University. Her research addresses topics related to elementary teacher preparation. Seth A. Parsons, PhD is an associate professor in the College of Education and Human Development at George Mason University. His research focuses on teachers' instructional adaptations, teacher education and development, and student motivation and engagement. Lois A. Groth, PhD is an associate professor in the College of Education and Human Development at George Mason University. Her teaching and research focuses on elementary literacy practices and teacher action research. Elizabeth Levine Brown, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor at George Mason University in the College of Education and Human Development. Her research addresses the developmental and psychosocial influences on marginalized students' learning.*

Appendix A  
Application for Mason Elementary PDS Network

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT  
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

School \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Principal's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Principal's Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

Preference (rank order):     \_\_\_\_\_ Partner School  
  \_\_\_\_\_ Clinical Practice School  
  \_\_\_\_\_ Collaborative Inquiry School

1. Complete the School Profile and Student Population documents. Briefly describe the special attributes of your school that you believe will add to the strength of the GMU Elementary Professional Development School (PDS) Network.
2. Describe how faculty commitment to the GMU Elementary PDS Network was obtained (i.e., through survey, staff vote, signatures, etc...). Include documentation.
3. Describe technology available for instruction purposes and faculty commitment to use of technology.

4. Please indicate whether you have building space to hold on-site courses or seminars during and/or after the school day.
  
5. In the chart below use an X to indicate previous areas of collaboration with GMU and/or other universities. Additionally, use an X to indicate areas of potential interest for collaboration with GMU.

	Previous Areas of Collaboration	Potential Interest in Future Collaboration
Working with interns		
On-site courses		
Working with field hours pre-service teachers		
Grant activity		
Professional development projects		
Collaborative research		
Conference presentations		
Co-teaching university classes		
Co-teaching in elementary classrooms		
Other		

6. What professional development needs do you believe are most pressing in your particular school setting? How do these connect with your school plan or PLC plan?
  
7. Describe any school wide research activities and/or identify at least one potential research project you would be interested in exploring in your particular school setting.



Principal:

\_\_\_\_\_

(name)

\_\_\_\_\_

(signature)

*Applicants will be notified as soon as possible regarding the review of their application.  
Further information may be requested, including an on-site visit.*