

Collaboration between the University and School District: Can it Work?

By Ruth A. Sandlin & Sharon Feigen

Ruth A. Sandlin is a professor in the Elementary/Bilingual Credential and Masters programs and the project investigator for the Inland Empire Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program at California State University, San Bernadino, California; Sharon Feigen is the principal at Jurupa Elementary School in the Fontana Unified School District, Fontana, California..

Collaborations

Collaboration among various educational agencies has been a key concept promoted in the educational reform movements in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Ward & Kunoff, 1982). There has been significant evidence that when state departments of education, county offices of education, school districts, schools, and even institutions of higher education pool their ideas, energies, and resources into a collaborative effort, the products or processes generated are not only richer in content but sounder in design and possible usefulness (Oja, 1990/1991).

Collaboration, however, is an often misunderstood idea that has the potential to circumvent any possible benefits to be gained by that collaboration. The *American Heritage Dictionary* (1982) defines the word collaborate two ways: (1) to work together,

Collaboration

especially in a joint intellectual effort; and (2) to cooperate reasonably, as with an enemy occupying one's country. It is the latter definition that more often than not sets the "tone" or "ambiance" of collaborative educational efforts. For example, one of the participants may end up doing more work than the other, causing resentment, or a philosophical difference may exist that could create a lack of understanding of one another's perspective. This does not have to be the resultant situation, and, in fact, when serious consideration and care is given to the initial planning stage of the collaboration as well as establishing clear guiding principles and choosing a cohesive group of members, the collaboration can be a true "joint intellectual effort."

The Fontana Unified School District-California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) New Teacher Project (January 1990 to June 1992) provided an excellent example of a collaborative model between a school district and university. This is not to say that there were not problems or obstacles experienced in that relationship, but those problems were appropriately attacked, with the benefits from collaboration being more profound and long-lasting.

A Collaborative Effort in Behalf of New Teachers

To understand how this collaboration originated and flourished, the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project will be briefly described. Fontana Unified School District and CSUSB implemented, in January 1990, a teacher induction program as part of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP). In the first year, the project actively involved 40 first-year teachers, eight student teachers, and nine veteran teachers (serving in peer coaching and consultant roles). The project was predicated on a preservice-to-inservice bridging model. In essence, the project began at the district level with student teachers being educated in an on-site teacher preparation program that included the student teachers being placed in new teacher mentors' classrooms. The mentors, therefore, served as resident or master teachers to the preservice teachers, but also worked with and supported beginning teachers hired within the district. This model allowed for continuity from the preservice to inservice phase. Two major goals were proposed for the project:

- (1) Through partnership between the university and the school district, beginning teachers would be provided with direction and assistance that was consistent from the preservice to induction phase.
- (2) New teachers would be provided with a program content designed to accommodate both the teachers' academic needs and affective needs.

Cognitively, teachers would be trained to provide a meaning-centered, academically rigorous curriculum to all student populations. Effectively, teachers would receive the support needed to foster a greater sense of self-worth and professionalism.

To achieve the goals stated above, the project built upon and brought together

two effective innovations: (1) a collaborative process model of teacher education piloted successfully by CSUSB for two quarters prior to the New Teacher Project with Fontana Unified School District; and (2) an induction process that combined an effective concerns-based approach with a close relationship with the mentor teachers. The preservice component clustered student teachers at four identified schools in Fontana where method courses, supervision, and special seminars were collaboratively planned and conducted by teams of master/mentor teachers and CSUSB faculty. In addition, strong second-quarter student teachers were placed in mentor classrooms to facilitate mentors' availability's to visit the new teachers. The induction component extended these collaborative relationships that began in student teaching in a way that was compatible with the affective needs of first-year teachers. A New Teacher Institute was created to meet new teachers' financial and affective needs. It was held during non-work hours (Saturdays and evenings) with monetary compensation at an hourly rate based on the beginning teachers' normal salary. Release time was provided for mentors to coach new teachers as follow-up on the themes of the Saturday institutes and evening sessions, or for new teachers to observe mentors.

The New Teacher Institute included:

- (1) a series of four-mini conferences held on Saturdays with a focus on three strands:
 - a. delivering a rigorous curriculum to low-achieving, at-risk, or Limited English Proficient Students;
 - b. teacher empowerment and self-actualization; and
 - c. specific content methodology
- (2) four evening sessions which built upon the ideas discussed during Saturday sessions while providing new learning and reflections on communication skills and the models/strategies of teaching.

Teachers were paid to attend the Saturday and evening meetings and were eligible to earn eight quarter-units applicable to both Fontana Unified School District's salary schedule and an MA program at CSUSB. Participants began to put together a portfolio at the preservice phase and expanded it through the first and second years of teaching. The portfolio became a cumulative record of professional growth, self-assessment, and critical self reflection.

All of the elements of the project were designed to achieve the following results:

- (1) To enable new teachers to be more effective in the classroom and feel more successful in their teaching.
- (2) To encourage long-term professional development in new teachers.

Program Implications

The program continued for the next two years with some modifications.

Collaboration

Approximately 90 teachers successfully completed the three-year program. During the three years, only one new teacher resigned due to poor teacher evaluation. However, she felt the Project provided support to her. In addition, the new teachers indicated that they felt more confident and better trained because of the project.

A continuing Masters program from CSUSB was established at the Fontana District during the second year of the project for new teachers who had finished the initial induction element (first year) and wanted to continue their professional development. This program thrived and graduated approximately 20 teachers in the Fall of 1993.

There were some lessons, however, learned by the district as well as the university. One of the biggest problems from the perspective of the university and the district was, even though they felt they were doing a good job supporting beginning teachers, they were less confident that they had impacted any real change in the teaching effectiveness of the new teachers or in the participating schools. Such improvements might have occurred, but the district and the university were not able to assess the available information in any meaningful fashion. However, based on anecdotal information and informal feedback from participants, Fontana Unified School District and CSUSB did believe they had made great strides in supporting new teachers and creating a collaborative relationship that was unique and rewarding. Research on the CNTP confirmed that, when support was intensive and well-delivered, projects did impact teacher development in many ways, and, in many cases, impacted the culture of the school.

University-School District Collaboration

If a collaboration between a district and university is to be effective, attention needs to be given to the collaboration as well as to the program. Collaboration between Fontana Unified School District and CSUSB began at the very earliest stages of the project. Two key figures, the assistant superintendent from the district and the department chair of the elementary/bilingual program in the School of Education at CSUSB started the initial phase. An invitation was extended to Fontana District staff and faculty from CSUSB to attend a planning and conceptualization meeting. Some of these people had worked together before in projects at schools in Fontana, so there was less of that awkward feeling that sometimes permeates first meetings. Over a series of meetings, a strong, collaborated proposal unfolded for a New Teacher Project. All of the members of this first planning group were enthusiastic and often commented that there was none of that “school people vs. university people” attitude present during this phase. It is hard to pinpoint why there was such a positive exchange initially without the potential constraints that often exist in new collaborative efforts, but it may have to do with the fact that because so many of these people had worked together before, credibility between both parties had been established previously.

The proposal was funded and in January, 1990, the program was supposed to be up and running. At this juncture, two people who had little or no involvement in writing the grant took over the reins of implementing the New Teacher Project. An instructional specialist in new teacher support became the district project director; a second year faculty member from CSUSB with background in educational psychology and preservice teacher education became the university project director. In some cases, the fact that two new people who neither knew each other nor had been part of the grant conceptualization stage were going to try and tackle such a complicated task might have been considered folly, but in the Fontana-CSUSB project it proved to be beneficial, especially in terms of continuing this collaborative relationship with a healthy, unbiased perspective.

The co-directors of the project, for the most part, were of equal professional status and perceived their respective roles as equally important. Both individuals had similar elementary teaching experiences and comparable adult learning or supervisory experiences. It is important in any give-and-take relationship that all constituents have an equal participation base (Sandlin, Young, & Karge, 1992). Although their inexperience and fresh attitude proved to be a benefit of the Project, it also created a problem that often plagues new collaborations. Neither co-director had enough power and status within their own organizations to make major decisions. For example, as part of the New Teacher Project, new teachers were involved in Masters Degree classes through CSUSB. Several core MA classes were identified as appropriate for the new teachers and were offered on-site in Fontana. However, after the first year of implementation, it was clear that the classes were too difficult and not relevant for many new teachers. The university project director facilitated modifications of the classes as much as possible, but did not have the power to make major decisions within the context of the MA classes.

The second year, however, the co-directors were able to make major modifications in the delivery and pacing of the classes. Through these collaborative efforts, new teachers were given more choices to fit their individual needs. Satisfaction and relevancy of the classes for the new teachers were then high. Additional course and network sessions were also offered separate from the MA classes.

Commitment from members involved in a collaboration must also be a consideration. If there is more than one leadership role, as in a school district/university collaboration, those roles need to be defined in terms of equal time spent doing the job, levels of responsibility, and recognition to be gained from successful completion of the collaboration.

Often, collaborations fail because one member feels they are working harder than the others or that they are not being recognized for their efforts. Because the co-directors in the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project were equally committed to the success of the project and both were recognized from each of their institutions as worthy and productive, there was no competition or jostling for rank.

Collaboration

Another potential problem for collaborative ventures, especially between universities and school districts, is the understanding of how financial resources are allocated. When district personnel assume a new responsibility, it often becomes part of their job requirement. The salary base of the individual in question does not change, but job duties are rearranged so that the new assignment can be managed. However, at the university, faculty duties are typically determined by the number of courses an individual teaches in a given year. Therefore, an individual's time must be bought out with real money to free that individual up for additional duties. It would appear then, in some cases, that the university is receiving more money for salary of faculty than the school district might be receiving for district personnel participation. In actuality, both the district and the university are being compensated at a fairly equal basis, but the numbers are confusing and leave the door open to misunderstandings and hidden agendas.

In the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project this did not occur. The co-directors made a concerted effort to discuss fiscal concerns from both the school district's perspective as well as the university's. Again, because the co-directors were so open with each other, they were able to gain a better understanding of how both the district and university compute and deal with financial considerations.

Many of the qualities that characterized the successfulness of the Fontana-CSUSB Project were also true of the other pilot projects involved in the CNTP. Program directors reflecting on successful collaborations indicated that it is important to understand the differences in institutional structures and relationships within those structures. In building district/university partnerships, each partner must recognize what the other can contribute to the collaborative effort. Garmston and Bartell (1991) point out potential contributions of each partner in such a relationship, based on their conversations with program directors and participants:

School-based educators bring:

- ⊃ familiarity with the problems facing new teachers;
- ⊃ an understanding of the setting in which new teachers teach;
- ⊃ knowledge of the school culture;
- ⊃ an understanding of the curriculum the teacher is expected to teach; and
- ⊃ formal institutional responsibilities and a set of expectations about teacher performance.

University-based educators bring:

- ⊃ professional expertise in academic content, curriculum, and pedagogy;
- ⊃ an understanding of how the new teacher has been prepared;
- ⊃ a previous helping relationship already established with the new teacher;
- ⊃ an understanding of beginning teaching and the problems faced by novices;
- ⊃ some flexibility in allocation of time; and
- ⊃ research and evaluation expertise.

Although CSUSB and the Fontana Unified School District felt their collaboration was highly unusual, there were some commonalities among the successful

CNTP projects. In well-managed CNTP collaborations, there was consistent leadership and administration, sufficient time was allocated for project directors to administer the local projects, the players' positions were sufficiently influential for effective administration, and the project directors were familiar with the local context of the schools. Effective collaborations between districts and a universities were characterized by a designation of one agency as lead, a clear division of responsibilities, and a delegation of duties to coordinators who were accountable to the project director.

Collaborations can require a great deal of time and hard work, and sometimes are not worth the effort. Collaboration among various organizations probably requires more thought, carefully articulated goals, and planning than working singly. On the other hand, the pay-off can be greater and the outcomes more desirable. Although the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project experienced the typical problems and adjustments that occur in any new collaboration, for the most part it was extremely successful. Because of this unique partnership between CSUSB and the Fontana Unified School District, the needs of the beginning teacher are now better understood both in the pre-service stage (where student teachers are placed in district schools, but are accountable to the university) and in the induction phase (where beginning teachers are accountable to the district). By working together collaboratively and seeing both sides of the coin, this partnership continually strived toward a common goal—success for beginning teachers. And, in turn, the collaborative model has proven to be a success for the university and the school district.

The successful collaborations begun in CNTP have contributed to another collaboration designed and implemented as part of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program. Beginning in 1993, participants in the Fontana/CSUSB CNTP Project have combined with participants in what was formerly a Riverside County Office of Education-led collaborative with 22 districts and the University of California, Riverside. This new partnership operates The Inland Empire BTSA Program, representing a consortium of two county offices of education (Riverside and San Bernardino), 18 school districts, and two universities. (This BTSA program is described in the article by Linda Scott in this issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly*). Special attention has been given to the linkages with preservice preparation programs in this new partnership. The early lessons learned in CNTP have helped contribute to the understanding of what is required to build, develop, and nurture a partnership program.

References

- American Heritage Dictionary* (1982). Second Edition. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Garmston, S. & Bartell, C.A. (eds.) (1991). *New teacher success: You can make a difference*.

Collaboration

- Riverside, CA: Riverside County Office of Education.
- Oja, S.N. (Winter, 1990/1991). The dynamics of collaboration: A collaborative approach to supervision in a five year teacher education program. *Action in Teacher Education*, 12(4), 11-20.
- Sandlin, R.A., Young, B.L. & Karge, B. D. (1992, November). A University induction model for new faculty. Paper presented at the California Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Ward, B.A. & Tikunoff, W.J. (1982). Collaborative research. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education's Implications of Research on Teaching for Practice Conference, Washington, DC.

Collaboration between the University and School District: Can it Work?

By Ruth A. Sandlin & Sharon Feigen

Ruth A. Sandlin is a professor in the Elementary/Bilingual Credential and Masters programs and the project investigator for the Inland Empire Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program at California State University, San Bernadino, California; Sharon Feigen is the principal at Jurupa Elementary School in the Fontana Unified School District, Fontana, California..

Collaborations

Collaboration among various educational agencies has been a key concept promoted in the educational reform movements in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Ward & Kunoff, 1982). There has been significant evidence that when state departments of education, county offices of education, school districts, schools, and even institutions of higher education pool their ideas, energies, and resources into a collaborative effort, the products or processes generated are not only richer in content but sounder in design and possible usefulness (Oja, 1990/1991).

Collaboration, however, is an often misunderstood idea that has the potential to circumvent any possible benefits to be gained by that collaboration. The *American Heritage Dictionary* (1982) defines the word collaborate two ways: (1) to work together,

Collaboration

especially in a joint intellectual effort; and (2) to cooperate reasonably, as with an enemy occupying one's country. It is the latter definition that more often than not sets the "tone" or "ambiance" of collaborative educational efforts. For example, one of the participants may end up doing more work than the other, causing resentment, or a philosophical difference may exist that could create a lack of understanding of one another's perspective. This does not have to be the resultant situation, and, in fact, when serious consideration and care is given to the initial planning stage of the collaboration as well as establishing clear guiding principles and choosing a cohesive group of members, the collaboration can be a true "joint intellectual effort."

The Fontana Unified School District-California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) New Teacher Project (January 1990 to June 1992) provided an excellent example of a collaborative model between a school district and university. This is not to say that there were not problems or obstacles experienced in that relationship, but those problems were appropriately attacked, with the benefits from collaboration being more profound and long-lasting.

A Collaborative Effort in Behalf of New Teachers

To understand how this collaboration originated and flourished, the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project will be briefly described. Fontana Unified School District and CSUSB implemented, in January 1990, a teacher induction program as part of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP). In the first year, the project actively involved 40 first-year teachers, eight student teachers, and nine veteran teachers (serving in peer coaching and consultant roles). The project was predicated on a preservice-to-inservice bridging model. In essence, the project began at the district level with student teachers being educated in an on-site teacher preparation program that included the student teachers being placed in new teacher mentors' classrooms. The mentors, therefore, served as resident or master teachers to the preservice teachers, but also worked with and supported beginning teachers hired within the district. This model allowed for continuity from the preservice to inservice phase. Two major goals were proposed for the project:

- (1) Through partnership between the university and the school district, beginning teachers would be provided with direction and assistance that was consistent from the preservice to induction phase.
- (2) New teachers would be provided with a program content designed to accommodate both the teachers' academic needs and affective needs.

Cognitively, teachers would be trained to provide a meaning-centered, academically rigorous curriculum to all student populations. Effectively, teachers would receive the support needed to foster a greater sense of self-worth and professionalism.

To achieve the goals stated above, the project built upon and brought together

two effective innovations: (1) a collaborative process model of teacher education piloted successfully by CSUSB for two quarters prior to the New Teacher Project with Fontana Unified School District; and (2) an induction process that combined an effective concerns-based approach with a close relationship with the mentor teachers. The preservice component clustered student teachers at four identified schools in Fontana where method courses, supervision, and special seminars were collaboratively planned and conducted by teams of master/mentor teachers and CSUSB faculty. In addition, strong second-quarter student teachers were placed in mentor classrooms to facilitate mentors' availability's to visit the new teachers. The induction component extended these collaborative relationships that began in student teaching in a way that was compatible with the affective needs of first-year teachers. A New Teacher Institute was created to meet new teachers' financial and affective needs. It was held during non-work hours (Saturdays and evenings) with monetary compensation at an hourly rate based on the beginning teachers' normal salary. Release time was provided for mentors to coach new teachers as follow-up on the themes of the Saturday institutes and evening sessions, or for new teachers to observe mentors.

The New Teacher Institute included:

- (1) a series of four-mini conferences held on Saturdays with a focus on three strands:
 - a. delivering a rigorous curriculum to low-achieving, at-risk, or Limited English Proficient Students;
 - b. teacher empowerment and self-actualization; and
 - c. specific content methodology
- (2) four evening sessions which built upon the ideas discussed during Saturday sessions while providing new learning and reflections on communication skills and the models/strategies of teaching.

Teachers were paid to attend the Saturday and evening meetings and were eligible to earn eight quarter-units applicable to both Fontana Unified School District's salary schedule and an MA program at CSUSB. Participants began to put together a portfolio at the preservice phase and expanded it through the first and second years of teaching. The portfolio became a cumulative record of professional growth, self-assessment, and critical self reflection.

All of the elements of the project were designed to achieve the following results:

- (1) To enable new teachers to be more effective in the classroom and feel more successful in their teaching.
- (2) To encourage long-term professional development in new teachers.

Program Implications

The program continued for the next two years with some modifications.

Collaboration

Approximately 90 teachers successfully completed the three-year program. During the three years, only one new teacher resigned due to poor teacher evaluation. However, she felt the Project provided support to her. In addition, the new teachers indicated that they felt more confident and better trained because of the project.

A continuing Masters program from CSUSB was established at the Fontana District during the second year of the project for new teachers who had finished the initial induction element (first year) and wanted to continue their professional development. This program thrived and graduated approximately 20 teachers in the Fall of 1993.

There were some lessons, however, learned by the district as well as the university. One of the biggest problems from the perspective of the university and the district was, even though they felt they were doing a good job supporting beginning teachers, they were less confident that they had impacted any real change in the teaching effectiveness of the new teachers or in the participating schools. Such improvements might have occurred, but the district and the university were not able to assess the available information in any meaningful fashion. However, based on anecdotal information and informal feedback from participants, Fontana Unified School District and CSUSB did believe they had made great strides in supporting new teachers and creating a collaborative relationship that was unique and rewarding. Research on the CNTP confirmed that, when support was intensive and well-delivered, projects did impact teacher development in many ways, and, in many cases, impacted the culture of the school.

University-School District Collaboration

If a collaboration between a district and university is to be effective, attention needs to be given to the collaboration as well as to the program. Collaboration between Fontana Unified School District and CSUSB began at the very earliest stages of the project. Two key figures, the assistant superintendent from the district and the department chair of the elementary/bilingual program in the School of Education at CSUSB started the initial phase. An invitation was extended to Fontana District staff and faculty from CSUSB to attend a planning and conceptualization meeting. Some of these people had worked together before in projects at schools in Fontana, so there was less of that awkward feeling that sometimes permeates first meetings. Over a series of meetings, a strong, collaborated proposal unfolded for a New Teacher Project. All of the members of this first planning group were enthusiastic and often commented that there was none of that “school people vs. university people” attitude present during this phase. It is hard to pinpoint why there was such a positive exchange initially without the potential constraints that often exist in new collaborative efforts, but it may have to do with the fact that because so many of these people had worked together before, credibility between both parties had been established previously.

The proposal was funded and in January, 1990, the program was supposed to be up and running. At this juncture, two people who had little or no involvement in writing the grant took over the reins of implementing the New Teacher Project. An instructional specialist in new teacher support became the district project director; a second year faculty member from CSUSB with background in educational psychology and preservice teacher education became the university project director. In some cases, the fact that two new people who neither knew each other nor had been part of the grant conceptualization stage were going to try and tackle such a complicated task might have been considered folly, but in the Fontana-CSUSB project it proved to be beneficial, especially in terms of continuing this collaborative relationship with a healthy, unbiased perspective.

The co-directors of the project, for the most part, were of equal professional status and perceived their respective roles as equally important. Both individuals had similar elementary teaching experiences and comparable adult learning or supervisory experiences. It is important in any give-and-take relationship that all constituents have an equal participation base (Sandlin, Young, & Karge, 1992). Although their inexperience and fresh attitude proved to be a benefit of the Project, it also created a problem that often plagues new collaborations. Neither co-director had enough power and status within their own organizations to make major decisions. For example, as part of the New Teacher Project, new teachers were involved in Masters Degree classes through CSUSB. Several core MA classes were identified as appropriate for the new teachers and were offered on-site in Fontana. However, after the first year of implementation, it was clear that the classes were too difficult and not relevant for many new teachers. The university project director facilitated modifications of the classes as much as possible, but did not have the power to make major decisions within the context of the MA classes.

The second year, however, the co-directors were able to make major modifications in the delivery and pacing of the classes. Through these collaborative efforts, new teachers were given more choices to fit their individual needs. Satisfaction and relevancy of the classes for the new teachers were then high. Additional course and network sessions were also offered separate from the MA classes.

Commitment from members involved in a collaboration must also be a consideration. If there is more than one leadership role, as in a school district/university collaboration, those roles need to be defined in terms of equal time spent doing the job, levels of responsibility, and recognition to be gained from successful completion of the collaboration.

Often, collaborations fail because one member feels they are working harder than the others or that they are not being recognized for their efforts. Because the co-directors in the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project were equally committed to the success of the project and both were recognized from each of their institutions as worthy and productive, there was no competition or jostling for rank.

Collaboration

Another potential problem for collaborative ventures, especially between universities and school districts, is the understanding of how financial resources are allocated. When district personnel assume a new responsibility, it often becomes part of their job requirement. The salary base of the individual in question does not change, but job duties are rearranged so that the new assignment can be managed. However, at the university, faculty duties are typically determined by the number of courses an individual teaches in a given year. Therefore, an individual's time must be bought out with real money to free that individual up for additional duties. It would appear then, in some cases, that the university is receiving more money for salary of faculty than the school district might be receiving for district personnel participation. In actuality, both the district and the university are being compensated at a fairly equal basis, but the numbers are confusing and leave the door open to misunderstandings and hidden agendas.

In the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project this did not occur. The co-directors made a concerted effort to discuss fiscal concerns from both the school district's perspective as well as the university's. Again, because the co-directors were so open with each other, they were able to gain a better understanding of how both the district and university compute and deal with financial considerations.

Many of the qualities that characterized the successfulness of the Fontana-CSUSB Project were also true of the other pilot projects involved in the CNTP. Program directors reflecting on successful collaborations indicated that it is important to understand the differences in institutional structures and relationships within those structures. In building district/university partnerships, each partner must recognize what the other can contribute to the collaborative effort. Garmston and Bartell (1991) point out potential contributions of each partner in such a relationship, based on their conversations with program directors and participants:

School-based educators bring:

- ⊃ familiarity with the problems facing new teachers;
- ⊃ an understanding of the setting in which new teachers teach;
- ⊃ knowledge of the school culture;
- ⊃ an understanding of the curriculum the teacher is expected to teach; and
- ⊃ formal institutional responsibilities and a set of expectations about teacher performance.

University-based educators bring:

- ⊃ professional expertise in academic content, curriculum, and pedagogy;
- ⊃ an understanding of how the new teacher has been prepared;
- ⊃ a previous helping relationship already established with the new teacher;
- ⊃ an understanding of beginning teaching and the problems faced by novices;
- ⊃ some flexibility in allocation of time; and
- ⊃ research and evaluation expertise.

Although CSUSB and the Fontana Unified School District felt their collaboration was highly unusual, there were some commonalities among the successful

CNTP projects. In well-managed CNTP collaborations, there was consistent leadership and administration, sufficient time was allocated for project directors to administer the local projects, the players' positions were sufficiently influential for effective administration, and the project directors were familiar with the local context of the schools. Effective collaborations between districts and a universities were characterized by a designation of one agency as lead, a clear division of responsibilities, and a delegation of duties to coordinators who were accountable to the project director.

Collaborations can require a great deal of time and hard work, and sometimes are not worth the effort. Collaboration among various organizations probably requires more thought, carefully articulated goals, and planning than working singly. On the other hand, the pay-off can be greater and the outcomes more desirable. Although the Fontana-CSUSB New Teacher Project experienced the typical problems and adjustments that occur in any new collaboration, for the most part it was extremely successful. Because of this unique partnership between CSUSB and the Fontana Unified School District, the needs of the beginning teacher are now better understood both in the pre-service stage (where student teachers are placed in district schools, but are accountable to the university) and in the induction phase (where beginning teachers are accountable to the district). By working together collaboratively and seeing both sides of the coin, this partnership continually strived toward a common goal—success for beginning teachers. And, in turn, the collaborative model has proven to be a success for the university and the school district.

The successful collaborations begun in CNTP have contributed to another collaboration designed and implemented as part of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program. Beginning in 1993, participants in the Fontana/CSUSB CNTP Project have combined with participants in what was formerly a Riverside County Office of Education-led collaborative with 22 districts and the University of California, Riverside. This new partnership operates The Inland Empire BTSA Program, representing a consortium of two county offices of education (Riverside and San Bernardino), 18 school districts, and two universities. (This BTSA program is described in the article by Linda Scott in this issue of *Teacher Education Quarterly*). Special attention has been given to the linkages with preservice preparation programs in this new partnership. The early lessons learned in CNTP have helped contribute to the understanding of what is required to build, develop, and nurture a partnership program.

References

- American Heritage Dictionary* (1982). Second Edition. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Garmston, S. & Bartell, C.A. (eds.) (1991). *New teacher success: You can make a difference*.

Collaboration

- Riverside, CA: Riverside County Office of Education.
- Oja, S.N. (Winter, 1990/1991). The dynamics of collaboration: A collaborative approach to supervision in a five year teacher education program. *Action in Teacher Education*, 12(4), 11-20.
- Sandlin, R.A., Young, B.L. & Karge, B. D. (1992, November). A University induction model for new faculty. Paper presented at the California Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Ward, B.A. & Tikunoff, W.J. (1982). Collaborative research. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education's Implications of Research on Teaching for Practice Conference, Washington, DC.