

First-Year Evaluation of Teach for Beaverton

**A Teacher Residency Model by Beaverton School
District and Oregon State University**

September 2017



About Education Northwest

Education Northwest was founded more than 50 years ago as a nonprofit corporation. Our mission is to build capacity in schools, families, and communities through applied research and development. Founded as a nonprofit corporation in 1966, Education Northwest builds capacity in schools, families, and communities through applied research and development. We partner with public, private, and community-based organizations to address educational inequities and improve student success. While most of our work focuses on the Pacific Northwest, our evaluations, technical assistance, and research studies have national impact and provide timely and actionable results.

CONTACT

Education Northwest

101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204
educationnorthwest.org
503-275-9500

AUTHORS

Vicki Nishioka
Angela Roccograndi

SUGGESTED CITATION

Nishioka, V. & Roccograndi, A. (2017). *First-year evaluation of Teach for Beaverton: A teacher residency model by Beaverton School District and Oregon State University*. Portland, OR: Education Northwest.

Executive Summary

Beaverton School District (BSD) and Oregon State University (OSU) formed a partnership to jointly design Teach for Beaverton (T4B), a residency teacher model that aims to produce new teachers who are both well-prepared and representative of the diverse student body in Beaverton schools. T4B incorporates the principles and best practices of exemplary teacher residency models including a strong district-university partnership; high-quality and engaged schools, clinical teachers, and course instructors; practicum experiences that allow graduate students to make real-time connections between theory and practice; and a one-year residency (Fraser & Watson, 2014; National Research Council, 2010; Gallimore, Ermeling, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2009).

Education Northwest conducted this evaluation of the T4B model at the request of BSD. They wanted information on how stakeholders who participated in T4B during the 2016-17 school year viewed its strengths, benefits, and areas for growth. Evaluators reviewed relevant documents and collected interview and focus group data from district and university administrators, faculty, school principals, OSU practicum students, and classroom teachers (called clinical teachers) who mentored and co-taught with practicum students placed in their classroom.

Stakeholders at every level believe the committed partnership between BSD and OSU is critical to T4B's success. They said the collaborative recruitment and selection processes for students and clinical teachers are successful in meeting T4B goals. Moreover, the combined support of clinical teachers and university faculty members helps practicum students link theory to their teaching practice in meaningful ways. They said the T4B model provides practicum students with valuable teaching experience, particularly with elementary students from diverse backgrounds, and with the professional skills necessary to be a contributing member of a school community. Finally, stakeholders believe the model contributes to a culture of learning within the participating schools that fosters leadership and professional learning of clinical teachers and the broader school community.

This report also summarizes recommendations suggested by stakeholders who were involved in the development and implementation of the T4B model. Because the model is still in development, these recommendations relate to strategies for improving the quality of the model activities and the sustainability of the university-school partnership. Key recommendations include:

- Continue to nurture collaborative relationships between district and university team members with focused attention on strengthening the involvement of classroom teachers (called clinical teachers) who provide mentoring and co-teaching support to practicum students.
- Organize formal and informal systems of communication to improve awareness of the expertise T4B partners bring, increase efficiencies in addressing immediate and long-term planning, and aligning courses with practicum experiences.

- Strengthen program structure by outlining clear expectations for practicum and residency students; clarifying roles and responsibilities of the clinical teachers and faculty members; and formalizing program processes (e.g., course syllabi, evaluation protocols, and processes for responding to practicum students who require additional support).
- Create permanent funding streams to ensure sufficient resources are available to maintain best practice and long-term sustainability.
- Use data—including perspectives from multiple stakeholders—to inform planning, capacity building, expansion, and next steps.
- Continue developing internal and external evaluation systems that will monitor program quality and position BSD to evaluate short- and long-term outcomes.

Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>vi</i>
Chapter 1: Introduction and Description of the Teach for Beaverton Program	1
History of the Teach for Beaverton Model	1
Description of the 2016-17 Teach for Beaverton Model	2
Evaluating Teach for Beaverton	3
Organization of the Report	3
Chapter 2: Logic Model and Description of the BSD-OSU Partnership	4
Logic Model	4
District-University Partnership	6
Summary	8
Chapter 3: Activities and Strategies	9
Schools	9
Clinical Teachers	10
Practicum Students	11
Online and Hybrid Academic Courses	13
Financial Incentives	14
Summary	15
Chapter 4: Successes and Next Steps	16
Benefits for Graduate Students	16
Benefits for Beaverton School District and Oregon State University	17
Next Steps	17
Conclusion	21
References	22
Appendix A: Methods and Focus Group/Interview Protocols	24
Data collection and methods	24
Teach for Beaverton IRB Recruitment and Waiver of Informed Consent Procedures	25
T4B Interview/Focus Group Questions	26
Appendix B: Requirements for the Oregon State University Master of Arts in Teaching	27

FIGURES

Figure 1. Teach for Beaverton logic model	5
---	---

TABLES

Table 1. T4B enrollment and student characteristics, 2015-16	9
Table 2. Planning next steps	19

Acknowledgments

The authors extend our gratitude to the Beaverton School District and the Oregon State University College of Education for their deep commitment to providing new teachers with the knowledge and clinical experiences they need to serve all students. We want to extend our thanks to Melissa Potter for coordinating the interviews and focus groups and for her feedback on the evaluation. Finally, we thank the administrators, clinical teachers, university instructors, and practicum students for their participation in the evaluation process. Their insights and experiences provided important context for this report.

The authors would also like to thank Dr. Fiona Helsel for her invaluable feedback on early drafts of this report. We would like to thank Allyson Hagen, Bracken Reed, and Ilona Wall for their editing and design contributions to this project. Without their expertise, this report would not have been possible.

Chapter 1: Introduction and Description of the Teach for Beaverton Program

Beaverton School District (BSD) and Oregon State University (OSU) formed a unique partnership to design Teach for Beaverton (T4B)—an innovative teacher residency program. The vision of T4B is to prepare confident beginning teachers who are well-prepared for the rigor of teaching students from diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds. The T4B partnership also hopes to establish a teaching workforce that reflects the diversity of the students they teach.

Teacher effectiveness is regarded as the most important school-based factor influencing student achievement, but many beginning teachers lack the experience to meet the demands of the teaching profession (Henry, Bastian, & Fortner, 2011; Nye, Konstantopoulos, & Hedges, 2004). As teachers gain experience, their students achieve higher academic and behavioral outcomes in their beginning years and across their educational career (Ingersoll & Strong, 2012; Papay & Kraft, 2015). They also support higher student achievement for their colleagues and the whole school (Kini & Podolsky, 2016). Deep knowledge of the content area and a keen understanding of how learners acquire knowledge are also characteristic of highly effective teachers (National Research Council, 2010; Neopolitan, 2010).

Evidence of the relationship between clinically oriented teacher preparation programs and increased efficacy for beginning teachers is growing (Castle & Reilly, 2011). Teachers prepared through residency programs report feeling more prepared than teachers who participated in traditional student teaching. Specifically, residency teachers said they were better prepared to create lesson plans, assess students, use a variety of instructional methods, select and adapt curricula, talk with parents, and manage classroom or discipline situations (Silva, McKie, Knechtel, Gleason, & Makowsky, 2014). Principals also report that beginning teachers who have been prepared by residency programs are more effective than other new teachers in classroom instruction, using data to inform instruction, establishing a positive classroom environment, and demonstrating professionalism and leadership qualities (National Center for Teacher Residencies, 2016).

HISTORY OF THE TEACH FOR BEAVERTON MODEL

The T4B district–university partnership has conducted two pilots of the T4B innovation in Beaverton schools. The first occurred in 2009-10 with two student teachers placed at Kinnaman Elementary School. In 2010-11, the district chose not to offer the T4B program. The partnership implemented the second T4B pilot in 2011-12 at the same school with a cohort of three OSU students who received six months of mentoring and coaching from three BSD master teachers (now called clinical teachers).

Although distance, time, and resources have made it challenging to sustain the program, both BSD and OSU leaders have remained committed to the T4B innovation due to the benefits it provides to graduate students and clinical teachers and its strong potential for contributing to a better and more diverse teaching workforce. The 2011-12 evaluation findings of T4B found strong support for the model (Nishioka, 2012). Stakeholders at every level (administrators, faculty members, clinical teachers, and student teachers) believed the combined expertise of highly skilled teachers and university faculty members provided student teachers with clinical experiences that enabled them to make meaningful links between theory and practice. They said that the T4B model provided student teachers with a realistic perspective of what teaching entails and their clinical experiences helped them become stronger and more confident first-year teachers. Finally, stakeholders believed the model contributed to a culture of learning within the host school that fostered professional growth and work satisfaction among clinical teachers, clinical supervisors, and administrators.

Although T4B was successful in providing students with a rigorous, clinically oriented program, there were several challenges that raised concerns about its long-term viability. For leadership, the main challenge was the distance between OSU and BSD, which made scheduling and coordination difficult. For students, teaching in the classroom five full days each week, in addition to taking required courses, created a heavy and exhausting workload and left little time for part-time work that could ease the heavy financial burden of tuition and living expenses. For clinical teachers the physical and cognitive demand of coaching a student teacher were significant and co-teaching required more time for lesson planning.

DESCRIPTION OF THE 2016-17 TEACH FOR BEAVERTON MODEL

In 2016-17, the district-university partnership made substantial revisions to expand the model and address concerns from previous years. T4B partners restructured the academic and clinical education requirements to reduce the workload for graduate students. Graduate students now enroll in OSU's Master of Arts in Teaching program in clinically based elementary education. The two-year program requires graduate students to complete 52 credit hours: 16 hours are fully online courses and 18 are hybrid courses that include online and face-to-face instruction. Students must also complete 18 practicum and internship courses under the mentorship and guidance of experienced BSD clinical teachers and OSU faculty. In year 1, students are *practicum students* who co-teach in the classroom setting two full days each week, as well as carrying a full load of academic courses. Practicum students earn university credit but do not receive financial compensation for practicum hours. T4B provides options to help practicum students manage tuition and living costs. If eligible, they can work as a BSD substitute teacher on non-practicum days. By substituting, practicum students earn additional income and gain teaching experience in different classrooms settings. OSU was also able to obtain scholarship funding for practicum students during this past year. During year 2, graduate students are *residency students* who teach full time for the school year with support from a clinical teacher. Residency students receive a stipend and attend academic courses.

The changes in practicum and residency hours also changed the roles and workload of the clinical teachers. During year 1, the clinical teachers now serve as mentors to a practicum student and support their learning through a collaborative, co-teaching approach during two clinical days each week. During year 2, the clinical teacher provides coaching and co-teaching support for two residency students who each have their own classroom. The clinical teacher is the teacher of record for both classrooms. An overview of the academic course, practicum, and internship requirements are in Appendix B.

EVALUATING TEACH FOR BEAVERTON

BSD requested this evaluation to provide information about the strengths and areas requiring improvement or further growth for the 2017 T4B pilot project. The district will use the findings to make improvement decisions, identify progress toward addressing lessons learned in the 2011-12 evaluation, and plan next steps in program implementation. This report includes a brief review of the previous evaluation findings and a description of the T4B innovation. We also report on stakeholder perceptions of the strengths and areas of growth related to the district-university partnership, mediators or factors that could influence its success, and program operations. In this report, stakeholders refer to district and university administrators, faculty, school principals, and OSU practicum students involved in T4B during the 2016-17 school year. It also includes clinical teachers—classroom teachers who mentored and co-taught with practicum students placed in their classroom. The questions that guided the data collection and analysis for this report are:

- How do district, school, and university personnel and graduate students who are directly involved in Teach for Beaverton perceive its strengths and areas for growth?
- What recommendations do district and university partners have for improving implementation, increasing capacity, and sustaining the T4B innovation?

The data analyzed for this evaluation include archival documents related to the T4B model and focus groups and interviews conducted with the following stakeholder groups: seven T4B practicum students, six clinical teachers, three school administrators, four district-level administrators and program specialists, and three OSU administrators and faculty members. A description of the evaluation methods and interview/focus group protocols are in Appendix A.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The remaining sections of this report provide the findings for the two evaluation questions. Chapter 2 includes a logic model that describes the overall structure of T4B and summarizes how stakeholders view the strengths and areas for growth of the model's components. Chapter 3 describes the implementation strategies and activities conducted in 2016-17. Chapter 4 offers recommendations and suggestions for next steps, as identified by stakeholders directly involved in the program.

Chapter 2: Logic Model and Description of the BSD-OSU Partnership

The nature and strength of district-university partnerships are critical to successful residency programs (Kirschenbaum & Reagan, 2001). Effective partnerships use collaborative processes for selecting and supporting schools, clinical teachers, and practicum students (Fraser & Watson, 2014; National Research Council, 2010; Gallimore, Ermeling, Saunders, & Goldenberg, 2009). They also work side by side to align the content and requirements of academic courses with the practicum students' teaching experiences. This chapter describes a logic model that diagrams the T4B model and reports stakeholders' perspectives of the strengths and areas for growth of the partnership between BSD and OSU.

LOGIC MODEL

As part of this evaluation, we created a logic model to reflect the changes in the T4B innovation. A logic model articulates the issue or problem, the strategies and processes to address the problem, the mediators or factors that influence the effectiveness of the innovation, and the expected outcomes. A logic model establishes a shared vision among partnership members and guides subsequent improvement decisions. A schematic that outlines these T4B relationships is in Figure 1. Due to its wide scope and complexity, the T4B model could have more than one logic model to describe different dimensions and different perspectives. For example, a logic model that describes how BSD will organize administrative processes to implement T4B is likely different from one that serves the same purpose for OSU. This logic model describes the innovation based on the perspectives of stakeholders. We hope this tool will be useful for explaining the innovation and will help guide discussions on improving the model and planning next steps.

Figure 1. Teach for Beaverton logic model



DISTRICT-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

The strength of the T4B district and university partnership is evident in its strong relationships and long-term commitment to building a highly qualified teaching workforce that contributes to the academic success of all students. BSD and OSU administrators describe their partnership as one of “collegiality, patience, mutual respect, and commitment to making T4B work.” T4B partners have collaborative relationships that allow them to have constructive and solution-focused conversations about the “inevitable challenges” that arise. Throughout these conversations, the focus is on “keeping it going,” with partners from both institutions willing to compromise or do extra work as needed. The strong commitment and willingness to be flexible to make T4B “work” is evident to administrators, clinical educators, and graduate students.

Remarkable commitment in partners from the start. There is a willingness to compromise to address issues together, shared vision—the strength of those pieces has carried us through the natural bumps of implementation (BSD administrator)

Despite the distance, my sense is that there is significant, productive, and functioning communication between leadership at both OSU and BSD—without that it would fall apart. (OSU staff member)

Shared vision and commitment

From the beginning and throughout implementation, the T4B partnership has remained committed to a shared vision, adhered to principles of best practices in residency programs, and engaged in authentic collaboration. Both district and university leaders envisioned a teacher residency innovation that would produce beginning teachers who are well prepared to meet the demands of teaching. Both BSD and OSU shared the goal of increasing the quality and diversity of beginning teachers. BSD viewed T4B as a “teacher pipeline” of exemplary teachers who they could get to know and begin recruiting early. In the future, they envision expanding the T4B model to graduate students placed in secondary schools or classrooms teaching specific content areas. Likewise, the university views T4B as one way to increase the quality and diversity of teachers who graduate from its programs. T4B provides an opportunity to expand the university’s teacher preparation programs and build a model that can be applied in different districts.

Intent is to make sure we have teachers who are prepared to walk in the door and meet the needs of kids. Design a preparation program that is exemplary and strengthen our candidate pool so we have a deeper selection of candidates who are ready to go and are of a quality we can stand behind. Develop a pipeline. (BSD administrator)

They have an in-depth look at graduate students coming up as potential employees—much better than they would get in any other program setting. They have first chance at influencing them and getting them interested in working in BSD. They also have an interest in increasing the diversity of the workforce. They can see a pay off if they recruit graduate students of color and/or who are bilingual into T4B. (OSU staff member)

Areas for growth. While the vision and goals of district and university partners are not mutually exclusive, it does influence how stakeholders prioritize implementation activities, approach expansion planning, and evaluate progress and success. During this past year, it has been a priority for BSD stakeholders to select graduate students of color who are also bilingual. Although diversity was important to OSU, the pragmatic need to enroll a sufficient number of graduate students to financially sustain the program was a more urgent priority. This resulted in differences in desired outcomes for the graduate student recruitment process. Some viewed it as a success because enough graduate students were enrolled. Others expressed disappointment that the graduate students did not represent the diversity that they hoped to achieve.

Collegial relationships and solution-focused, authentic communication

The T4B partnership developed a conceptual model for a two-year master's-level course that incorporated extended practicum experiences with a full-year residency. Although the structures and protocols were not fully developed, the partnership decided to launch the new program. One stakeholder described this as “building the plane while flying.” Implementing T4B created opportunities to engage stakeholders at every level in early planning meetings, including clinical teachers and graduate students. All were aware that T4B was a new program, that their input was important to “making it work,” and that adjustments would be made as needed. Although communication and other challenges surfaced during the year, the engagement of all stakeholders in early planning contributed to continued buy-in from district and university partners.

It's terribly exciting. Everyone is wanting T4B to work, and there is this effort to give and take to be responsive. Clinical teachers have had major input into changes because of their experience and the practicum teachers have as well. You don't usually see that kind of responsiveness. (BSD principal)

Great communication between different components. We meet regularly via Zoom and in person, to talk about what is working and what is not. We are realizing things we thought would work don't, and now[we] are changing [in response]. We are meeting the needs as we go, with no egos involved—very collaborative and everyone has the desire for this program to work. (BSD principal)

Areas for growth. As in previous years, distance and limitations in time and resources to meet, discuss, and plan implementation of T4B activities presented obstacles to both partners. Exacerbating this situation was limited understanding of “each other's worlds” and differences in perspectives that lead to distrust and weaken relationships. For example, OSU perceived the district was monopolizing the professional development and preparation of clinical teachers. Upon reflection, OSU realized that lack of time and distance were the reasons for their limited participation in professional development or meetings with clinical teachers. The relationships between OSU and clinical teachers have suffered the most from lack of opportunities to build trust and appreciation for the skills each brings to T4B. OSU states clearly that they “appreciate and want to access their (clinical teachers') wisdom, but we also need to have a better link with them.” Meanwhile, the clinical teachers say that while their expertise is acknowledged, their lack of involvement in program implementation, evaluation of practicum students, and other areas undermines this message and makes them feel that they have “no say or influence.”

For all stakeholders, building relationships takes time and is even more difficult if geography and distance are factors. BSD and OSU leadership states that clinical teachers provide insights and important information and that there are efforts to increase their involvement but not to the ideal extent. (BSD administrator)

We have spent a lot of time with BSD staff members—there is trust and community so we feel we can go to them and they'll listen. We have not had that opportunity to do that with OSU. There is a lack of trust and limited time, so we don't feel as respected, and [we] feel they don't trust our judgment because we have not built that community with them. (Clinical teacher)

The biggest change from the initial T4B design has been in how residency students are placed. Originally, the goal was to maintain graduate students in the same school throughout their practicum and residency. Due to budget reductions and earlier placement issues, this was not feasible for all students. The change in clinical placements was disappointing for clinical teachers and practicum students, as many believed they would stay together for the full two years. Both groups expressed a sense of loss because they would not continue their close mentoring and co-teaching relationship. Practicum students wondered whether they would have the time to develop the same level of trust with the clinical teachers who would be overseeing their residency. They also said the change in placement made them less confident in taking on the responsibilities of a resident student.

Originally, a benefit was that we would be with this mentor teacher for two years. There are so many pros with this but because of a lot of reasons, we will be with different clinical teachers next year. (Practicum student)

SUMMARY

The strength and commitment of the T4B partnership—including program leaders, implementers, and graduate students—were critical to the program's success in 2016-17. All stakeholders commented on the willingness of T4B partners to address problems through authentic, solution-focused discussions and to make program adjustments if needed—even if it meant extra work or changes to existing operating procedures. All stakeholders identified communication as an area in need of improvement. They also said improving the relationship between clinical teachers and university faculty would be an important factor in the coming year. Actions that could improve these working relationships include developing a shared understanding of roles and responsibilities and developing communication processes that help link course content to practice. Stakeholders also agreed that clinical teachers should be more involved in leadership meetings and other discussions that would directly benefit from their input.

Chapter 3: Activities and Strategies

The activities and strategies that T4B developed and implemented are aligned with best practices for teacher residency programs. These include recruiting, selecting, and supporting welcoming schools, highly skilled clinical teachers, and graduate students with strong potential for becoming exemplary educators. This chapter describes these activities and strategies and summarizes stakeholders' perspectives on areas of strength and growth.

SCHOOLS

One goal of the T4B partnership is to keep graduate students in the same school for both their practicum and residency. They believe that long-term placement in the same school will allow the graduate student to become part of the school community and will deepen both their skills and their connection to BSD.

Recruitment and selection of schools

BSD administrators had the primary responsibility for recruiting and selecting T4B elementary schools to host graduate students. The multistep process began with BSD administrators “surveying” school leaders and identifying schools with principals who were willing to participate in an innovative program that differed from traditional student teaching. For interested schools, BSD and OSU then presented information about the T4B model and expectations of school partners. The schools that hosted practicum students had principals and staff members who were willing to welcome and include graduate students as part of their school. This commitment included “involving graduate students in the life of school and work in the classroom setting” and ensuring they were “seen as a BSD teacher by colleagues, families, and students.”

BSD ultimately recruited three elementary schools to participate: Hazeldale, Nancy Ryles, and Rock Creek. All three schools serve highly diverse student populations, with a minimum of 40 percent of their students coming from racial or ethnic minority groups (Table 1). In Hazeldale, the percentage of students who were economically disadvantaged (58%) was significantly higher than in the other two schools (24%). The number of languages spoken at each of the three schools ranged from 21 to 27. The percentage of students at Hazeldale who had ever received English learner services (34%) was more than double the percentage at Nancy Ryles (15%) and Rock Creek (13%).

Table 1. T4B enrollment and student characteristics, 2015-16

Elementary school	Number of enrolled students	Number of languages spoken	Percentage of students			
			Economically disadvantaged	Special education	Ever English learners	Students of color
Hazeldale	524	21	58%	15%	34%	53%
Nancy Ryles	590	26	24%	7%	15%	49%
Rock Creek	591	27	24%	13%	13%	40%

Source: Oregon Department of Education Report Cards, 2015-16.

Schools that are part of T4B benefit from their partnership with OSU. By bringing academia into the building, all staff members have access to the latest research from OSU. Participation also provides leadership opportunities to teachers who want to stay in the classroom as opposed to becoming administrators. Stakeholders also credited practicum students with bringing “new energy into (school) staff” and mentioned that “having more adults in the classroom” had been beneficial for elementary school students.

Areas for growth. Principals stated that some staff members had concerns about the possibility of graduate students displacing contracted teaching staff or the influence that new T4B teachers might have on employment opportunities in their building and the district.

CLINICAL TEACHERS

Clinical teachers play a critical role in the T4B innovation. They are the mentors, coaches, and co-teachers of practicum students placed in their classrooms. Co-teaching requires working side by side to plan and teach lessons. In the classroom, co-teaching may mean teaching the whole classroom together, teaching smaller groups the same or different subjects, or one teacher instructing a large group while the other teaches a smaller group. Individuals fulfilling this role must be exemplary teachers of both students and adult learners.

Recruitment and selection of clinical teachers

Stakeholders viewed the process for recruiting and selecting clinical teachers as rigorous and collaborative. Principals were instrumental in identifying and recruiting teachers with exemplary teaching skills who might be interested in the clinical teacher position. T4B administrators then shared information about the innovation with interested teachers, explained the application process, and answered any questions they might have. Teachers described the application process as rigorous and said it promoted both leadership and professional learning. Stakeholders did not offer any recommendations to improve the process but did suggest that continued work on developing a shared understanding of pedagogy and culturally responsive practices would improve T4B.

We have recruited quality teachers who are supported by administrators and put themselves out there. There is a good process with interviews—a broad team looking at them—that has resulted in very high-quality placements for grad students. (BSD staff member)

Support for clinical teachers

Clinical teachers described several ways in which T4B supported their work and professional growth. First, BSD administrators recognized clinical teachers as their “top performers,” and the university viewed their expertise as an important contribution to T4B’s success. They believed the clinical teacher position provided a leadership position in the building, while also allowing them to stay in the classroom. T4B also provided opportunities for them to reflect on their own practice with a community of clinical teachers and to improve their own practice because “you grow more when you help others grow.”

Teachers said weekly meetings provided updates and time to discuss concerns. They thought these regular meetings strengthened their relationship with district staff members. Principals identified supporting clinical teachers in their building as a primary element of their T4B role.

Areas for growth. Many stakeholders identified strengthening the working relationships between university faculty and clinical teachers as a priority for the coming year. Clinical teachers said they understood BSD expectations but were unclear about OSU expectations. District and university partners said making sure clinical teachers received information about the content and expectations of courses, both overall and by week, would be helpful. They also said clarifying the distinct roles of clinical teachers and faculty members—and how they should work together to support practicum students—could improve implementation and relationship building. For example, they need more clarity about which team members are responsible for having difficult conversations with practicum students about areas in need of improvement and for determining when a plan of assistance is needed. Finally, both OSU staff members and clinical teachers suggested that more face-to-face time between the two groups could build trust and increase mutual understanding. Clinical teachers mentioned that having a teacher representative at the T4B leadership meetings could be one way to make this happen.

It would help to bring OSU and BSD staff members together in the right venues to hash out challenges, learn from each other, and build theory and practice for making this work well. (OSU staff member)

Clinical teachers could also benefit from more information about the content of university courses and from additional professional development on “how to coach adults” and how to help practicum students incorporate theory into their teaching.

Clinical teachers need professional development on how to coach adults because it’s different. We have tremendous mentor tools for mentoring new teachers, and mentor-type training is out there for new clinical teachers, but T4B is very different ... They need to have critical conversations that coach graduate students forward and difficult conversations that coach them up while not demoralizing them. (BSD staff member)

PRACTICUM STUDENTS

The goal of the T4B innovation is to design and implement a sustainable teacher preparation model that produces new teachers who are confident and well prepared to teach students from diverse racial, cultural, and language backgrounds. Additionally, they want to increase the diversity of the teaching workforce in the district and the diversity of new teachers graduating from OSU. During this past year, financial and pragmatic considerations influenced the recruitment and selection of graduate students. To sustain their teaching program, OSU must enroll a sufficient number of graduate students to meet budget projections. They must also recruit and select graduate students who have strong potential for becoming exemplary teachers, have the ability to meet time and travel requirements as practicum students, and have the capacity to relocate for their residency year.

Recruitment and selection of practicum students

Although recruitment is a joint responsibility, OSU led efforts to encourage graduate students to apply for the program. They marketed the T4B program through their website, newsletters, presentations, and other recruitment venues and developed a video to share information and generate interest. The university also had primary responsibility for processing applications to its Master of Arts in Teaching program, but the selection process was a collaborative effort.

Amazing and unique that BSD is part of the OSU process (in selecting candidates to enroll) and they are part of ours (in selecting clinical teachers). We have a seat at the table to say who we will allow in our schools to work with our students. That is huge and is thinking outside of the box. (BSD staff member)

Selection [is] going well. We have a system that is straightforward, and there are clear benchmarks that we use—[there has been] lots of agreement on the selection part. (OSU faculty member)

OSU faculty members collaborated with district representatives and building principals on reviewing applications, interviewing candidates, and making the final decision for T4B enrollment. The selection process led to useful conversations about selection criteria, including the role that diversity, skill level, and match for the program should play in enrollment decisions. Both partners described the student recruitment and selection process as collaborative, flexible, and successful.

Areas for growth. Although district and university partners viewed the recruitment process as a success, they acknowledged the need for a more robust recruitment effort. BSD principals and administrators said the district should continue its efforts to “recruit from our own student population.” University faculty would like to increase recruitment in Beaverton, at OSU campus entities, and with the Oregon Education Association, but finding time to do so is challenging.

Challenges—having enough human power to be out in the right places in Beaverton to explain the program, to be proactive about in getting into places where we can attract culturally diverse candidates, being in high schools to help students think about teaching as a career, and fostering a connection to community colleges and OSU. (OSU staff member)

Support for practicum students

Practicum students who participated in the focus group endorsed the value of T4B on their learning. From day one, they were welcomed as part of the school and had access to mentoring from an experienced clinical teacher. Although it took time to build trust, co-teaching with their clinical teacher provided experiences that fostered confidence and helped them link their classroom learning to practice. They appreciated the expertise of the clinical teacher and their willingness to teach them “so many little things that you don’t think about asking a clinical teacher—until we observed the clinical teacher.” Finally, they appreciated the collegial and safe environment that allowed them to learn from their own mistakes.

Having a mentor to talk to and ask questions. It took time, but developing a relationship and being comfortable enough to ask questions, fail, and take risks. (Practicum student)
Prepare and train homegrown teachers that are ready to be hired, successful, and retained in the district. (BSD staff member)

Areas for growth. Practicum students identified a need for greater alignment between their courses and clinical experiences and better communication about the requirements of the program. They also said they would like more clarity about how to get information and from whom. For T4B partners, the main challenges in 2016-17 were student attrition and the need to support practicum students who were struggling. One graduate student left for personal reasons and another returned to traditional student teaching. In both situations, stakeholders praised the responsiveness of the T4B partnership. However, principals and others said it would be helpful to clarify roles, communication systems, and decision-making processes on supporting students who need more intensive support or advice on pursuing different pathways to achieve their goals.

ONLINE AND HYBRID ACADEMIC COURSES

The OSU master's program requires graduate students to complete 34 academic credit hours and 18 clinical credit hours across the two-year program. OSU faculty members teach fully online courses, and OSU faculty and BSD teachers co-teach hybrid courses that combine online and face-to-face instruction. Course instruction leverages the district and university partnership in a way that benefits both institutions.

The courses they deliver in BSD are run by one OSU faculty and one BSD staff member. I find that to be thrilling. That is exactly what we need to be doing to forge what is cutting edge about this: both parties are true equal parties in the delivery of the program and there are ways that we are interacting so that each is learning from the other. (OSU staff member)

This year T4B stakeholders were generally pleased with the collaboration between OSU faculty and BSD co-teachers, while acknowledging that the alignment of course content and practice is still a work in progress. Students enjoyed the flexibility that online courses offered because it allowed them to “do their work and manage their own schedules.” They also believed that opportunities to apply theory directly to practice were helping them learn how to teach. Courses such as classroom management and advanced math methods, which covered content that practicum students could directly apply in their clinical practice, were highlights of the year.

There is so much newness—learning how to teach, knowing how we are going to implement it. It has been good and informative. Really nice to learn it and then apply it in the classroom. (Practicum student)

The required courses have benefited from the willingness of OSU faculty to modify the content and syllabi of courses based on feedback from clinical teachers and students. Clinical teachers appreciated opportunities to “co-construct” some of the classes because they believed it helped

“make theory and practice match as much as possible.” Students also appreciated the openness of OSU to feedback about aligning courses with their teaching responsibilities, increasing class participation activities, and other ways that they could improve courses and assigned work.

Areas for growth. Stakeholders said the program should continue to work on the sequencing and alignment of course content to allow students to apply theory directly in their practicum. Clinical teachers and co-instructors also said guidance from university faculty was essential to increasing their knowledge and understanding of expectations and procedures for evaluating student performance during practicum and on course work. Clinical teachers also said it would be helpful to have a clear procedure for addressing practicum students’ needs during clinical practice, including whether those needs should be addressed immediately or could wait until the weekly meeting. Finally, some administrators thought that making time for practicum and residency students to network in year 2 could build camaraderie and foster learning among the two cohorts.

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES

The T4B provides practicum students with scholarship and substitute teaching opportunities to ease the financial burden of graduate school. Residency students receive a stipend (paid internship) of 0.4 FTE. During the practicum year, eligible students can receive scholarship funds.

T4B is fortunate that OSU has provided some tuition assistance. It does not usually give money to part-time programs, and we have been able to sell it to the graduate school as innovative, cutting edge, and far-looking, and we were able to get funding at the highest level. (OSU staff member)

Practicum students can also earn money by applying for a restricted substitute license that allows them to be a paid substitute in BSD classrooms during non-practicum days. Substituting provides practicum students with opportunities to teach different grade levels, classrooms, and students that vary in needs. These experiences also allow them to learn about different teaching and classroom management styles. In 2017–18, BSD are able to fund stipends for residency students by assigning two classrooms to each clinical teacher.

Areas for growth. T4B administrators and graduate students are concerned about the sustainability of the paid residency year and the scholarship program. The district and university both invested staffing and funding resources to implement T4B in 2016-17, but both partners recognize the need to create permanent funding streams to ensure sufficient resources are available to maintain best practice and long-term sustainability.

SUMMARY

Designing and planning the TFB partnership is an ongoing, collaborative process. BSD has primary responsibility for recruiting and selecting T4B schools, and it led the effort to recruit clinical teachers, while OSU took the lead in recruiting graduate students. Both partners view the selection and support of students and clinical teachers as a shared responsibility. Stakeholders also viewed aligning course instruction with clinical practice experiences as a shared responsibility, but the university had primary responsibility for developing course instruction curricula and supporting course instructors. This division of labor reflects the organization of most teacher residency programs (Silva et al., 2014).

T4B partners agreed that the process for selecting graduate students and clinical teachers was rigorous and successful. They also viewed the scholarship and substitute teaching opportunities as important strategies for retaining students. All stakeholders described the support that schools and clinical teachers provide to students as “exemplary.” However, principals, students, and clinical teachers also mentioned the need for greater clarity about how to address the needs of practicum students who require more personalized support. Finally, all stakeholders identified priorities around improving communication, strengthening OSU faculty and clinical teacher relationships, and increasing involvement of clinical teachers in leadership decisions.

Chapter 4: Successes and Next Steps

The T4B partnership had many successes and accomplishments in 2016-17. They tripled the size of the innovation and successfully launched a master's-level program that involves an intricate schedule of courses, practicum, and internship/residency experiences. The new program reduced the students' workload and provided financial support through scholarships and substitute teaching opportunities during the practicum year. BSD allocated funding for a paid internship or residency, which is groundbreaking in teacher education. Stakeholders also praised the collaborative processes for selecting students and clinical educators. Perhaps the greatest success was the implementation of these changes—and the necessary adjustments throughout the year—through collaborative leadership and decision making. Both partners agree that making it through this first year—with graduate students ready to start their residency and schools that remain engaged and enthusiastic about T4B—is a success. They also recognize that it is only a beginning. This chapter describes how the program has benefitted the graduate students, district, and university and offers next steps for improvement.

BENEFITS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS

The driving force behind T4B is the conviction that residency programs result in more confident and well-prepared beginning teachers on “day one” of their teaching career. Both OSU faculty members and clinical teachers said that practicum students do appear to be more advanced in their practice than traditional student teachers. For example, graduate students have learned more than how to teach a specific class; they have learned how to become part of the fabric of a school. Principals of T4B schools are intentional in their efforts to welcome students and ensure they participate in staff meetings, professional learning events, teacher-parent conferences, and other events.

Looking at our grad students (T4B), they are doing so much better and are so much further along than grad students in other, more traditional teacher preparation programs. (Clinical teacher)

The grad students that I observed yesterday were phenomenal! In 20 years, what I see is they are way ahead of their peers who have that have had as much time in the classroom—the differences are in classroom management and confidence. (OSU staff member)

The practicum students expressed deep appreciation for the mentorship and trusting relationship they share with the clinical teachers and the rest of the school. Unlike traditional student teachers, who complete academic courses before their placement in schools, practicum students are immersed in teaching immediately. Stakeholders believe the ability to apply theory from their university courses directly to their classroom teaching was critical to practicum students' learning. It bolstered their confidence, provided an opportunity for reflection with experienced teachers, and helped them develop a deeper understanding of “what they do and how and why they do it.” Practicum students also valued the “tidbits of information” that the clinical teachers provided about what to do and not do in their first year.

Totally beneficial. My friends who are in traditional programs are totally stressed ... You are getting that confidence. You are getting the confidence to do your best. Our education is theory-based, but until you experience doing it, you don't know how to handle it. All the theory in the world won't help you without experience. (Practicum student)

The T4B model builds a sense of responsibility for practicum students to ensure that clinical teachers will “feel confident that we (practicum students) will do a good job.” They recognize that their clinical teacher is responsible for their students’ achievement, and this knowledge increased their desire to perform well. Practicum students also recognized that the opportunity to be part of a school community, meet administrators, learn district procedures, participate in professional development activities with BSD colleagues, and gain experience as a substitute had strengthened their chance of being employed in a district they know and like.

I joined the program because I loved the idea of becoming a part of BSD—meeting these important persons, having a guaranteed (substitute) job. I knew that I would be a substitute and would be prepared for my first job. Seeing all the support and experience that this program provides made me feel prepared to become a teacher. (Practicum student)

BENEFITS FOR BEAVERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT AND OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

BSD and OSU stakeholders said T4B had strengthened their knowledge and practice. For teachers, it offered leadership opportunities for those who did not want to become administrators. It also strengthened their own learning and practice. Principals believe the opportunity to be a clinical teacher provides professional development, leadership opportunities, and “something they would aspire to.” Clinical teachers concurred with these observations. Because of their involvement in T4B, they were “learning a ton” and were part of a supportive professional learning community.

It's a great experience—first time mentoring and doing mentoring with support. In traditional programs, there is no support. We are a support group, and we feel comfortable sharing anything. (Clinical teacher)

OSU faculty also benefit from the immersion of graduate students in schools. The linkage of theory and practice puts graduate students “exactly where K–12 work is happening.” Consequently, T4B allows faculty to be “intertwined with current practice through their graduate student, which is “very valuable” to maintaining a perspective on the day-to-day realities of teaching.

NEXT STEPS

The T4B partnership has accomplished a great deal during this past year, but stakeholders recognize the need to formalize program structure and communication processes to increase efficiency and improve working relationships. They also provided ideas on recruiting, selecting, and supporting schools, clinical teachers, and graduate students. These ideas are summarized below and are provided as “questions to consider” (Table 2), which the T4B partners may find helpful for planning.

Formalize program structure and communication processes

Stakeholders suggest that clearly defining roles and responsibilities, developing internal communication processes, and defining roles and responsibilities would improve efficiencies and reduce misunderstandings that may strain relationships among partners. The clinical teachers want a clearer understanding of the expectations of OSU, both for themselves and for the practicum students. All stakeholders expressed the desire to improve efforts to recognize the important role of clinical teachers and to find ways to increase their knowledge of the curricula students are learning in their university courses. There is consensus that finding time to plan and discuss issues is a priority. Although distance and time limitations necessitate reliance on virtual meetings, stakeholders agree that in-person meetings are helpful for building trust and strengthening relationships.

OSU liaison based in Beaverton School District

The university and district partners were unanimous in their recommendation for adding an OSU faculty member to serve as a direct liaison to BSD. Ideally, the faculty member would be based in Beaverton so that OSU would have a “regular presence” to support clinical supervision of students and improve collaboration with BSD partners. This could improve co-instructors’ and clinical teachers’ understanding of OSU’s conceptual framework and what is required for assessment.

Relationships and communication with clinical teachers

Strengthening communication with clinical teachers and creating an environment in which they feel trusted and respected are areas for growth. Clinical teachers voiced some concerns that could be resolved with little difficulty. For example, concerns about delays in getting answers to urgent questions could be resolved by agreeing on a system to alert district or university administrators if a question needed an immediate answer or could wait for discussion. Other concerns would require more effort to address. Clinical teachers want to reduce the heavy reliance on email communications by increasing opportunities to discuss issues with OSU faculty during in-person meetings or by telephone. They also want to see more “teacher voice” in the selection of students, and they want more opportunities to participate in decision making, especially on issues that involve their practicum student.

Aligning the schedule and course content with instruction in the practicum settings has also been challenging. Both partners said defining the roles and responsibilities of clinical teachers, course instructors, and clinical faculty would be helpful. Teachers said they understood the district’s expectations but were less clear about how OSU defines the clinical teacher role and its responsibilities. This included supervising and evaluating graduate students, coordinating with course instruction, and using specific co-teaching processes and tools. OSU would like to explore ways for clinical teachers to increase their knowledge of the content and syllabi of academic courses so they are more effective in helping practicum students incorporate theory into teaching. Their ideas include posting a monthly newsletter and providing information about weekly classes in a format that busy teachers can use.

Table 2. Planning next steps

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER
<p>Shared vision and goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are priorities, timelines, and/or progress indicators for recruitment numbers and diversity of graduate students? • How does T4B define diverse educator workforce? <p>Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are easy ways to communicate expectations, course content by week, and other information that would help clinical teachers and graduate students link theory to practice? • How can clinical teachers signal when they need answers as soon as possible and when an issue can wait until the weekly meeting? • Who should students contact if they have questions about their courses, clinical experiences, or district procedures? What methods should the student use, e.g., email, phone, Canvass, or others? • What agreements and procedures could improve communication and engagement of all participants in virtual meetings? <p>Graduate students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should graduate students be placed with the same clinical teacher throughout their practicum and residency, or should students be placed in different classroom settings? • Should practicum students be required to apply for a restricted substitute license given the additional teaching experiences substituting provides? • Could a wait list of graduate students be helpful in addressing attrition especially if a student leaves early in the school year? • If a student is having difficulties, what are the guidelines for determining how to support the student? When do you discuss alternative pathways for students such as return to traditional student teaching? How are these decisions made? What is the role of the OSU, district administrators, principals, and clinical teachers? <p>Clinical teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should T4B allow clinical teachers to retain this position for as long as they want or should their tenure be limited e.g., two cycles, or organized in a rotation schedule? • Should clinical teachers have to reapply if they want to participate in a second cycle? • How can clinical teachers share their successes and concerns directly to T4B leadership given their limitations in time? • What is the role of clinical teachers in making residency placement decisions—especially those that involve their practicum students? Are there ways to ensure that clinical teachers who want to support residency students can do so? If so, what input do they have about continuing to co-teach the same student throughout the practicum and residency? Are there ways to support clinical teachers around placement decisions? • How can OSU and BSD balance the responsibilities of clinical faculty and clinical teachers to ensure course content is incorporated and aligned in practice, and clinical teachers feel they have autonomy and flexibility in co-teaching with graduate students? • What involvement could clinical teachers have in determining the schedule of university courses to take advantage of opportunities to align content with the school and classroom academic calendar? • How can clinical teachers and OSU share feedback and have difficult two-way conversations without jeopardizing or straining their relationship with them?

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER (*continued*)

Schools and classroom

- Should recruitment of host schools focus on Title I or high needs schools so graduate students are prepared to serve students who are most at risk for school difficulties? Or should this opportunity be available to all schools who have strong interest in being part of T4B?
- How many schools and classrooms are needed to grow T4B to a size that is sustainable? What is the highest number of graduate students that one school can accommodate?
- How should principals balance the needs of their school versus the needs of the teaching profession and/or BSD?
- Is the goal to develop a cohort of host schools for the district, rotate this opportunity to schools, or make selection decisions on an individual basis?
- Given their knowledge about their school community, what is the role of building principals in making placement decisions?
- If two practicum students are placed in one classroom on the same schedule, what additional orientation and working agreements would help organize responsibilities and address differences in teaching styles and management skills?

School recruitment and selection

Stakeholders offered several ideas—and raised several questions—regarding the recruitment and selection of additional schools. For example, they asked whether the vision was to establish a cohort of schools to host graduate students or whether any interested school could participate in a given school year. They also said it would be helpful to determine the maximum number of graduate students a school can host without overextending its staff and resources. Finally, they also expressed concern about the potential impact on the school of having several classes taught by residency students.

Clinical teachers' recruitment and length of service

Stakeholders shared several ideas related to clinical teachers' recruitment and length of service. Some wondered whether the goal should be to develop a small cohort of highly trained and experienced clinical teachers or a large group of teachers with varying levels of experience and skills. Others thought the professional development and leadership opportunities that come with being a clinical teacher should be available to as many teachers as possible. They suggested limiting the number of cycles that clinical teachers could participate in T4B or organizing a rotation schedule. One principal suggested limiting clinical teachers' participation to two cycles (four years), which would provide ample time for them to learn and grow, but would then open the opportunity to others. Another principal thought requiring clinical teachers to reapply for the position following each cycle could promote professional growth.

Graduate student selection and support

Stakeholders offered different perspectives on the placement of graduate students in clinical settings. Some felt it was essential to place graduate students with the same clinical teacher throughout their practicum and residency in order to leverage the strongest possible mentoring relationship. Clinical teachers and practicum students said building trust takes time, but once established, the authentic conversations it fosters deepens practice. Moreover, deeper familiarity brings more

nuanced understanding of the graduate students' strengths and needs for support, while also strengthening the clinical teacher's ability to provide more meaningful support. Others said that students who have clinical experiences with strong teachers in different classroom settings will "finish the program better able, with more tools, to meet the needs of all students."

CONCLUSION

The T4B partnership has made substantial changes to expand and improve the program. Implementing the OSU Master of Arts Teaching program was a major achievement that required substantial effort for both partners. All stakeholders involved in these efforts believed T4B strengthened the practice of clinical teachers, university faculty, and practicum students. District administrators, faculty, building principals, and teachers are all steadfast in their commitment and belief that T4B will produce beginning teachers that are confident and well-prepared. The advantages that practicum students believe T4B brings to their preparation and future teaching career suggests T4B is on track for realizing this goal.

Residency is the draw for them—such an authentic experience—they want to be a teacher because they believe they love the classroom. This gives them a chance to try it on for size, get their feet wet, with a great deal of embedded support—they are not alone, but getting a real experience in a classroom working with exemplary clinical teachers. (BSD staff member)

References

- Castle, S., & Reilly, K. A. (2011). Impact of professional development school preparation on teacher candidates. In J. E. Neapolitan (Ed.), *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook: Vol. 110, pt. 2. Taking stock of professional development schools: What's needed now* (pp. 337–371). New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College.
- Fraser, J. W., & Watson, A. M. (2014). *Why clinical experience and mentoring are replacing student teaching on the best campuses*. Princeton, NJ: Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.
- Gallimore, R., Ermeling, B. A., Saunders, W. M., & Goldenberg, C. (2009). Moving the learning of teaching closer to practice: Teacher education implications of school-based inquiry teams. *Elementary School Journal*, 109(5), 537–553.
- Henry, G. T., Bastian, K. C., & Fortner, C. K. (2011). Stayers and leavers: Early-career teacher effectiveness and attrition. *Educational Researcher*, 40(6), 271–280.
- Ingersoll, R., & Strong, M. (2012). What the research tells us about the impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. In T. M. Smith (Ed.), *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Vol. 111, pt. 2. Organization and effectiveness of induction programs for new teachers* (pp. 466–490). New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College.
- Kini, T., & Podolsky. (2016). *Does teaching experience increase teacher effectiveness? A review of the research*. Retrieved from Learning Policy Institute website: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/does-teaching-experience-increase-teacher-effectiveness-review-research>
- Kirschenbaum, H., & Reagan, C. (2001). University and urban school partnerships: An analysis of 57 collaborations between a university and a city school district. *Urban Education*, 36(4), 479–504.
- National Center for Teacher Residencies. (2016). *2015 network impact overview* [Research brief]. Retrieved from <https://nctrresidencies.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/NCTR-2015-Network-Impact-Overview.pdf>
- National Research Council, Committee on the Study of Teacher Preparation Programs in the United States. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Neapolitan, J. E. (Ed.). (2011). *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Vol. 110, pt. 2. Taking stock of professional development schools: What's needed now*. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College.
- Nishioka, V. (2012). *Teach for Beaverton: An innovation in teacher education, Beaverton School District, Oregon State University*. Portland, OR: Education Northwest.
- Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L. V. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26(3), 237–257.

- Papay, J. P., & Kraft, M.A. (2015). Productivity returns to experience in the teacher labor market: Methodological challenges and new evidence on long-term career improvement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 130, 105–119.
- Silva, T., McKie, A., Knechtel, V., Gleason, P., & Makowsky, L. (2014). *Teaching residency programs: A multisite look at a new mode to prepare teachers for high-need school* (NEE 2015-4002). Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance website: <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20154002/>

Appendix A: Methods and Focus Group/Interview Protocols

Beaverton School District (BSD) requested this evaluation to provide stakeholders with descriptive information about Teach for Beaverton (T4B), a teacher residency model. T4B serves graduate students enrolled in Oregon State University's (OSU) Master of Arts in Teaching program who are placed in BSD schools for practicum and residency experiences. Education Northwest evaluators worked in partnership with T4B partners to design a two-year evaluation that would produce data to inform decision making and continuous improvement. We are using a developmental evaluation approach to facilitate real-time, meaningful discussions that will deepen stakeholders' understanding of T4B components and help them make data-driven improvement decisions. This approach centers on describing T4B's model, as well as suggesting measures and tracking mechanisms that could provide feedback on short- and long-term outcomes.

During year 1, our focus was to describe the purpose and model components of the T4B partnership and residency model. We also wanted to learn more about factors that influence implementation and relationships among the district and university partners. Through the first year, we participated in project meetings with T4B leadership to develop the evaluation plan and report on preliminary findings. We also developed a logic model that describes the issues being addressed, T4B components, and desired outcomes. Finally, we conducted a brief literature summary and collected interview and focus group data from district and university administrators, faculty, school principals, OSU practicum students, and clinical teachers who were involved in T4B during the 2016-17 school year. The questions that guided these evaluation activities are:

- How do district, school, university personnel and graduate students who are directly involved in Teach for Beaverton perceive its strengths and areas for growth?
- What recommendations do district and university partners have for improving implementation, increasing capacity, and sustaining the Teach for Beaverton innovation?

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODS

The data that informed this evaluation include archival documents related to T4B recruitment, board reports, and previous evaluation reports. After receiving approval from Education Northwest's institutional review board, we conducted separate interviews and focus groups with the following stakeholders: seven T4B practicum students, six clinical teachers, three school administrators, four district-level administrators and program specialists, and three OSU administrators and faculty members.

Data analysis

Interview and focus group data were entered into Atlas.ti, a qualitative data analyses software system. Two researchers used content analysis to code and synthesize common themes, verify statements, and identify areas of agreement and disagreement among the focus group, interview, and document review data.

TEACH FOR BEAVERTON IRB RECRUITMENT AND WAIVER OF INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURES

Informed consent script

Beaverton School District (BSD) contracted with Education Northwest to conduct an external evaluation of the Teach for Beaverton (T4B) program. We are talking with Oregon State University (OSU) faculty members, BSD T4B program administrators, principals in schools with T4B student placements, BSD clinical teachers with T4B student placements, and T4B students participating in, not participating in, and formerly participating in the program. During the interview, we will discuss the program's goals and components, roles of participants, successes and challenges, and its impact for all stakeholders in 2016-17.

As your role is integral to implementation, your perspective is especially valuable. Your feedback will help improve implementation of the program, including the response to any challenges or concerns you may raise here. I do not foresee any risks in your participation. The interview should take about 60 minutes.

Your participation is voluntary and you may discontinue your participation at any time. Please give honest answers. I cannot promise confidentiality, as we are only interviewing a few participants in the various groups of stakeholders, so it may be possible to identify you. Only staff members from Education Northwest will have access to the interview notes. In our final report, we will not identify you by name. Instead, we will discuss themes mentioned by multiple interviewees. We may include some of your comments in quotes. These quotes will not be verbatim and we will not attribute them to you specifically, but rather as an OSU/BSD/T4B staff member or student, as appropriate. If there is something you want to tell me that you are concerned about sharing, please let me know and we can work together to figure out how to include it or whether to include it. In addition, if any question makes you uncomfortable, feel free to decline to answer it.

If you have any questions, please contact:

Angela Roccograndi, at 503-275-9632 or angela.roccograndi@educationnorthwest.org

T4B INTERVIEW/FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Goals and vision

1. In your own words, please describe the overall goal(s) of T4B.
2. What are your organization's (BSD's or OSU's) goals for participation?
3. How do you envision T4B five years from now?

Program description

4. Please describe the T4B model (partner roles and components including T4B oversight; graduate student recruitment, selection, and retention; clinical teacher recruitment, selection, retention; online and hybrid academic courses; clinical placements; financial incentives; and communication). From your perspective, what is successful about these components? What challenges exist?
5. To what extent do T4B components complement each other? What gaps exist?
6. What do you see as the main differences in the way T4B graduate students experience the T4B program compared to students in a traditional student teaching program?
7. How do different stakeholders benefit from participation in T4B?

Collaboration and relationships

8. Think about the relationships that exist between the following groups of stakeholders. Are their roles and responsibilities clear? Is their communication effective? What works well? What challenges exist?
9. Please describe your impression of the BSD/school culture for supporting practicum students. What is most effective at making students feel welcome and part of the school? What challenges exist?
10. Was the goal of establishing a "collaborative working relationship" between OSU faculty, practicum teachers, and clinical teachers achieved? If so, how? If not, why not?

Sustainability

11. To continue to successfully engage in this program, what, if any, additional supports do you need (from OSU and/or BSD)?
12. How would you know if the program was successful?
13. As T4B is currently implemented, do you think it's on track to attain its goals? Why or why not?
14. Is there anything else I should know about T4B that we have not already discussed?

Thank you.

Appendix B: Requirements for the Oregon State University Master of Arts in Teaching

Year 1	Course Title	Credits	Location	Clinical Hours
Fall	Classroom Management & Discipline K-12	3	Ecampus Hybrid	30
	Foundations of ESOL Education	3	Online	
	<i>Practicum</i>	1	Hybrid	30
Winter	Inquiry in Mathematics & Mathematics Education	3	Ecampus Hybrid	30
	Technology for Educators	3	Online	
	<i>Practicum</i>	1	Hybrid	30
Spring	Students with Special Needs	2	Online	
	Strategies for Developing Literacy	3	Ecampus Hybrid	30
	<i>Practicum</i>	1	Hybrid	30
Summer	Inquiry in Science & Science Education	3	Ecampus Hybrid	
	K-5 STEM Integration in Diverse Classrooms	2	Online	
Summer Electives ¹ (Not counted towards degree)	Algebra and Function in K-8 Mathematics	3	Online	
	Probability and Data Analysis in K-8 Mathematics	3	Online	
Year 2	Course Title	Credits	Location	Clinical Hours
Fall	Social Justice in Education	3	Online	
	Strategies for Integrating Humanities	3	Ecampus Hybrid	20
	<i>Practicum</i>	1	Hybrid	30
Winter	Assessment for Learning	3	Ecampus Hybrid	
	<i>Practicum (edTPA Preparation)</i>	2	Hybrid	60
Spring	Teacher as Reflective Practitioner	3	Online	
	<i>Internship</i>	12	Hybrid	360
	Sum of Practicum & Internship Hours			540
	Sum of Course Embedded Practicum Hours			110
	TOTAL CREDITS	52	TOTAL CLINICAL HOURS	650

¹Algebra and Function in K-8 Mathematics and Probability and Data Analysis in K-8 mathematics course hours are electives and are not counted towards degree.

Note: The two-year program requires students to complete 34 academic course hours and 18 clinical credit hours. Practicum hours are in italics.