

The Effect of a School-University Partnership on the Student Teaching Experience

By Linda Kroll, Jane Bowyer,
Marty Rutherford,
& Margaret Hauben

Linda Kroll is an associate professor and Jane Bowyer is a professor and head, both with the Department of Education at Mills College, Oakland, California; Marty Rutherford, a former teacher at John Swett Elementary School in the Oakland Unified School District, is a staff member with the Spencer Foundation; and Margaret Hauben is retired from her position as assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction with the Oakland Unified School District. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Boston, Massachusetts, in April of 1990.

The notion of school-university collaboration is not new in United States education. As early as the late 19th century, members of the two educational communities worked together for the good of educating American youth (Clark, 1988; Wesley, 1957). During the past century, however, separation between institutions of higher learning and the public schools has been the norm. Schools and universities continue to share the responsibilities of preparing new teachers to enter teaching, but in large part they do so separately. Institutions of higher learning have been responsible for educating prospective teachers in theory and methodology, while the public school classroom has served as a place for modeling teaching strategies and as a practice ground for prospective teachers to try out teaching. Although the student teacher may be supervised by a college faculty member, as well as by the master teacher in classroom, the

relationship between college faculty and public schools has typically been brief and limited in scope and substance.

During the last decade school-university partnerships and collaborations have increased, brought on by the call for educational reform (Carnegie, 1986; Clark, 1988). The realization is growing that more collaborative connections can benefit all parties: college faculty, public school faculty, student teachers, and public school students (Burch, 1993; Driscoll, Benson & Livneh, 1994; Gifford & Gabelko, 1987; Goodlad, 1991, 1984; Williams, 1988). College faculty have an opportunity to learn more about classroom practice; public school faculty have the opportunity to become involved in educational research; both faculties can contribute more effectively to teacher education if they are more familiar with each other's area of expertise. The latest research can then inform classroom teaching techniques and the reality of the classroom can inform college course content.

Most partnerships are initiated at the university level (Gifford, 1987; Goodlad, 1988) where the notion of research lends itself to the examination of the school community. Furthermore, the university has greater access to the ways and means of obtaining funding and resources for financing expensive, long-term projects. Partnerships that survive over a long time usually have a consistent means of financial support (Goodlad, 1988); however, a determination to continue with or without financial backing is essential. Successful partnerships exist because of a sincere desire to be part of school renewal.

Problems experienced in school-university partnerships are similar to problems felt by partnerships in most fields where diverse groups come together to collaborate. As John I. Goodlad (1988), R.W. Clark (1988), and Philip L. Schlechty and Betty L. Whitford (1988) pointed out, the nature and culture of the schools and the teacher education institutions differ. Each operates on different sets of needs, assumptions and goals, as well as different reward and credit systems. Conflicts arise around goals, accountability, and rewards. At the university level, few incentives exist for school collaboration rather than research. At the public school level, no incentives are given for working with teacher education or educational research. Teachers, university faculty members, and administrators come to partnerships with set agendas and priorities. To refocus the partnership or the collaboration on a set of mutually agreed upon criteria and goals is often difficult (Gifford, 1987; Goodlad, 1988; Lemlech & Hertzog-Foliart, 1993; Williams, 1988).

Communicating and understanding one another in a partnership are a constant struggle. Classroom teachers commonly believe that members of institutions of higher learning are too far removed from the classroom to understand the intricacies involved in orchestrating the education of children. Researchers, conversely, tend to feel shut out of the classroom by teachers who are intimidated by having "experts" open the doors that have been traditionally closed (Goodlad, 1984). Neither thinks the other can connect theory and practice effectively. Therefore, partnerships have found that the first step they must take to create a successful

environment for collaboration is to open the lines of communication, dedicating "quality time to engage in reflective practice—to bring together knowledge, inquiry and action" (Goodlad, 1988, p. 27). When such an environment is created, where collaborative reflection and inquiry are supported, "school district personnel and university faculty (become) significant contributors to the professionalization of teaching" (Driscoll *et al*, 1994, p. 67).

The Mills College-Oakland Unified School District Partnership

For five years, Mills College's Department of Education worked in a partnership with John Swett Elementary School in the Oakland Unified School District, in Oakland, California. Mills College is a small women's college that has several coeducational graduate programs including a long-standing program in teacher education. John Swett is a small, neighboring, inner city elementary school (six regular education classrooms and two special education classrooms) with a culturally and economically diverse student population.

The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation funded a partnership whose overall aim was to create a new model for teacher education; one where teachers and professors together define teacher knowledge, and the role of the master teacher is transformed into the role of clinical professor, not unlike the role of the doctor or lawyer or businessperson in their respective professional training (Goodlad, 1988). This role transformation could have the effect of promoting teacher empowerment and confidence. The partnership thus:

- (a) Provided for a concerted, coordinated effort in inservice education for Oakland classroom teachers and Mills faculty;
- (b) Provided an arena where both college faculty and school faculty could experiment in putting theory into practice with particular curriculum, both for school-age students and prospective teachers;
- (c) Defined and refined the role of the master teacher in the education of new teachers; and
- (d) Provided a center for student teaching that was closely linked with the college and the college curriculum.

One aspect of this partnership was to provide a center for student teaching in the form of a demonstration school that was closely linked with the college and the college curriculum.

Although most partnerships involve several school districts in league with large institutions of teacher education (*e.g.*, University of California, Berkeley with three neighboring school districts, see Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988), the partnership of Mills College with the Oakland School District's John Swett School was more limited. The small size of both the college and the school involved in the partnership allowed for more intimate working relationships between the faculties.

In the beginning, members of the Mills College Education Department met

School-University Partnership

with the principal of John Swett School and interested teachers to establish the site as a demonstration school both for the students enrolled at Swett and for the student teachers at Mills. Active support of both the Mills College administration and the Oakland Unified School District school board and administration encouraged and allowed true collaboration between the two institutions in a number of arenas. Mills and John Swett faculties jointly selected John Swett teachers. The principal of John Swett School (a half-time position) was a visiting faculty member in the college Department of Education, teaching courses in the teacher education program and supervising student teachers. The head of the Department of Education at Mills and the school principal shared the directorship of the partnership.

Once the faculty of John Swett School was hired, student teachers were assigned to all six regular education classrooms on a continual basis. They were supervised on site by the principal. This arrangement proved beneficial for the students. The principal knew the teachers and the children at John Swett well. She provided frequent observations and consultation with each student, supporting her and negotiating when necessary with the master teacher. She also provided support for the master teachers and helped them to feel part of the entire credential program.

In addition to direct work with student teachers, relationships between the Swett faculty and Mills education faculty developed. Meetings were held at the beginning of each year of the partnership to establish goals for the year. The goals focused on field placement designs, student teacher instruction, student instruction, and Swett and Mills faculty staff development. In the final years of the partnership, an executive committee, composed of the college coordinator, two Swett faculty members, and the Swett principal, met to plan regular joint conversations between the two faculties.

With regard to field placements, a number of different models were tried. Initially, students were assigned to one placement at Swett and one placement at another school. During their placement at Swett, students were involved not only with one classroom, but were able to observe and teach in other classrooms. The sense at Swett was that the student teachers were assigned not simply to one teacher but to the school as a whole.

The teachers at Swett and the faculty in the Department of Education at Mills discussed other alternative models for the field placement component of the program. A second model involved actually assigning each student teacher to two different classrooms during one semester placement. Students spent one 11-week period in an upper grade classroom and a second 11-week period in a lower grade classroom. Again, with the principal as the supervisor, this model worked well for many of the students. They were included in the working of the school in a variety of ways: they observed in the special education (hearing impaired and severely emotionally disturbed) classrooms on campus; they worked with the science specialist; they participated in faculty meetings and IEP meetings.

During the fourth year, a third model was developed, born of the teachers'

concerns that the student teachers needed further understanding of whole school settings before beginning to work in the classroom. Students spent the first six weeks of the semester observing in a variety of classrooms in several different schools. The principal met with the students on a regular basis to debrief the observations, students kept observation notebooks, and the teachers met with the students once to help them focus on what they were learning about schools as contexts for learning. This particular field placement model gave the student teachers the opportunity to see a number of different schools, and gave the master teachers the opportunity for some initial privacy in their classrooms as the year got underway. The need for this privacy points out a difficulty with using a school with only six classrooms as the basis for a demonstration school, where all the teachers felt compelled to host a student teacher each semester. This model was less successful for the student teachers who felt "homeless" for the first six weeks of the semester.

In addition to field placement collaboration, during the five-year period Swett faculty and Mills faculty participated in a variety of staff development experiences including *Finding Out/Descubrimiento* (a cooperative learning science instruction program developed by Elizabeth Cohen at Stanford University), *Family Science* (a parent participation science program taught at the Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California, Berkeley), and *Tribes* (a classroom management system for creating communities within classrooms and schools). Participating in staff development experiences together allowed the faculty at both institutions to develop intellectual relationships and discussions regarding issues in a broader context beyond the immediate concerns of the elementary school and college classroom. In the final year, Swett and Mills faculty participated in action research on their own teaching, meeting regularly to discuss the questions they were considering and the data they were gathering.

Swett faculty and Mills faculty participated in each other's institutional programs in a number of ways. During the fourth year, Swett faculty participated in the orientation program for new student teachers. They held special sessions at Swett for the students and participated in some of the college campus activities. As indicated earlier, during that same year they held one seminar during the first six weeks for student teachers assigned to the school who were in a six-week observation period. Throughout the years of the partnership, they regularly made presentations in the college methodology courses in curriculum and instruction and in reading and language arts.

Mills faculty participated to a lesser extent in the Swett program. They participated in selecting new teachers and in selecting the new principal when the first principal was promoted to a central office position. They made occasional class presentations. The college coordinator met with the teachers to participate in their self-initiated review of the school's reading and language arts program.

A significant component of the partnership program was the dual role played by the principal of John Swett School. For three years she taught the year-long

curriculum and instruction class for the student teachers, a class which encompassed all areas of the curriculum except reading, language arts and mathematics. During the fourth year of the partnership she taught the health education and mainstreaming class. For the first three years, as mentioned previously, she served also as supervisor to the student teachers assigned to Swett.

Perceived Effects of Collaboration

Collaboration between the college and the elementary school was not a straightforward or simple act, yet for all of us involved it was certainly a period of learning and growth. From the perspective of the Mills faculty, it was exciting to have the opportunity to be more involved on a regular basis with a school that represented all the benefits and challenges we were teaching our student teachers to meet. From the perspective of the Swett faculty, it was exciting to contribute to the education of new teachers and to have a significant hand in shaping the nature of their preservice experience. Collaboration between institutions with different goals and purposes is never easy, but we believe our experience can provide perspective on both benefits and problems that arise in such collaborations.

One way to examine the benefits and challenges of the partnership was to ask the participants themselves. The authors, all of whom were involved in one way or another with the partnership, decided it would be of interest to see how master teachers and student teachers perceived the partnership as serving their needs.

Because one goal of the partnership was to create a model teacher education program, the question we decided to investigate was the effect of the partnership on the student teaching experience. We looked at this from the point of view of the master teachers, and from the point of view of the student teachers who had participated in this experience from two different years (and under two different models of field experience).

Methods

We designed questionnaires to send to the master teachers at Swett, master teachers at another similar Oakland school who were not involved in the partnership, and the student teachers from two cohorts who had at least one student teaching placement at Swett. Because of the size of the school (six master teachers), the numbers we questioned were small: six master teachers from John Swett; six master teachers from the other school; and 13 student teachers from the two years. Not surprisingly, the number of responses we received from each group correlated with their involvement and commitment to the partnership. All six Swett teachers responded promptly and fully to the questionnaire; seven of the 13 student teachers responded; and three of the teachers from the other Oakland school responded. In addition to questioning the teachers and student teachers, the principal was also interviewed about her multi-faceted role.

In analyzing the answers, a category system developed by two of us was used. Categories were determined by examining, grouping, and labeling similar responses from three sets of responses (two partnership and one non-partnership set), keeping in mind the expressed goals of the partnership. Once categories were determined, the entire set of data was scored independently by two of the authors. An inter-rater agreement of 95 percent was established.

Results and Discussion

The questionnaires for the teachers and student teachers are contained in Appendix I. The questions for the master teachers referred to their role as master teacher, their relationship to the college, their relationship to the school and their colleagues as affected by having a student teacher, and the effects of the partnership on their opportunities as teachers. The questions for student teachers asked them to contrast their experiences at Swett with their experiences in their other student teaching placement. Both groups were asked about their view of the role of the principal.

Teachers' Responses. The teachers' responses indicated that both partnership and non-partnership teachers took their responsibilities as master teachers seriously. They chose to become master teachers for their own professional growth and for the sake of others. They wished to extend themselves beyond their own classrooms for the future of education.

In addressing the role and responsibilities of the master teacher, response differences between the two groups of teachers became apparent. Only the partnership teachers saw part of their role as providing student teachers with a broader picture of the educational world, beyond the immediate classroom. For example, this is one teacher's response to the question, *How do you view your role as a master teacher?*: "Hopefully, to erase some of the 'stereotypical' attitudes about teaching in a multicultural, inner-city school." Another said, "To be a contributor to maintaining quality education for children...to make them (student teachers) aware of the multi-facets within the education areas that are an intricate part of a teacher's day and life style." These teachers had the needs of the broader educational context in mind by making such a commitment. The partnership teachers also saw themselves as resources and as providing the student teacher with a place to experiment with teaching. On the other hand, most of the non partnership teachers viewed their role traditionally, as providing teaching models and a practice ground.

Understandably, partnership teachers saw themselves as much more responsible to the college program than did the non partnership teachers. The non-partnership teachers reflected attitudes of distance from the college despite their long association as master teachers with the Mills teacher education programs. Two out of the three indicated lack of knowledge about even the most basic aspects of the program and disagreed with the philosophical basis of the program. This was

evidenced in the suggestions that they made for changes to the program. For example, while the thrust of the program is to make the relationship between theory and practice explicit by having students complete course work while student teaching, the main suggestion from two of the non partnership teachers was to separate college course work from the field experience. This suggestion probably stemmed from their own teacher education experiences in which, traditionally, student teaching is the last part of the program, occurring in the final semester after all course work is completed. These teachers had very little understanding or sympathy for the goals of the program. The exception was one non partnership teacher who indicated more understanding of the nature of the program. She agreed with the goals as she understood them (teacher reflection, developmental teaching situations), and made suggestions for changing the program that did not directly conflict with the program philosophy (*e.g.*, lengthen the program to two years).

Partnership teachers, on the other hand, felt responsible to the college program. When asked about the changes she had suggested for the program, one partnership teacher responded:

Our ideas develop and evolve, so that I'm not sure which I originated. We take an idea and interact. It evolves.

This sense of an ongoing collaboration and dialogue between the members of the partnership about the teacher education program is reflected in many of the responses. Reflecting again their commitment to the college program, partnership teachers were articulate about the need to be familiar with the course work. They understood the necessity of a link between the college and the classroom and believed it was their responsibility to take on that role.

Neither group of teachers found that having a student teacher affected their relationship with the school district. In regard to collegial relations, however, the partnership teachers and non partnership teachers had opposite experiences. Partnership teachers indicated that having a student teacher increased their contact with their colleagues by promoting dialogue, problem-solving, positive relationships, and professional growth. The non partnership teachers, in spite of being at a school where several students were assigned simultaneously, did not find that sharing the responsibility of educating future teachers created a collegial bond. They never discussed with their colleagues either the student teachers or the work they were doing in the classrooms.

Student Teachers. Student teachers felt more included in the partnership school and felt they were treated more professionally by the John Swett faculty. The master teachers included the student teachers in the school community, and made them feel as if they were an integral part of the staff. For example, one student wrote about the positive aspects of working at Swett:

Working in a supportive environment with teachers who seemed to understand my

role there and earnestly tried to give me their best.... (I always felt) included in the staff room, meetings, like a real member of the school community.

Also, the fact that all the master teachers felt responsible for all the student teachers on some level, seemed clearly reflected in the students' sense of belonging to the school, and in the availability of opportunities for trying out a variety of curriculum in different classrooms.

Student teachers' relationships with the administrators in the partnership and non partnership school differed in quality rather than in quantity. At the non-partnership school, the principal offered advice and information, but was largely uninvolved in the student teachers' training. At the partnership school, the principal served as the supervisor for the students while they were at the school, and she also taught the Curriculum and Instruction course at the college. Hence, students had higher expectations for the involvement of the partnership principal. Most considered the principal's bridge role between the school and the college as having a positive effect on their student teaching experience, because she was so knowledgeable about all aspects of the program.

Partnership Effects. When asked directly about the partnership, two responses were dominant. First, the teachers regarded participation in the partnership as granting them more professional status and greater opportunities to contribute to education beyond their role in the classroom. One teacher said,

Opportunities are endless; I feel we can create our own. Mills has encouraged this.

Another teacher said,

I feel I am part of a larger educational process, able to develop policies that impact on a broader scale.

Such responses indicate the empowerment the partnership provided these teachers.

Secondly, the partnership teachers saw the multiple roles played by the principal as crucial to the success of the student teacher-master teacher experience at the partnership school. One teacher said,

It has been a blessing to have such a supportive principal/supervisor. She has provided the bridge between the student teacher and master teacher. She has listened to the teachers' concerns and provided the student teachers with practical activities.

Another said,

It is very helpful to have my student teacher's supervisor be someone I work with intimately. We can discuss what is going on, what problems they (the student teachers) are having, how I can help them.

The Principal's View. The principal, who served as co-director of the

School-University Partnership

partnership (with the head of the Department of Education at Mills), principal of the demonstration school, and a college faculty member, described one major goal of the partnership to be **teacher empowerment**. From the first meeting of the partnership, she said she saw that shared decision-making was the only way to run the school and the partnership:

It was clear to me, in looking at the long range goals of the project and thinking back on the Carnegie report on how teachers perceive themselves as being undervalued and not knowing how to direct their own destiny, that they (the teachers) bring a great deal of expertise to their professional role and that we would get much further faster, and in a broader sense, if we shared the development of the goal.

Like the teachers, the principal saw her multiple roles in the partnership as important to its success for a number of reasons. She saw herself as the link between the college and the school. Having multiple responsibilities at the different institutions gave her a "broader perspective on education and educational considerations." When asked if she thought her role was crucial to the success of the partnership she replied,

If there was no one who had the ownership, who felt that his or her role was totally responsible to the partnership then I think you'd be in big trouble.

The principal saw herself as the only person involved in the partnership for whom the partnership was her **first** responsibility. From her perspective, all other members of the partnership, including the college faculty, the college co-director and the classroom teachers were **first** responsible to their positions either at the college or within the school district and secondarily the partnership. The principal prioritized the partnership as her responsibility because the school district office mandated her return to the school site from a central office position specifically to facilitate the partnership:

My professional assignment role was to be the co-director of the partnership, and along the way to be a principal, work at the college.

The principal confirmed the data from both the master teachers and the student teachers concerning the importance of her multiple roles in helping the students to feel included at the school site in a professional way. Her familiarity with both the school and college programs helped create a sense of professionalism and **empowerment** for the student teachers and the master teachers. When the principal's teaching load was reduced due to personnel changes at the college, the classroom teachers felt that the principal, the partnership, and they, personally, were no longer as highly valued by the college. The principal and the co-director at the college recognized this and worked with the staff to reassure them.

When asked about communication difficulties, the principal described issues from both the school and college points of view. The institutional memories at both John Swett and Mills concerning the original partnership expectations and agree-

ments were eroded because of changes in both the college and school faculties over time:

The weakest link (in the partnership) was what happened when there was a transition of people. We missed the group memory, we missed the same emotional commitment.... But I think that for the partnership to succeed, and all partnerships to succeed, they have to continually ask themselves, how are we communicating? Because it (the loss of group memory and communication) happened without us realizing it.

The principal identified the difficulty of the pressure on the teachers to be a demonstration school, in addition to the usual problems confronting an inner-city urban school. The principal also perceived that the teachers had never quite fulfilled the expectations of the college for the demonstration school, although this perception was never voiced by any of the partnership members at either the college or school site:

We at the school site weren't ever quite able to give...the college the type of wonderful learning environment that was envisioned for the student teachers. We would have all liked to become (like the laboratory preschool at the college). That type of program where there was ample time for planning, for developmental learning, in all areas, which would have been the logical extension (of the laboratory school)... The reasons we never quite got to that level were that it was an inner-city school in a public school system (with all the constraints that entails.)

The principal's point of view about the partnership confirms and enhances the data obtained in the questionnaires of both partnership master teachers and student teachers.

Summary

The success of the Mills/Oakland partnership with the focus on a demonstration school site was primarily due to three factors, the importance of which cannot be underestimated. The first factor was the commitment of the teachers at the school site to making the partnership successful, to creating a supportive environment for the education of student teachers as well as for the education of children. This commitment is clearly evident in the answers to the questionnaire and in the history of what the teachers did above and beyond the requirements of their jobs for the partnership.

A second major factor was the intimate nature of the relationship between the school and the Department of Education at Mills College. The size of the partnership forced different members to take on a number of roles, and this multiplicity of roles provided many different ways for faculty from each institution to interact with one another. Thus, the Swett faculty participated not only as master teachers, but also as participants in college courses, as school district advisors to the college programs and as full participants in formulating different models of fieldwork.

Through these interactions, collegial relationships between the two faculties were established that allowed for more effective education for student teachers and for the children who attended John Swett.

The third critical factor was the role the principal played in wearing several hats. That she was able to have a central role both at the school site and in the College provided an entrance into the College for the master teachers and into the school for the College faculty. The importance of this bridging role, particularly as seen by the master teachers, became clearer when the principal's teaching assignment was changed to what was seen as a less important class. While the principal herself did not regard this change in class assignments as a denigration of her position, the master teachers did interpret the change in a negative light. The master teachers saw the principal as the critical factor to the success of the program, underestimating the crucial nature of their own participation.

Reflections on the Past and a View Toward the Future

What worked about this collaboration and what can we learn about future collaboration? The most successful aspect of the collaboration seemed to be the teachers' growing sense of empowerment. The principal and the teachers themselves recognized this growth and the benefit of it for themselves and for the students they taught, both preservice teachers and youngsters. The teachers were empowered by the partnership, because they were involved in a wider educational venture that did not end at the classroom door. Rather, it extended to a larger community which included teacher education and educational research concerning school age children and teacher development.

Partnership teachers took a broader view of the role of master teacher than did their colleagues at the non-partnership school. They considered themselves professionals involved in teacher education at many levels. They became a viable part of the academic community as evidenced through their continual input into the teacher education program at Mills. The partnership teachers were considered clinical professors, taking responsibility for a group of students and serving as a resource for the whole Mills community. They were respected by the Mills faculty, and were able to define for themselves those arenas they wanted to investigate and develop.

The Swett teachers did not feel the sense of isolation that many teachers report (Goodlad, 1985). The shared responsibility for educating student teachers encouraged the teachers to reach out to each other to confer about student's development, about program problems, and, eventually, about issues other than student teacher learning (Darling-Hammond, 1988). In addition, the principal's commitment to sharing responsibilities for the school with the teachers on an equal basis was clearly recognized by the teachers. In their responses to the questionnaire, the overwhelming feeling about the benefits of the partnership was that the partnership imparted a professionalism and sense of responsibility that these teachers had not felt before

as classroom teachers.

While non-partnership teachers gave the same reasons for becoming master teachers as the partnership teachers, their experience and sense of themselves as teachers did not seem altered by the master teacher experience. The development of the partnership teachers, such as a greater sense of self as a professional and of affecting the broader educational picture, was not shared by non-partnership master teachers. Their sense of isolation from the teacher education process was evidenced by the fact that three out of six respondents failed to answer the questionnaire. Even the three who did respond indicated a lack of connection with the Mills program, although they were clearly making an effort to improve that connection.

For the student teachers, the benefits of the partnership reflected the benefits for the master teachers. The extended sense of professionalism and responsibility felt by the Swett teachers was passed on to the student teachers who all reported that, in spite of whatever difficulties they experienced with the partnership and at the school, they felt treated as professionals and equals only at John Swett School; that it was here that they began to feel they were making a difference in education. This sense of professionalism helped them take their education and goals more seriously. They began to see education in a broader, more complex context. The student teachers' sense of connection to the partnership school was strong. After they were employed as teachers, they came back to meet with the principal to discuss their new classrooms and to get practical advice.

As well as the benefits and strengths of the partnership, there were difficulties. We began our discussion of partnerships by discussing other schools' and universities' experiences with partnering attempts. It appears that many partnerships suffer from communication difficulties; much of the literature addresses such problems. The principal of the school identified similar communication problems between John Swett and Mills College. During the final year the partnership focused on the complexity of this problem. The members met with an outside facilitator a number of times to reestablish goals and organizational details that could continue to support the growth of the partnership. There was a sense of moving on, accompanied by feelings of frustration and anger. Because of the size of the partnership, it was possible to discuss these issues openly. The master teachers recognized the importance of having a person like their principal to act as a bridge between the two institutions. With the loss of this bridge, it became more difficult to keep the lines of communication open. Individual expectations and goals for the partnership changed.

Ultimately, the partnership expanded to include teachers from other schools within the Oakland Unified School District. The focus on action research, begun during the final year at Swett, was expanded to include these other teachers. The decision was made to move from a demonstration school model to a collaborative research model. The sense of empowerment gained by the teachers during the demonstration school phase of the partnership, enabled them to feel confidence in

exploring their own pedagogical questions. The faculty at Swett and Mills discovered different ways for classroom teachers and college professors to collaborate. The willingness to continue to communicate and to question made working collaboratively challenging and satisfying. The intellectual benefits of reflecting on this process gave us the insight to understand when we needed to change.

Perhaps the final conclusion about partnerships can not be final. The success of the Mills/Oakland partnership lay in the ability of its members to be reflective, flexible, and receptive to one another's ideas. One lesson to be gleaned from this experience is the importance of providing contexts for growth and empowerment for all members of a school community. The partnership between Swett and Mills College provided such an opportunity for the Swett faculty. The move from a focus on the school as the model site to a focus on teacher research was most appropriate, given the sense of direction indicated by the partnership members. The ability to grow and change was critical to the success of the partnership.

References

- Burch, C.B. (1993, October). Teachers vs. professors: The university's side. *Educational Leadership*, 51 (2), 76-77.
- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Clark, R.W. (1988). School-university relationships: An interpretive review. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 32-65). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). Policy and professionalism. In A. Lieberman (Ed.) *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Driscoll, A., Benson, N. & Livneh, C. (1994). University/school district collaboration in teacher education: Outcomes and insights. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 21(3), 59-68.
- Gifford, B.R. (1987). Editor's introduction. In *Education and urban society*. (pp. 363-367). Newbury Park, CA: Sage publications.
- Gifford, B.R., & Gabelko, N.H. (1987). Linking practice-sensitive researchers to researcher-sensitive practitioners. In *Education and urban society*. (pp. 368-388). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gifford, B.R., & Gabelko, N.H. (1987). SUPER project case studies. In *Education and urban society*. (pp. 389-420). Newbury Park, CA: Sage publications.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. *Educational Leadership*, 49(3), 4-10.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1988). School-university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K.A. Sirotnik & J. I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 3-31). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Lemlech, J.D. & Hertzog-Foliar, H. (1993). Linking school and university through collegial student teaching. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 20(4), 19-27.
- Lieberman, A. (1986). Collaborative research: Working with, not working on... In *Educa-*

- tional Leadership*, 43, 28-32.
- Lieberman, A. (1988). The metropolitan school study council: A living history. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 169-190). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lieberman, A. (1989, May). On teacher empowerment: A conversation with Ann Lieberman. In *Educational Leadership*, 46, (8).
- McClaughlin, M.W. & Yee, S.M.L. (1988). School as a place to have a career. In A. Lieberman (Ed.) *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schlechty, R.L. & Whitford, B.L. (1988). Shared problems and shared vision: Organic collaboration. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 191-204). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sinclair, R.L. & Harrison, A.E. (1988). A partnership for increasing student learning: The Massachusetts coalition for school improvement. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 87-105). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sirotnik, K.A. (1988). The meaning and conduct of inquiry in school-university partnerships. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 169-190). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sirotnik, K.A. & Goodlad, J.I. (1988). Introduction. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. vii-xii). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wesley, E.B. (1957). *NEA: The first hundred years*. New York: Harper.
- Williams, D.D. (1988). The Brigham Young university-public school partnership. In K.A. Sirotnik & J.I. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: Concepts, cases and concerns*. (pp. 124-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix

Questionnaire for Partnership Master Teachers

1. What are your reasons for being a master teacher?
2. How do you view your role as a master teacher?
3. What are your responsibilities as a master teacher and a member of the partnership?
 - a. To your student teacher?
 - b. To other student teachers at the school?
 - c. To Mills College?
4. What do you know about the course work at Mills for the student teachers?
5. Does your knowledge of the course work affect how you interact with the student teacher?
6. What ideas have you suggested to be included in the student preparation program?
 - Which ideas have been acted on?
 - Have any of these ideas been implemented?
 - How do you evaluate their success?
7. How does having a student teacher affect your relationship
 - a. with the school district?
 - b. with your colleagues?

School-University Partnership

8. Do you have expanded opportunities as a result of the partnership?
If so, what are they?
9. How do you think M___'s dual role as principal and supervisor affected your relationships with your student teachers?

(Non-partnership Master Teachers received questions 1-7 only.)

Questionnaire for Former Student Teachers

1. What were your positive experiences at Swett as a student teacher?
What were your negative experiences at Swett as a student teacher?
2. What were your positive experiences at your other student teaching placement?
What were your negative experiences at your other student teaching placement?
3. How do you think M___'s dual role as principal and supervisor affected your student teaching experiences?
4. Did you feel that your master teachers at Swett had more knowledge of your course work than your other master teachers?
Did that knowledge affect your total student teacher experience at Swett? How?
5. What relationship between the Swett faculty and the Mills faculty did you experience?
How did it affect your experience as a student teacher?
6. While you were at Swett did other teachers interact with you, besides your master teacher?
In what way?
7. While you were at your other school for a placement, did teachers other than your master teacher interact with you? In what way?
8. Were there any administrators with whom you interacted during either placement? Were they helpful?