Teacher Education Faculty Publications   Department of Teacher Education

2013

Urban PDS Partnership: Preparing Teachers for Social Justice

Connie L. Bowman
University of Dayton, cbowman1@udayton.edu

Rachel M. B. Collopy
University of Dayton, rcollopy1@udayton.edu

Jamie Bentley
Dayton Early College Academy

Elizabeth Cameron
Dayton Early College Academy

David A. Taylor
Dayton Early College Academy

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/edt_fac_pub

Part of the Elementary Education and Teaching Commons, Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons, Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons, Pre-Elementary, Early Childhood, Kindergarten Teacher Education Commons, and the Secondary Education and Teaching Commons

eCommons Citation

Chapter 10
Urban PDS Partnership:
Preparing Teachers for Social Justice

Connie Bowman, University of Dayton
Rachel M. B. Collopy, University of Dayton
Jamie Bentley, Dayton Early College Academy
Elizabeth Cameron, Dayton Early College Academy
David A. Taylor, Dayton Early College Academy

Introduction

Walking through the halls of the Dayton Early College Academy (DECA), people can hardly miss the message. Copies of classmates' college acceptance letters greet students at the elevator. Pictures of DECA graduates in academic robes cover a wall. Banner-sized posters call out messages of resiliency. When students check their hair in a mirror, the words "I'm going to college" encircles their faces. DECA's singular mission is preparing urban students to become first-generation college graduates.

In 2003 DECA was founded jointly by the University of Dayton (UD) and the Dayton Public Schools in response to what we believe is the social injustice of limited educational opportunities and lack of college access for urban students. Today, DECA boasts a nearly perfect record of sending its graduates to college. Over the last five years, all but two of the school's 180 graduates entered college. While the national sophomore college retention rate is 67.1 percent (ACT 2011), DECA boasted a retention rate of 92 percent in 2009 and 91 percent in 2010. On the 2012 Ohio Graduation Test, DECA students had a 100 percent passage rate in reading compared to Ohio's rate of 80 percent; in math DECA students' passage rate was 97 percent compared with Ohio's passage rate of 78 percent.

DECA students and graduates have received a great deal of notoriety for their academic achievements. Two 2012 DECA graduates received the Bill and Melinda Gates Millennium Scholars Award, a prestigious honor that provides full college funding for the nation's most promising minority students. The students now respectively attend Cornell University and Morehouse College. Last year's robotics team received the Rookie of the Year Award at the Dayton-area regional competition and advanced to the national competition, ranking in the top ten. And two teams won the school district Mock Trial competition, with one team advancing to the state competition.

We believe that for urban schools to meet their goals and mission—in the way the DECA is modeling—takes a partnership among many stakeholders.

One such partnership that supports DECA, and might buttress other schools and students—and simultaneously help to enact a social justice ideal—is a school-university connection. DECA was founded as a Professional Development School (PDS), with the school and university developing a reciprocal relationship with a shared focus on the preparation of new teachers, the enhancement of high school students' achievement, school and university faculty members' professional development, and collaborative inquiries aimed at improving instructional practices for all of the educators involved (Holmes Group 1990a).

In this chapter, we will describe our Midwestern university's response to two social justice issues: the lack of support for urban students to be ready for college and the issue of teacher quality in urban schools. DECA explicitly endeavors to respond to the dearth of educational opportunities for city youth. As well, as a PDS, DECA serves the university and our profession as a site for preparing the next generation of urban teachers. Our partnership relies on a PDS framework and a social justice approach to impact students' access to learning and to develop quality educators through learning communities (Holmes Group 1990a, 1990b, 1995; Teitel 2003). Using the lenses of the Marianist Catholic tradition and the PDS mission, here we will frame our social justice stance. We will specifically describe the revamping of two critical courses in the teacher education program with the goal of enacting social justice through developing effective teachers for urban settings.

DECA—The Context

In 2003, a unique partnership between the University of Dayton, a Catholic university founded by the Society of Mary (Marianist), and the Dayton Public Schools created DECA. The singular mission of the Dayton Early College Academy is to prepare urban students to become first generation college graduates. University faculty and leaders from the Dayton Public Schools collaborated to develop DECA's curriculum and structure and received start-up funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Early College High School Initiative and the Cincinnati-based Knowledge Works Foundation. Facing severe staffing cuts after a school district levy failed to pass in 2007, DECA retained its teachers by converting to a "community" school, Ohio's term for charter schools. Today, DECA is a seventh- through twelfth- grade school supervised by the Dayton Public Schools and operated by the University of Dayton. More recently UD has moved from a role of operating DECA to a collaborative role by giving DECA more autonomy in its governance, day-to-day operations, as well as fiscal operations.

At its founding, DECA was only the tenth early college academy in the United States. Early college academies ease the transition from high school to college by allowing upper class high school students to take college courses. In addition, these programs deliberately craft experiences that prepare students for applying to and succeeding in college.

DECA is tuition-free and welcomes approximately 425 students living in Dayton on a first-come, first-served basis. In the 2011-2012 school year, 73.7 percent of DECA students were classified as low income with 53 percent of students eligible for free or reduced school lunch. In that same year, 79 percent of DECA's students were African American, 12 percent white, and 2 percent Hispanic. The remaining 7 percent included students of Middle Eastern, Asian, and multiracial descent. Over 87 percent of DECA's students are potentially first-generation college students.

DECA has four distinctive structures that set it apart from traditional schools: advisory, the "Core Instructional Framework," gateways, and data teams. First, each student is assigned an advisor who serves as a mentor, role model, advocate, and instructor. Advisors conduct home visits and maintain frequent contact with the family throughout his/her time at DECA. This promotes a strong relationship between the student, advisor, and student's family. The relationships these young people develop with advisors and teachers are often the difference between student success and failure and students' sense of belonging in their classrooms and school. Students also often build relationships with classmates in these advisory sessions, establishing "families" that assist, encourage, and support young people in achieving their shared goal of going to college. Advisory was intended to provide students with role models and mentors throughout high school and into their college experiences, with the hope that many of these relationships would be maintained. Graduates from DECA frequently remain in contact with their mentors and receive general encouragement as well as support and assistance with their college courses and assignments. In many cases, an advisor is the only mentor in a student's life who has earned a college degree.

Second, DECA is implementing the "Core Instructional Framework" developed by University Park School in Boston, as a means of promoting consistency in instructional practices across all classes in the school. The focus is on rigorous instructional methods that emphasize problem solving and critical thinking as fundamental to student success and college readiness. These include, for example, Socratic seminars to develop students' speaking skills, abilities to defend claims, take a range of perspectives, and develop their academic voices. The Core Framework was selected because students often enter DECA several grade levels behind their generally Whiter and wealthier age group peers in non-urban settings in multiple subject areas and their parents and families are often unequipped to tackle skill gaps in the home. Classroom strategies are coupled with additional support via tutoring by teachers and teacher candidates at available after-school study sessions.

Third, in addition to coursework, students must pass six "gateways" to graduate from DECA. Each gateway consists of specific personal and academic learning goals that culminate with a presentation to a panel of teachers, the student's parents and family members, UD faculty, community leaders, and teacher candidates. The gateways include job shadows, internships, independent reading and writing projects (e.g., journals, an autobiography), community service, and academic requirements (e.g., college classes, use of planners, class attendance).

Fourth, DECA teachers use a variety of formative and interim assessments to drive instruction (Lee 2008). Teachers use data to modify and differentiate their instruction to meet the needs of their students. DECA uses data teams to analyze student assessment information to identify trends, seek clarification about student performance, and suggest interventions if necessary. Teachers meet weekly in data teams by content areas within and across grade levels to analyze students' performance based upon formative and summative assessments used to monitor student progress. Data is shared at faculty meetings for the purpose of improving instructional practice and student performance. As appropriate, data-based conversations may involve individual students, their families, and other stakeholders.

DECA has committed itself to an intentional culture of continuous reflection and improvement. The most recent change at DECA is the addition of PreK-2 and sixth grades as an attempt to close skill gaps earlier than the seventh grade year that was the school's original entry year for students. In summary, DECA is in the process of developing a PreK-12 school system that assists students in developing the required skills to be successful college classes.

Social Justice in Catholic and Marianist traditions

As a Marianist university, our conception of social justice draws from the Catholic, Marianist tradition. Social justice is rooted in the intrinsic dignity and worth of each and every person and the human rights that flow from that dignity. Dignity is God-given, not earned or granted to people based on their accomplishments, actions, abilities, and place in society or beliefs, religious or otherwise. A person cannot forfeit her or his dignity nor can society take it away. In short, all people possess dignity equally and regardless of race, nation, origin, gender, culture, or class (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace 2004).

Dignity is expressed in the context of human communities as human rights. Human rights support individuals' abilities to participate in the economic, political, and social life of community and include "rights to fulfillment of material needs, a guarantee of fundamental freedoms, and the protection of relationships that are essential to participation in the life of society" (National Conference of Catholic Bishops 1986, 79). Education is a basic, inalienable human right because it gives people tools to better their lives and to participate more fully in society (Vial 1994). We believe that inequities in the U.S. educational system deprive classes of people of their human right to education, effectively marginalizing them in society.

In the Marianist Catholic tradition, every individual must engage in the pursuit of social justice; this quest is not an optional activity for anyone. Social justice demands the reorganization of unjust institutions so that they are focused on the service of the common good (Ferree 1947/1997; Pope Pius XI 1931). The common good is the collection of social conditions that allow people, both as groups and individuals, to reach their potential and flourish as members of so-

ciety (Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace 2004; Vatican Council II 1965). Every individual, regardless of position or role, is called to work for the common good (Ferree 1947/1997). In addition, social justice is a social affair, not an individual undertaking. While individuals alone may be helpless against an unjust system, social justice is accomplished by individuals working together as members of groups (i.e., socially to change social structures) to transform social institutions. As educators, we are working together as PDS partners to address injustices in urban education.

Urban Education Challenges

Dayton, like urban school districts across America, faces a plethora of difficult challenges and dismal statistics related to the well-being of its citizens. Nationally, as many as 50 percent of students are not graduating in many urban districts, evidenced by recent data that indicates that out of the 3.5 million students in eighth grade, one million will drop out of school (Dewald 2003). Many factors contribute to low efficacy of urban schools. For example, urban students are more than twice as likely to be living in poverty as their counterparts found in the suburbs (Asimeng-Boahene 2010; Marley 2008), a fact that strongly correlates to student achievement and success (Fox, Connelly, and Snyder 2005; Hernandez 2011; National Center for Educational Statistics 2011; Richert, Donahue, and LaBoskey 2008). At the same time, urban school districts across the nation are economically strapped—seemingly in perpetuity—with schools that are dilapidated, overcrowded, and segregated (D'Amico 2001; Darling-Hammond 2010; Lee 2002; National Center for Education Statistics 2011). Compared to those in middle-class settings, urban classrooms are more likely to be poorly equipped, substandard, and crumbling, with students sharing outdated texts and substandard technology (Agarwal, Epstein, Oppenheim, Oyler, and Sonu 2010; Darling-Hammond 2010; Kozol 2005).

As classroom teachers and teacher educators, we recognize that we can do little to change the poverty that students encounter in their daily lives, and we can have little impact on the inadequate and substandard resources found in urban schools. The challenges our city students, schools, and communities are facing may seem overwhelming, but Marianist social justice advocate Ferree (1947/1997) reminds us that individuals must always act in the face of injustice and this action begins within one's own sphere of influence. We focused on working together to educate future teachers who could be effective with urban students, especially those living in poverty.

Many entry-level teachers are ill-prepared and ill-equipped to face the challenges they confront in urban schools (Chizhik 2003; Darling-Hammond 2000, 2009; Ingersoll 2003; Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff 2002; Williams 2003). A significant challenge facing urban schools is the cultural disconnect that often exists between urban teachers and their city students. In part because of limited cross-cultural experiences and a general cultural mismatch, many teacher candi-

dates lack knowledge about the increasingly diverse student populations they might serve (Collopy and Bowman 2008; Trumbull, Greenfield, and Quiroz 2003). The majority of teacher candidates are White, middle-class, monolingual females under twenty-five years of age with little experience with urban or high poverty settings (Follo, Hoerr, and Vorheis-Sargent 2002; Proctor, Rentz, and Jackson 2001; Terrill and Mark 2000). Studies have reported that teacher candidates hold negative perceptions of urban schools and diverse student populations and express a preference toward working in middle-class, suburban districts (Tiezzi and Cross 1997). In addition, research has consistently demonstrated that teachers must be content and pedagogical specialists in order to best promote student achievement and success (Banister and Reinhart 2011). A shortage of qualified teachers often translates to a shortage of higher-level courses (Darling-Hammond 2000).

Through our school/university PDS partnership, we have accepted the Marianist challenge to act for social justice in education. To do so, we have considered how together we can impact the quality of urban education. Specifically, we significantly revised the university sophomore and senior level experiences in our teacher education program in order to develop teachers who are both pedagogically and culturally competent.

Professional Development Schools

The UD/DECA partnership prepares future educators, promotes faculty development, encourages inquiry to improve practice, and enhances student achievement (Holmes Group 1990a, 1990b; Levine 2002; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education 2001). All nine criteria established by the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) as the "essentials" of PDS partnerships (NAPDS 2008) are met in our partnership, but for this chapter four relate directly to our teacher education program curriculum revision: essential two, school/university culture committed to the preparation of candidates; essential three, ongoing and reciprocal professional development; essential four, shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice; and essential eight, work across institutional settings.

Professional Development Schools are often compared to teaching hospitals because of their rigorous content and clinical experiences. Both PDSs and teaching hospitals require sound academic programs and strong clinical experiences to achieve the desired outcome: qualified professionals who can meet the needs of the clients (Teitel 2003). To accomplish our common goal of preparing effective and qualified teachers as stated in essential two, DECA and UD are working together to construct such effective learning opportunities. For example, the PDS experience introduces sophomore candidates to urban students through personal interactions and supports DECA students' success through individual tutoring. During teacher candidates' senior year, instructional rounds engage the candidates in a common conversation with the PDS teachers concerning their

planned observations, followed by observations and post-conferences for debriefing. Rounds are embedded into the DECA school curriculum and used for faculty development as well as training of teacher candidates. Rounds have enabled candidates, DECA faculty, and university faculty to address essential three and move the dialogue from the "what we do" to the "how" and "why" of teaching (Ladson-Billings 2006).

With an eye on best preparing effective teachers for urban districts, UD/DECA PDS began collaboration in 2006 on the redesign of the sophomore child and adolescent development course for teacher candidates seeking seventh-through twelfth- grade licensure. In 2009, conversations began on the redesign of the senior year methods course, embedding instructional rounds into the curriculum. Working together, members of our PDS partnership believed in order to meet our goals it was imperative that university and school faculty facilitate opportunities for candidates to make connections between theory and practice and assist candidates in understanding the contexts of teaching relating to essentials four and eight. So began the journey of reframing our teacher education curriculum.

Sophomore-Level Child and Adolescent Development Course

With this objective of best preparing teachers for city districts like ours, we began our redesign process in 2006 by concentrating on revisions to one course, a required sophomore-level child and adolescent development course. The course provides candidates with their first in-depth field experience in an urban school. We recognized that through a revision of this course we could best consider the characteristics of our teacher candidates and the collective insights of UD and DECA faculty about needed changes to our program.

A primary concern was the fact that our teacher candidates are similar to the pool of teacher candidates nationally (Follo, Hoerr, and Vorheis-Sargent 2002; Proctor, Rentz, and Jackson 2001; Terrill and Mark 2000). They are predominately white, middle- to upper-middle class, and describe their school experience as exclusively suburban (Collopy and Bowman 2008). Moreover, the majority of our candidates reported no or limited experiences with urban students or students living in poverty, with fewer than 20 percent having formed personal relationships as part of a formal role (e.g., Big Sister program) in an urban context or having been a member of a urban or economically disadvantaged community. We were concerned that our candidates' lack of experience with and isolation from other racial and ethnic groups, economically disadvantaged students, and urban settings could engender misconceptions and low expectations for students who were different from them (Howey 1999; Lalas 2007; Sleeter 2008). Similarly, we worried that candidates' conceptions of "normal" reflected their own characteristics with only minimal self-awareness of privilege, deficit thinking, broader sociopolitical contexts of inequity, and their own cultures.

Second, surveying our UD sophomores revealed that fully half hoped to eventually obtain future teaching positions in suburban schools while only 16 percent preferred teaching in an urban school. This suggested that, although 70 percent of our graduates teach in urban schools, most of our candidates would probably not proactively seek out opportunities to learn about urban students and communities. We were also concerned that many of them would not see urban field placements as relevant to their future plans.

In redesigning the development course that we identified as a pivotal point of impact for our students' preparation as future city teachers, we leveraged field experiences, readings, and course assignments to connect academic knowledge of development and theoretical frames with focused observations and personal interactions. Changes to the field experience evolved over several years. One primary change occurred in 2006 when DECA became the field site for the course. Each semester was book-ended with an orientation to DECA and debriefing on the field experience with DECA's principal. Approximately fifty candidates each semester observed for twenty hours in a mentor teacher's classroom. During observations, candidates collected field notes for a case study of one student's development. Before the field experience began candidates practiced taking observation notes that separated descriptions from their interpretations of their observations. To focus their data collection, candidates also constructed observation guides for each aspect of development. Guides included a specific aspect of development, data the candidate hoped to collect, questions for and activities with the student, and a related list of developmental concepts from course readings.

In the summer of 2009, a group of DECA teachers and the course instructor collaborated on the redesign of the field experience for this course based on three concerns. First, teacher candidates struggled to obtain enough data for their case studies if the students with whom they were working were absent or taking a test on a day they observed. Second, mentor teachers noted several candidates settled into being only passive observers at the back of the classroom and did not become proactive in moving out of their comfort zones and developing rapport with DECA students. Finally, the field experience afforded only haphazard opportunities for candidates to interact individually with students, thus making observations related to development more superficial and, we feared, the reinforcement of racial and class stereotypes more likely.

The redesigned field experience paired each candidate with a partner student. To support the changes, the team developed guidelines for teacher candidates to use in selecting partner students, expectations for candidates' interactions with partner students, and a revised form for evaluating candidates' performance. During their first visit to DECA the principal provides an orientation to the school's mission, structure, and demographics, underscores expectations for candidates' conduct and responsibilities, and introduces each candidate to their partner student. Instead of remaining in their mentor teacher's classroom, candidates now follow their partner student's schedule for fifteen hours. This model allows more extensive, varied observations of these youths' devel-

opment in a range of contexts and a richer foundation for the eventual case study assignment.

For the remaining five field experience hours, candidates have a number of options for tutoring students individually. Most work with students as arranged through their mentor teacher or with students who come to after-school study sessions. Others volunteer at school-organized events such as helping students revise papers at "Edit Night" or reviewing science content at "Nerd Night." Tutoring also affords opportunities for candidates to work closely with individual students, practice developing rapport with these young people, and identify strengths in students whose backgrounds are different from their own. These activities also represent an explicit attempt to give back to DECA, by providing over 500 hours of tutoring annually.

Because introducing teacher candidates to unfamiliar populations through field experiences alone can reinforce stereotypes, we revised course readings, activities, and assignments as well. In addition to textbook chapters that cover concepts, theories, and trends and are standard in development courses, the syllabus is permeated with readings on diversity in development. Linguistic development, for example, includes readings on dialects, code switching, and sociolinguistic behaviors. Classroom activities and discussion provide candidates a safe place to examine their assumptions and investigate their place in society.

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner 1979) serves as a touchstone throughout the courses. Candidates consider the many layers of environmental influences on development as they read, for example, about the magnitude, distribution, and impact of poverty on development, the social construction of race and privilege, and at-risk and resiliency paradigms. The case study with its focus on an individual student in one urban school dovetails with a second experiential assignment that takes candidates into the wider community. For their "Environmental Explorations" projects, candidates work in groups to collect data comparing prices, note the availability of food items at urban and suburban grocery stores, find housing for fictional families with varying levels of education and corresponding income levels, reflect on their own expectations after participating in events in which they are a racial or ethnic minority, or compare resources in tours of urban and suburban neighborhoods. Analyses of these data in light of course and additional readings are often eye-opening to candidates as they again reflect on their own social location, preconceptions, and the divergent experiences of their potential future students.

Instructional Rounds

A common complaint made about teacher education programs regards the separation between university-based classes and school-based student teaching (Darling-Hammond 2009). Yet, as early as their sophomore years, the adolescent young adult teacher candidates (in grades seven through twelve licensure area with content emphases in math, science, English, and social studies) are in-

volved in extensive observation, case study development, and tutoring at DECA. And to further address this inconsistency between theory and practice, the conversations between the UD and DECA partnership have focused on the implementation of "instructional rounds" due to the potential of this practice to provide collegial learning opportunities among teachers that are often lacking in schools (Sarason 1996). Rounds create a channel for communication about educational practice between school and university faculty, and provide all participants with occasions for situated learning in context of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Thompson and Cooner 2001).

Instructional rounds are a practice adapted from the medical field, where "Grand Rounds" are an integral feature of physician training. During rounds, medical residents learn clinical reasoning skills and develop knowledge of specific pathology areas through discussing patient cases with experienced physicians. Traditionally, medical rounds were conducted bedside and included clinical examinations of a patient. Today, rounds often include presentation of data on particularly intriguing, challenging, or unusual cases with no patient interaction.

Similarly, instructional rounds are structured in a variety of ways. Each of these strives to develop professional knowledge through analysis of data from specific clinical cases (Blagg 2008). Another variation of rounds involves the use of observations followed by evidence-based conversations on a pre-identified problem (Graham 2008; Rallis, Tedder, Lachman, and Elmore 2006) with teams developing strategies for differentiating instruction. Thompson and Cooner (2001) documented that rounds improved candidates' education by providing "first-hand experience in observing, questioning and reflecting on the 'best practice' strategies of master teachers in a collaborative and supportive environment" (87). In this study, mentor teachers found questions from teacher candidates were helpful in reflecting on their instructional practice and professional development. Rounds by themselves are a transformation of the often isolating practice of teaching into a communal examination of pedagogical practice (Thompson and Cooner 2001; Virtue 2005), making pedagogical thinking explicit and addressing both how to think about and what to do with issues of social context, students, curriculum, and instruction. Such practices have strengthened the reciprocal partnership between DECA and UD faculty and the link between the academic and clinical education of teachers.

Our model follows the instructional rounds study implemented by Del Prete (1997, 2006) at Clark University to create a reflective culture in the university's five collaborative schools, which are similar to PDS sites. The model includes pre-round discussion of the planned lesson, lesson observation, and post-observation discussion among teacher candidates and school and college faculty.

Structure of Instructional Rounds

During our pilot year of instructional rounds in 2009, twelve teacher candidates in the Adolescent Young Adult English language arts program, all females, participated in four rounds sessions during the fall semester prior to student teaching. Candidates observed four different teachers. One teacher had thirty years of teaching experience, two each had eight years of teaching experience, and one had been teaching for five years. Two had graduated from the University of Dayton and the other two from out-of-state institutions. Three of these teachers were female and one was male.

Prior to the instructional rounds session, the DECA teachers and methods faculty discuss and align topics being taught at DECA to the university course syllabi in order to coordinate the focus for the observations. This is a demonstration of the theory being taught in the methods course and the observation of practice at the school site. It was decided that each teacher being observed would prepare a lesson plan for the pre-conference and observation. Candidates train in the process of data collection using a focused observation form on three topics: verbal flow, question types, and engagement time. Verbal flow documents student participation in the class, questioning examines all inquiries posed by the teacher and students, and engagement time investigates student time on task.

On the day of the observation, the candidates and university faculty meet with the DECA teacher/teachers for a pre-conference. During this time the teacher provides a lesson plan that includes objectives, standards, activities, assessments, and other special considerations prior to the lesson (see appendix 1). The teacher also details a rationale as to why strategies or methods were selected, provides a context of the class to be observed, and poses a question to the candidates for data collection for the teacher's own professional development. Data collected might focus on such factors as the engagement time of students, the interaction time between the teacher and students, the types of questions being posed to students, or the number and nature of critical questions being used to promote student learning. The university faculty member serves as the facilitator for the rounds and candidates are data collectors and collaborators.

Following the pre-conference, candidates enter the teacher's class to observe the teaching episode and collect data. During this time, the teacher may engage the candidates in a "sidebar activity" by stopping the lesson and posing a question to the candidates about methodology or pedagogy being implemented, inquiring about what they believe is the next step in the teaching episode, or discussing an adjustment in the lesson plan. The candidate collects data using the social justice observation form (see appendix 2) as well as poses questions on the data collection form to be used in the debriefing.

Following the teaching episode, candidates, DECA teachers, and university methods faculty meet to report and discuss data, procedures, methods, and ask questions based on the observations. This is an opportunity for the teacher to discuss his/her view of the teaching episode prior to the candidate sharing data

collected. This is a time for all to collaborate, elaborate, and respond to situations that occurred within the context of the class in a non-evaluative stance. The candidates then share data and discussion follows about students, content, methodology, and instructional strategies that connect the theory from the university methods class to the reality of the classroom. This is a time for brainstorming, analyzing, and discussing data to contextualize the candidates' observations of the class. In many cases, teacher candidates will have been at DECA in previous semesters and will know students from tutoring and mentoring during their sophomore and junior years. This allows the candidates to add depth to the conversations concerning content, context, students, and procedures.

The data collected by the method professors for rounds during this pilot year consisted of three points: analysis of pre- and post-conference discussion and questions, candidates' reflections following the rounds, and candidates' observational data collected during the rounds. The analysis consisted of the method professors scripting the pre and post conference discussions, coding concept units, and categorizing the units. Based on this analysis, it became evident that pre-clinical experience candidates' questions focused on the "what" and the "how" of teaching. We found that 95 percent of the candidates' questions dealt with implementation issues and instructional procedures and 5 percent focused on planning of instruction. Teacher candidates were primarily were concerned with knowing which instructional strategy to select in delivering content.

Our analyses further revealed three emphases emerging from candidates' reflection papers: classroom management (100 percent), instructional strategies (75 percent) and assessment (1 percent). Every candidate commented on classroom management, either in their observational data or questions posed in the reflection paper. Instructional strategies were the second largest category, with candidates' identifying methods and strategies presented from the methods class or previous university classes, but with no elaboration of the strategy's effectiveness in the class. The third category, assessment, was identified by one person and related to a formative assessment technique observed during rounds.

The same three data points were collected for the post-clinical rounds: analysis consisting of scripting, coding, and analyzing concept units of pre and post conference, candidates' reflections, and candidates' observational data. Based on the results from the analysis of the pre-conference, teacher candidates asked many questions focusing on teaching new content and the differentiation of instruction. As well, candidates' reflection papers presented a broader view of the observed classrooms. They identified methods and strategies and elaborated on how these supported student learning. They also added rationales for using these and described personal experiences from their teaching experience related to these strategies. The responses given also included explanations of both how and why they would use the strategies.

Three common topics emerged from the reflection papers: teaching strategies, classroom management, and assessment. It was interesting to note that the teaching strategies moved from the second most frequently noted topic during the first set of rounds to the most commonly noted topic in the reflections, and that classroom management was actually highlighted less frequently. After the

clinical experience, teacher candidates commented that the most successful classroom management techniques were those that were integrated into the teachers' teaching methods and instructional strategies that engaged students and were implemented consistently throughout the classes.

In the post-conference discussion, the teacher candidates were more at ease with the DECA teachers and more willing to offer their candid observations. They identified difficult elements of the lesson and the frequent use of scaffolding to assist students with developing new content and forge connections to their prior knowledge. Teacher candidates were more comfortable making suggestions and using personal scenarios from their teaching to extend these conversations.

During the post-conference, DECA teachers were asked to write reflections of their experiences with the instructional rounds. They were required to reflect on what they learned about themselves as teachers, what they learned about their students from the data shared by the candidates, and how they grew as professionals. Based on their written reflections collected following the rounds experience, the DECA teachers' feedback was very positive about the use of instructional rounds and they consistently felt they received help with their teaching practices and grew in their abilities to enhance student learning. In her reflection, a tenth-grade English teacher with five years' teaching experience wrote:

> You reminded me to provide more opportunities for students to synthesize information independently. Based on students' assessments, you were right. Many students did not retain the information and I think that problem derives from the fact that they did not get a chance to truly own the knowledge.

A second teacher, an eleventh-grade English teacher with eight years of experience, responded in her reflection:

> One of your students suggested that I provide an opportunity for students to illustrate the various settings (in the novel the setting of the story shifted many times). I did it and found the lesson highlighted students' misconceptions, but it also forced them to look back at the text for imagery and detailed descriptions.

A third teacher, an eighth-grade Language Arts teacher with five years' teaching experience, responded, "Your feedback regarding student participation encouraged me to create seating charts that distribute active and passive participants evenly throughout the classroom."

Overall, we discovered that these rounds gave the candidates and the teachers opportunities to discuss the "thinking" of the teacher in planning and delivering lessons and to discover that it is not only knowledge of the curricular content that goes into teachers' planning, but also consideration of students' lives, experiences, and even broader contexts. Following the second session of rounds, the teacher candidates often asked questions about students they observed and what the teacher was doing to create opportunities for student learning and achievement. These structures and their attendant opportunities for reflection and dia-

logue clearly allowed all of the constituents of our PDS to develop the practice of working with and as a community of teachers.

Conclusion

In the United States, the lack of educational opportunities for urban students and the challenge of preparing quality teacher candidates for urban settings are some of the crucial social justice issues of our time. In this chapter we have offered a brief study and illustrations of a PDS partnership that simultaneously addresses the preparation of candidates, faculty professional development, and the improvement of student learning through transforming elements of both our PK-12 schools and our teacher preparation institutions. Our PDS work began by concentrating on one critical course in our teacher education program—our adolescent child development class—and then moved to a second course, the senior methods class. The Dayton Early College Academy (DECA) was founded on the University of Dayton's campus to prepare seventh through twelfth graders to become first generation college graduates. In turn, DECA has become an essential site for preparing University of Dayton teacher candidates to become effective teachers of traditionally underachieving students.

The pursuit of social justice in schools and PDSs is a continuing and imperfect endeavor. While preliminary evidence suggests that our efforts are moving us toward the enactment of social justice in our PDS contexts, we are continuing to refine the structure of our programs as we analyze data from our teacher candidates, collaborate with colleagues, respond to needs of current students, and learn from the research and experiences of others. The social justice work of transforming schools and empowering individuals continues at DECA and within University of Dayton's teacher education programs with, as Ferree (1947/1997) described, incremental changes by people within their spheres of life.

References

ACT. (2011). "College Student Retention and Graduation Rates from 2000 to 2012." Retrieved from http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/reports/graduation.html

Agarwal, Ruchi, Shira Epstein, Rachel Oppenheim, Celra Oyler, and Debbie Sonu. 2010. "From Ideal Practice and Back Again: Beginning Teachers Teaching for Social Justice." *Journal of Teacher Education* 61 (3): 237-47.

Asimeng-Boahene, Lewis. 2010. "Counter-Storytelling with African Proverbs: A Vehicle for Teaching Social Justice and Global Understanding in Urban, U.S. Schools." *Equity and Excellence in Education* 43 (4): 434-45.

Banister, Savilla, and Rachel Reinhart. 2011. "TPCK for Impact: Classroom Teaching Practices that Promote Social Justice and Narrow the Digital Divide in an Urban Middle School." *Computers in the School* 28 (2011): 5-26.

Blagg, Deborah. 2008. "Rounds for Teachers." In Harvard Graduate School of Education. Retrieved from http://www.uknow.gse.harvard.edu/teaching/TC103 607.html.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1979. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chizhik, Estella W. 2003. "Reflecting on the Challenges of Preparing Suburban Teachers for Urban Schools." *Education and Urban Society* 35 (4), 443-461.

Collopy, Rachel M., and Connie L. Bowman. 2008. "Teacher Candidate's Perceptions of Urban Schools and Students. *Ohio Journal of Teacher Education*, 21 (1), 25-30.

D'Amico, Joseph J. 2001. "A Closer Look at the Minority Achievement Gap." *ERS Spectrum* 19 (2): 4-10.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. 2000. "Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 8 (1) http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1/.

———. 2009. "We Must Strip Away Layers of Inequality." *Journal of Staff Development* 30 (2): 52-56.

———. 2010. *The Flat World and Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine Our Future.* New York: Teachers College.

Del Prete, Thomas. 1997. "The 'Rounds' Model of Professional Development." *From the* Inside 1 (1), 12-13.

———. 2006. "Equity and Effectiveness: Challenge and Promise in a Tale of Two Schools and a Partnership." *Equity and Excellence in Education* 39: 47-54.

Dewald, Matthew 2003. "A New Path to Higher Education." Dayton Educator 2: 12-15.

Ferree, William J. 1947/1997. *Introduction to Social Justice.* Arlington, VA: Center for Social and Economic Justice.

Follo, Eric J., Bill Hoerr, and Ann Vorheis-Sargent. 2002. "Where Will Urban High School Teachers for the 21st Century Come From?" *American Secondary Education* 30 (3): 2-22.

Fox, Mary Ann, Brooke Connolly, and Thomas Snyder. 2005. *Youth Indicators 2005: Trends in the Well-Being of American Youth.* Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, US Department of Education. Document NCES 2005-050.

Graham, Thomas. 2008. "Learning Rounds." Scotland. Retrieved from http://www.scssa.ed.ac.uk/system/files/Learning+Rounds+August08.pdf.

Hernandez, Donald. 2011. *Double Jeopardy: How Third Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation.* Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.aecf.org/media/Pubs/Topics?Education/Other?DoubleJeopardy HowThirdGradeReadingSkill- sandPoverty/DoubleJeopardyReport040511FINAL.pdf.

Holmes Group. 1990a. *Tomorrow's Schools of Education: A Report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. 1990b. *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Holmes Group. 1995. *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Howey, Kenneth. 1999. "Preparing Teachers for Inner City Schools." *Theory into Practice* 38 (1): 31-36.

Ingersoll, Richard M. 2003. "The Teacher Shortage: Myth or Reality?" *Educational Horizons* 81: 146-52.

Kozol, Jonathan. 2005. *The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America.* New York: Crown.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2006. "Yes, But How Do We Do It?: Practicing Culturally Relevant Pedagogy." In *White Teachers/Diverse Classrooms: A Guide to Building Inclusive Schools, Promoting High Expectations, and Eliminating Racism,* edited by Julie Landsmand and Chance Lewis, 29-42. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Lalas, Jose. 2007. "Teaching for Social Justice in Multicultural Urban Schools: Conceptualization and Classroom Implication." *Multicultural Education* 14 (3): 17-21.

Lankford, Hamilton, Susanna Loeb, and James Wyckoff. 2002. "Teacher Sorting and the Plight of Urban Schools: A Descriptive Analysis." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 24: 37-62.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, Jaekyung. 2002. "Racial and Ethnic Achievement Gap Trends: Reversing the Progress Toward Equity?" *Educational Researcher* 31 (1): 3-12.

———. 2008. "Is Test-Driven External Accountability Effective? Synthesizing the Evidence from Cross-State Causal-Comparative and Correlational Studies." *Review of Educational Research* 78 (3): 608-44.

Levine, Marsha. 2002. "Why Invest in Professional Development Schools?" *Education Leadership* 59, (6): 65-69.

Marley, David. 2008. "Rich and Poor Gap Has Failed to Narrow." *The Times Educational Supplement* 4815: 24-25.

National Association for Professional Development Schools. *What It Means to Be a Professional Development School.* 2008. Columbia, SC: National Association for Professional Development Schools. http://www.napds.org/nine_essen.html.

National Center for Education Statistics. 2011. *NEAP Data Explorer.* Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education. http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nde/.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. 1986. "Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy." Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. 2001. *Handbook for the Assessment of Professional Development Schools.* Washington DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. 2004. *Compendium of the Social Doctoring of the Church.* Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Pope Pius XI. 1931. "The Reconstruction of the Social Order (Quadragesimo Anno)." Encyclical letter. American Press, 1931.

Proctor, Thomas J., Nancy L. Rentz, and Marcus W. Jackson. 2001. "Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools: The Role of Field Experiences." *Western Journal of Black Studies* 25 (4): 219-227.

Rallis, Sharon, Jane Tedder, Andrew Lachman, and Richard Elmore. 2006. "Superintendents in Classrooms: From Collegial Conversations to Collaborative Action." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87: 537-545.

Richert, Anne, Donahue, David. M., and LaBoskey, Vicki. 2008. "Preparing White Teachers to Teach in a Racist Nation." In *Handbook of Social Justice in Education,* edited by William Ayers, Therese Quinn, and David Stovall, 640-653. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sarason, Seymour. 1996. *Revisiting "The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change."* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sleeter, Christine. 2008. "Preparing White Teachers for Diverse Students." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: Enduring Questions in Changing Contexts,* edited by Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, D. John McIntyre, and Kelly Demers, 559-582. New York, NY: Routledge.

Teitel, Lee. 2003. *Professional Development Schools Handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Terrill, Marguerite, and Dianne Mark. 2000. "Preservice Teachers' Expectations for Schools with Children of Color and Second Language Learners." *Journal of Teacher Education* 51 (2): 149-155.

Thompson, Susan, and Donna D. Cooner. 2001. "Grand Rounds: Not Just for Doctors. *Action in Teacher Education* 23 (3): 84-88.

Tiezzi, Linda J., and Beverly Cross. 1997. "Utilizing Research on Prospective Teachers' Beliefs to Inform Urban Field Experiences." *Urban Review* 29: 113-125.

Trumbull, Elise, Patricia M. Greenfield, and Blanca Quiroz. 2003. "Cultural Values in Learning and Education." In *Closing the Achievement Gap: A Vision for Changing Beliefs and Practices* 2nd ed., edited by Belinda Williams, 67-98. Alexandria: ASCD.

Vatican Council II. 1965. *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* (Gaudium et Spes). Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vatii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html.

Vial, Bernard. 1994. Education: In *Commentary on the Rule of Life*, edited by Ambrogio Albano, 375-393. Dayton, OH: North America Center for Marianist Studies.

Virtue, David C. 2005. "A Visit to ESOL Island: Notes on a Shadowing Experience with Middle Level English Language Learners in South Carolina." South Carolina Middle School Journal 13(1): 42-44.

Williams, Belinda. 2003. *Closing the Achievement Gap*. 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Appendix 1

Teacher Preparation Form for Pre-Conference Session

1. Lesson Plan: use your own format but be sure to include objectives, procedures, etc.
2. Questions: Three to five questions related to your teaching that will help guide the observation and reflection of the observers.
3. Background: provide a paragraph that will give perspective for your observers. Include relevant things like student ability levels, reasons for selecting certain teaching methods, or anything else you feel they need to know for this teaching episode.
4. Review your objectives for your lesson.
5. Explain what you'd like the observers to look for during your lesson for your professional development.
6. Discuss the role your observers are to have in the room (i.e., remain seated in the back, raise hand if have something to contribute, sit at tables with students, work with students)
7. Answer questions from the observers about the upcoming lesson.

Appendix 2

Social Justice Observation Form

I. Data Collection: Questions

1.   In the box below, record all the questions that the teacher poses to the
      students.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
│                                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

2.   Categorize the questions according to Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) and
      Revised (1995).

Knowledge Revised: Remembering	
Comprehension Revised: Understanding	
Application Revised: Applying	
Analysis Revised: Analyzing	
Synthesis Revised: Evaluating	
Evaluation Revised: Creating	

3.   Based on the categories—what data can you present to the teacher at
      the post-conference and what questions do you bring to the conversa-
      tion about teaching and learning?

II. Data Collection: Engagement Time
    1.   For this activity, you will observe four different students during a ten-minute interval. Record the activity, time on task, and time off task.
    2.   Based on your data, what factors increased or decreased engagement time and what questions do you bring to the conversation about teaching and learning?

Student	Observation
1	
2	
3	
4	

III. Data Collection: Interaction Time
    1.   You will receive the teacher's seating chart. For this observation, you are to use arrows representing who is talking and to whom. This may be teacher to student, student to teacher, and student to student.
    2.   Based on your data, what can you posit about the class? Where did the interaction originate, were certain students called upon more than others? What questions do you bring to the conversation about teaching and learning?