



4-1-2011

The Urban Teacher Residency Program: A Recursive Process to Develop Professional Dispositions, Knowledge, and Skills of Candidates to Teach Diverse Students

Kathleen Tindle

Maxine Freund
George Washington University

Bridget Belknap
George Washington University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/edconsiderations>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Tindle, Kathleen; Freund, Maxine; Belknap, Bridget; Green, Colin; and Shotel, Jay (2011) "The Urban Teacher Residency Program: A Recursive Process to Develop Professional Dispositions, Knowledge, and Skills of Candidates to Teach Diverse Students," *Educational Considerations*: Vol. 38: No. 2. <https://doi.org/10.4148/0146-9282.1132>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Considerations by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact cads@k-state.edu.

The Urban Teacher Residency Program: A Recursive Process to Develop Professional Dispositions, Knowledge, and Skills of Candidates to Teach Diverse Students

Authors

Kathleen Tindle, Maxine Freund, Bridget Belknap, Colin Green, and Jay Shotel

The Urban Teacher Residency Program: A Recursive Process to Develop Professional Dispositions, Knowledge, and Skills of Candidates to Teach Diverse Students

Kathleen Tindle, Maxine Freund, Bridget Belknap, Colin Green, and Jay Shotel

To be prepared to teach in an urban setting, preservice teachers must exit their teacher preparation program with a professional disposition toward equity and social justice as well as the knowledge and skills required to meet the needs of all students in their classroom. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) requires under Standard 4-Diversity that accredited institutions of higher education train, equip, and assess preservice candidates with regard to their ability to address diversity in their classrooms; and ensure that preservice candidates encounter diverse student populations as they prepare to teach (NCATE 2008). In addition, preparing teachers for the challenges of urban schools requires candidates dedicated to self-examination and reflection on practice to assure comfort in the setting and the flexibility necessary for adjustment in the implementation of expected teaching and learning outcomes.

Kathleen Tindle is Senior Program Associate on the Assessment and Evaluation Team with Synergy Enterprises, Inc., a consulting firm in the Washington, D.C. area. Her areas of research interest are urban education, novice teacher support, case study design, and program evaluation.

Maxine Freund is Professor in the Department of Special Education and Disabilities Studies and Director of the Office of Partnership and External Relations in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development at The George Washington University. She is engaged in local and regional partnerships with community school systems and community organizations where graduate students are prepared as teachers and counselors in residency and internship programs.

Many preservice candidates preparing to teach in urban schools will meet students from ethnic, racial, linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds that are different from their own. These new teachers may encounter what Zumwalt and Craig (2008) described as a “diversity gap” when they enter their teaching settings whereby they simultaneously struggle to understand and build a context for the often vast cultural differences between the lives of students and their own.¹ To that end, it is central that teacher preparation programs provide opportunities for urban teacher candidates to explore, develop, and maintain dispositions and beliefs that allow them to instruct students in a manner that respects each child’s unique characteristics while promoting the highest standard of learning possible.² This commitment aligns with NCATE Standard 4 that demands “...all teacher candidates must develop proficiencies for working effectively with students and families from diverse populations and with exceptionalities to ensure that all students learn” (NCATE 2008, 36) This article describes how the George Washington University (GWU) Graduate School of Education and Human Development Urban Teacher Residency Program meets NCATE Standards 4a and 4d through a program design that includes a recursive exploration of teacher beliefs, knowledge, and effective practice for diverse student populations.

NCATE Standard 4a relates to the design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences in teacher preparation programs (NCATE 2008, 34). It requires that teacher candidates participate in coursework and clinical settings that promote diversity and inclusion of all students. NCATE defines diversity as: “Differences among groups of people and individuals based on ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, exceptionalities, language, religion, sexual orientation, and geographical area” (NCATE 2008, 86). Curriculum in teacher preparation programs must be rooted in a conceptual framework that considers all students’ experiences and backgrounds valuable and that all students can learn. According to this standard, teacher candidates must be able to translate and apply this conceptual framework to their own classrooms and teaching. Their instruction must actively incorporate aspects of their students’ lives and cultures. In doing so, there should be frequent and meaningful communication between the teacher candidate and students and their parents that invites participation in the classroom community and values the unique experiences of each party. Teacher candidates also must create a classroom environment that promotes diversity and fairness for

Bridget Belknap is a Research Associate in the Department of Teacher Preparation and Special Education at The George Washington University and is a doctoral student in special education. Her research is on risk and resilience in special education teachers.

Colin Green is Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy at The George Washington University. His teaching and research interests focus on urban education and curriculum theory.

Jay R. Shotel is Professor of Special Education and a former chair of the Department of Teacher Preparation and Special Education at The George Washington University. Over the past 20 years, he has created numerous partnerships with local school systems designed to prepare regular and special educators. He is currently the principal investigator on three such projects.

all students. Candidates are to be assessed on their ability to translate the GWU diversity and fairness conceptual framework taught in their graduate courses into actual classroom practice.

NCATE Standard 4d requires teacher candidates to participate in a range of clinical experiences that allows them to work with students from diverse backgrounds. By participating in clinical settings with students from backgrounds different from than their own, candidates are able to confront their own beliefs about diversity and apply learning from coursework in diversity. They work to improve student learning in a variety of contexts with a variety of students and thereby improve their effectiveness as teachers. This process is facilitated and assessed by frequent feedback from program supervisors and peers.

The Urban Teaching Residency Program

This section of the article describes the Urban Teaching Residency Program and is divided into four parts: (1) Overview of the program; (2) Recruitment and Selection of Residents; (3) Pre-residency course and community mapping; and (4) Residency fieldwork, clinical practice, course assignments, and seminar.

Overview of the Program

The mission of the Urban Teaching Residency Program, hereafter referred to as the “program,” is to develop confident teachers with positive professional dispositions supported by knowledge and skills to meet the educational needs of urban students with diverse learning strengths and needs within a social justice framework. The program was designed to build a community of learners comprised of faculty, staff, graduate preservice teachers (“Residents”), alumni, and school personnel preparing teachers within the context of the


day-to-day life of urban, high needs schools. The residency creates multiple opportunities for recursive reflection and growth in disposition and pedagogical knowledge and skills over the course of a year. The program draws on the capacity-building of longstanding GSEHD professional development school (PDS) partnerships and aligns with the clinical practices of nationally recognized urban teacher residency models like the Boston Teacher Residency, Chicago’s Academy for Urban School Leadership, and the Denver area Boettcher Teacher Program.

The program selects candidates based on rigorous academic criteria as well as a predisposition toward social justice. Once invited into the program, Residents take coursework over the summer that encourages them to expand, frame, and articulate their beliefs about working in urban schools with diverse populations. As the school year begins, Residents enter a recursive cycle during which they teach, reflect, and collaborate in their clinical practice, field experiences, and coursework while simultaneously challenging, reaffirming, and confronting their beliefs about teaching in an urban setting. At the conclusion of the program, Residents emerge with a deep understanding of social and cultural capital and professional dispositions informed by knowledge and skills requisite to meet the needs of the students in urban classrooms and to positively impact the communities they serve. The Figure below shows the recursive framework employed by the program.

Recruitment and Selection of Residents

The program recruits Residents already predisposed to urban education by focusing on individuals who desire to work in high need schools in the District of Columbia Public Schools because preservice teachers with positive dispositions toward working with students

**Figure
Recursive Process**



from diverse backgrounds have been identified as more capable of meeting the needs of these students (Haberman, 1996). Applicants are selected using the Haberman Teacher Selection Interview (Haberman 1995), an instrument designed to screen for dispositions favorable to teaching students living in poverty and to social justice. Interviews are a day long experience held at a high needs, urban school and include brief classrooms observations. Conducting the interview at the school site gives interviewers a context for their questions and helps situate candidate belief statements in reactions to school conditions and classroom observations. Over the five years of the program, five themes have emerged from the responses of candidates who have been accepted into the residency program: (1) Education improves the lives of students over time; (2) Education should provide equal access for everyone; (3) All students can learn; (4) Education must engage high standards for students; and (5) education involves relationships.³ Table 1 provides samples of student interview comments which align with these themes.

Pre-Residency Course and Community Mapping

Pre-Residency Course. The summer before the year-long residency experience, Residents take an intensive four-week course in foundations of urban schooling. The content and themes are woven into a subsequent course that will span the residency year. This pre-residency course is designed to anchor Residents in the relevant literature and research that address the promises and challenges associated with working in high poverty, urban schools with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Based upon NCATE Standards 4a and 4d, it focuses on developing foundational knowledge and dispositions that strengthen the capacity of Residents to be successful with diverse student populations. Here, schooling is viewed as a process with racial,

cultural, economic and political dimensions, and as a system responsible for challenging inequities and establishing a more socially just society. Further, schooling is viewed through a socio-ecological lens that can inform stakeholders of the potential for improvement and reform. These views of schooling form the building blocks of the course and lead to readings and collaborative deliberation that illuminate three well-developed strands of theory and research on urban schools: (1) Social and cultural capital in schooling (Lareau 2003 and Suskind 1999); (2) the interaction of race, class, poverty, and literacy (Finn 1999); and (3) social and ecological systems that influence a student's lived experience in school (Bronfenbrenner 1996).

Through reading Lareau's (2003) ethnographic study of 12 fourth grade children from middle and working class backgrounds in Philadelphia, coupled with Suskind's (1999) detailed description of one high school student's journey from poverty in Washington D.C. to an Ivy League university, Residents are introduced to the multiple ways in which parenting and family life can support or conflict with what is valued in mainstream schooling practices. Beginning with a definition of social and cultural capital as the resources and networks that promote valuable academic and mainstream cultural knowledge, Residents note the advantages garnered by middle class students through their families and wider social networks. For the most part, mainstream schooling practices build on these to advantage the academic achievement of students from middle class backgrounds in comparison to lower socioeconomic status peers.

The majority of Residents respond to the notion of social and cultural capital by underlining their role as one of advocacy, acting as agents to promote these forms of capital in their students. They view themselves as social and cultural agents whose task was to "fill in

Table 1
Interview Themes with Supporting Statements

Theme	Supporting Statements
1. Education improves the lives of students over time.	"Education is transforming." "A person who experiences diversity will be well-rounded and able to understand the world." "Education leads to a progressive mind."
2. Education should provide equal access for everyone.	"Everyone should be given the opportunity of a quality education." "SES should not affect education."
3. All students can learn.	"Meet each child at their needed level." "All students have amazing potential." "Engaged kids are successful in education." "There is no one right way."
4. Education must engage high standards for students.	"Critical thinking gives hope for potential." "Creativity out of a foundation of disciplined skills."
5. Education involves relationships.	"Teaching is about relationships" "Each one teach one." "Children are our best teachers."

the gaps, add the missing pieces to the student's jigsaw puzzle, make them equal to kids from better backgrounds, and work for students just like invested parents do all the time" (Resident journal entries, June 15, 2009). There is a strong desire on the part of Residents to develop a "middle-class (ness)" in their urban students, a quality they deem essential to academic success. In essence, they want to mimic the "concerted cultivation" that Lareau (2003) characterizes as central to middle-class parenting styles. They view caring, invested teachers like Mr. Taylor in Suskind's (1999) work as excellent role models for their own teacher identities. At the same time, most Residents draw attention to the need to "build on what a student already has" to develop the sorts of knowledge schools value. As a result of the interview and screening process prior to admission, most Residents come into the program acutely aware of the social and cultural disconnect that often characterizes the relationship between low income students of color and mainstream schooling practices. This awareness underpins a tacit recognition that middle-class knowledge valuable to academic achievement cannot simply supplant or replace existing knowledge that students bring to the classroom, but, rather, Residents, as teachers and advocates, must tap into students' different ways of knowing that can work in tandem with culturally situated mainstream knowledge and further students' academic achievement.

At the heart of the process of developing social and cultural capital that is valued by schools, Residents observe the role of language and literacy and its development and nurturing through careful adult scaffolding and support as central to their work as social and cultural advocates. The intersection of race and class with language development and literacy instruction emerges as a second strand of the pre-residency course. This exploration often results in deeper knowledge that informs and strengthens Residents' dispositions as articulated in NCATE Standard 4. For example, one Resident began his course essay (June 29, 2009) with the words, "Come on, man, let's pre-game!" He proceeded to describe the ritual undertaken by some college students on Friday nights that involves consuming alcohol before venturing out to the night's main activities of clubbing and partying – a head start on the main event. He further noted that many middle class college students have been pre-gaming most of their lives, fully supported by their parents:

Middle-class families do not pre-game with liquor, however, but with literacy. By constantly conditioning their children to the rules and routines, hence the game, of literacy, middle-class parents give their own children a powerful advantage over the children of working-class and low-income families, for school, college and in the professional world to come.

Another Resident advanced the idea that teachers in high-poverty areas needed to develop their classrooms as spaces where "language games" can be created and practiced to display the "importance of verbal language in making it in the world" (journal entry, June 17, 2009).

Residents come to an understanding that "all literacy is not created equal" based on a reading of Finn's (1999) typology of distinct levels of literacy. With supporting research, Finn identified a strong correlation between different types of literacy teaching and differing socioeconomic categories of students, noting the prevalence of performative and functional literacy development in schools populated by low income students. In Finn's (1999) view, powerful literacy was most frequently witnessed in affluent schools where language and literacy

are seen as creative acts, exercises in negotiation and reasoning with the goals of being able to "evaluate, analyze and synthesize what is read" (p. 124). In short, students who are nurtured and supported in the ability to negotiate and reason acquire power in language that is foundational to academic success. Residents, through collaborative deliberation and self-reflection, return to the middle class children of Lareau's (2003) text and recall how their language facility was cultivated by their parents so that they knew how to navigate interactions with professionals such as doctors and coaches, how to question opinions, and how to advocate for their positions on teams. The ability to harness powerful language and literacy deepens the reservoir of social and cultural capital of middle class students and, in the eyes of the Residents, needs to be nurtured by teachers in interactions with high-poverty urban students.

The interaction of race and class with specific forms of language and literacy development, and the role this interaction plays in expanding students' funds of social and cultural capital, does not occur in a societal vacuum. Rather, a deeply rooted ecology of systems and processes provides a complex backdrop for the typical trajectory of many high-poverty urban students. This course helps Residents who have not typically experienced such a trajectory to understand how broader systems and processes in which schools are embedded may come to exert strong positive or negative influences on students' experiences. Exploring this knowledge base enhances Residents' dispositions and abilities to communicate with students and families in sensitive and culturally responsive ways.

Community Mapping. Residents are introduced to Bronfenbrenner's (1996) notion of the multidimensional processes that underpin students' daily lives within and outside school, ranging from macroprocesses like government regulation, media, and popular culture to the microlevel role of parents and community members. Bronfenbrenner (1996) also noted the negative psychological effects on students if physical, emotional and cognitive safety are lacking. Course readings and class discussion underscore that the absence of such safety lowers the sense of self-determination and sense of efficacy a student living in a high-poverty urban environment may experience. In the process, Residents reflect on their own educational biographies where school and community values and goals were generally aligned and mutually reinforced. The question then becomes how to help Residents view the urban community in which the school is embedded as an asset and a source of capital that can be utilized for academic success. The answer is found in a community mapping exercise that follows the pre-residency foundations course.

As a pre-residency activity, the program uses mapping of a school community to acquaint Residents with its culture, resources, issues, concerns, and needs.⁴ To facilitate the activity, program staff designate several small geographic areas around a school that provide Residents with opportunities to develop knowledge of the community. In small groups, Residents explore resources, housing, businesses, social service providers, recreational facilities, religious institutions, neighborhood history, local issues, and opinions of people in their school community. They walk through the area talking to people on the streets and in businesses and resource centers about their experiences and the history of the community. In addition, Residents collect appropriate artifacts and take pictures. Every group member is responsible for observing and talking to people; asking questions; and deciding where to stop; and what is important. Through this activity, Residents begin to identify instructional resources and opportunities

in the community that may prove relevant to their students' goals, interests, and backgrounds.

When mapping has been completed, Residents convene to debrief with emphasis on community assets; issues or concerns in the community; and patterns observed across the different areas the groups mapped. Debriefing also provides Residents with an opportunity to discuss any discomfort or anxiety they felt due to cultural differences. Community mapping is the Residents' first attempt at applying Bronfenbrenner's (1996) ecological perspective whereby they must acknowledge a new set of relationships and reflect on connections with and differences from existing influences in their lives.

Although many Residents are familiar with high needs communities, the community mapping activity allows them to interact with people living and working in the specific community where they will be teaching. As such, this activity serves as Residents' first step in becoming members of their school community. At the same time, the community mapping process might serve as a challenge to some Residents' beliefs, and so it becomes an opportunity to confront and strengthen Residents' professional dispositions.⁵

Residency field experiences, clinical practice, course assignments, and seminar

The Residency year begins at the start of the academic year for both the school system and GWU. Residents now are working in a classroom with K-12 students in an urban school where they continue to focus and deliberate on race, class, poverty, and literacy as facets of social and cultural capital. Residents met weekly in year-long courses and a seminar that address classroom events and connect with summer curriculum topics. Consideration of the needs of low performing and special education students are now added to deliberations on classroom contexts. Deliberations are planned to situate discourse in the context of classroom events that confirm, challenge or confuse Residents' beliefs about educating urban youth. Like the community mapping activity, each opportunity is designed and layered to support effective practice that considers and values students' diversity of needs and identifies community assets.

Residents teach students from urban communities and families defined by and impacted by generational cycles of poverty, representing a wide range of learners, many with disabilities particularly in the area of literacy. Most students are reading at least two years below grade level and have difficulty writing sentences and paragraphs. Many elementary students exhibit disruptive behaviors that emanate from the social and emotional trauma of their lives while many secondary students do not attend school regularly or appear disinterested in education. These conditions create discomfort for Residents who struggle with questions of how to put their dispositions of advocacy and social justice frameworks into practice in an environment that is mostly foreign to them.

In fall semester coursework, Residents draw upon course readings to connect relevant applications in the classrooms while recognizing divisions between theory and practice. Initial indications of emerging struggles are revealed in Resident's responses to assignments in the early weeks of the semester. When asked to respond to readings about family involvement, Residents have noted several challenges to their belief systems, as follows:

I did notice that I do look down upon young mothers with no husband or partner. ...I guess the reason that this scenario bothers me is that sometimes children of young, partner-less mothers don't get what they need as they

develop and grow because the mother isn't ready to take on the responsibility of raising a child. I need to somehow overcome this prejudice. ...This raises another issue, which is: how do we overcome the prejudices and preconceived notions that we may already have that could potentially cause trouble for us when communicating with our students' parents?

A second Resident confronted the apparent gap between home and school:

(In) my classroom of twenty-two (students) and forty-four possible parents, I have seen and /or met only seven. At the beginning of the school year some parents weren't even present. Back to school night ...had a total of three parents show. ...Even if the parents are not physically in the school, it's still important that there is a way to reach out to them.

At the same time, a third Resident indicated a growing understanding of the importance of social and cultural capital:

Being in a high needs school, its stereotypes sometimes make you see parents as deficits, non-supportive of the teacher. We have got to remind ourselves to view interaction with parents on an asset-based and positive reinforcement standpoint not deficit or negative reinforcement standpoint.

In another assignment, Residents grapple with the topic of behavior, informing their dispositions with knowledge and skills from related courses as they confronted field experiences that affect student learning and effective teaching. One wrote:

I have to think about these (behavioral) annoyances in the big picture. Which ones interfere with classroom learning, which ones can I change by implementing a structure/ system, and which ones do I accept because the energy expended to change them is not worth the effort?

Another Resident confronted the influence of the teacher on behavior in the class by connecting knowledge learned in the summer with new knowledge in the fall:

In the summer course we discussed the fact that all of us have individual hang-ups and snapping points that are not immediately apparent to those around us, but which can be drawn to light quite easily by the stressful extemporaneous nature of the classroom. ...These behaviors make up an individual's "deep culture," which are not immediately ostensible but nevertheless vital for the teacher to address in themselves for the sake of a smooth classroom.

These statements indicated that even people who hold positive professional dispositions must continually combine knowledge, skills, and reflection to find ways that make sense when confronted with challenging classroom experiences.

In order to facilitate opportunities to combine knowledge, skills, and reflection, Residents take methods and curriculum courses in the fall semester which contain specific methods and materials to facilitate culturally responsive pedagogy with a culturally and linguistically diverse student population. GWU faculty then observe implementation in the field and provide feedback on Residents' performance, tying the knowledge bases of diversity and inclusion to classroom practice. The lessons Residents implement are also monitored by mentor teachers and field-based supervisory personnel who provide layers of integrative feedback that reinforce the recursive process

and the connection of culturally responsive pedagogy with student performance outcomes. This layering of supervision represents a process to meet NCATE expectations that Residents' abilities to teach all students and plan for ways to improve practice are regularly reviewed and assessed.

Journal prompts are used to tie the content of methods to the reality of urban school teaching. For example, a "beliefs and practices assignment" based in the methods experience requires Residents to tie a dispositional frame of reference to curriculum content formally presented in the course. Residents are prompted to consider curriculum content as it relates to their field experiences and conceptualizations of diversity and inclusion. Table 2 contains representative journal responses indicating how Residents integrate coursework with practice to advance their students' learning needs while considering their own dispositions. Through deliberate layering and structuring of recursive opportunities in collaborative deliberation and self-reflection, Residents continually confront their beliefs with newly acquired knowledge and skills to strengthen and deepen their abilities to incorporate multiple perspectives around issues of diversity within real life contexts.

Along with the aforementioned layered approach to monitoring of Resident lesson implementation, Residents engage in written reflection throughout the year after each formally observed lesson, focusing on student learning and next teaching steps. Concurrently, Residents are engaged in academic work that facilitates continued learning about their own, their student, and the families' social and cultural capital; their teacher identity; and issues of special education. Asking Residents to engage in this level of recursive collaborative exploration and reflection each week helps them interpret the work of urban education as challenging yet rewarding and supports persistence in the development of positive professional dispositions informed by knowledge and skills as expected by NCATE Standards 4a and 4d.

As such, the recursive structure continually provides Residents with opportunities to deliberate and self-reflect to support their clinical practice. In a seminar, Residents engage in problem-solving issues and concerns based on their clinical practice through role-playing, small-group discussions of issues, use of the critical friends structured protocol, small-group presentation, and deconstruction of Resident teaching events captured on video. Frequently Residents raise issues that are new to their experience, knowledge, and skill set but endemic in urban teaching. They come to seminar grappling with experiences that do not necessarily match their belief systems and that often feel too big for one teacher to take on. For example, they want to know why a special education classroom is populated exclusively by black males; why students are frequently absent from class; why they do not see many parents at parent-teacher conferences; and why suspension and expulsion rates seem disproportionately high? They ask questions about classroom management, community resources, and literacy strategies for students reading several grade levels below their peers. They work with each other and with project staff to reflect collaboratively and offer strategies and support to one another to increase their application of theory to practice and to confront the discontinuity they experience between their beliefs and experiences around issues of diversity.

The seminar requires Residents to work collaboratively in unpacking the complexity of what their students already know and identifying what they need to know. This requires Residents to figure out ways to collect student data that is meaningful to the teaching and learning cycle so their practice is informed by students' prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural background. For example, at the beginning of the school year, one Resident asked her students to write "I am from" poems (Christensen 2000) in addition to completing a basic reading assessment. These brief poems informally assess writing ability and provide the Resident with information about students' cultural background and interests. The Resident was

Table 2
Method Journal Responses

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy	Teacher Strategies and Techniques
Be a role model to students by being enthusiastic about the subject matter.	Being aware of difficult circumstances that populations different from my own face will help me to avoid making judgments about the parents.
Teach students learning strategies so they will become effective learners.	Give specific and detailed feedback that includes showing progress in students' learning.
Explain that mistakes are part of the learning process and not a negative sign of ability or intelligence.	Make lessons relevant to students' lives by demonstrating the usefulness of the lessons in their lives.
Promote self-motivation by helping students monitor their own performance.	Form relationships with each student to create sense of belonging.
Praise students authentically and convey high expectations for them.	Create a classroom that focuses on learning rather than performance.

then able to use that data to build a classroom culture that incorporated reading tasks that were not only grade-level appropriate but also responsive to student interests. A Resident in a high-school science classroom gave weekly quizzes to students to assess their learning. In addition to asking students to answer the questions, the Resident also asked students to rank on a scale of one-to-three how prepared they felt to answer that particular test item. By allowing them to rank their preparedness to answer questions, he was promoting fairness, gathering useful data, and encouraging students to think critically about assessments.

Conclusion

Meeting the accreditation requirements set forth by NCATE Standards 4a and 4d requires that institutions of higher education provide preservice candidates with opportunities to encounter diverse student populations. While NCATE standards 4a and 4d identify dispositions, knowledge and skills necessary for success with all learners, the challenge of preparing teachers for urban schools demands careful structuring of programmatic components to build capacity for effective program delivery to ensure successful candidate outcomes. Reflecting on GWU's experience with the Urban Teacher Residency Program, the authors believe several elements warrant careful consideration:

- It is imperative to collect evidence of applicants' predisposition to view education through a social justice lens and, upon admission to show flexibility with and comfort in complex urban settings.
- Institutional faculty must carefully align coursework with field experiences and clinical practice, consciously bridge theory with practice-based examples, and be ready to work with and to tolerate Residents' cognitive dissonance and disillusion in order that Residents' patterns of learning are developed.
- As the Resident moves through the program, faculty, staff and field partners must appreciate the intersecting challenges of the clinical practice including the many challenges to Residents' belief structures and knowledge/skill building that impact dispositions.
- The real work with Residents is to support their experiences so as not to change dispositions that align with diversity and inclusion but instead to grow and foster their development.
- Building habits of practice and habits of the mind over time enables the Resident to become an effective teacher who creates a culture of diversity and inclusion.

It is through this labor-intensive recursive structure that GWU's urban teacher preparation program is able to prepare novice teachers willing and able to persist in the hard work urban schools demand.

Endnotes

¹ Urban teacher preparation literature acknowledges a cultural and socioeconomic mismatch between the majority of teachers in training and their future urban students. Most urban preservice teachers are white and middle class, while urban students are typically culturally and linguistically diverse and come from low socioeconomic

status backgrounds (Grant and Gillette 2006; Sleeter 2001; Wiggins, Follo, and Eberly 2007). Research on preservice urban teachers has indicated that many preservice teachers who experience this mismatch demonstrate "culture shock" or "cultural disequilibrium" and may not possess the cultural competence to effectively teach diverse students (Bergeron 2008; Foote and Cook-Cottone 2004).

² There is a significant body of preservice urban teacher preparation literature that reveals many preservice teachers have negative preconceived notions about urban students (Groulx 2001; Leland and Harste 2005; Zygmunt-Fillwalk and Leitze 2006; Sleeter 2001). For example, preservice teachers may believe that urban students do not desire to learn or come from homes that do not care about education (Groulx 2001). Much of the research on preparing urban teachers discusses the importance of preservice teachers' dispositions related to becoming effective urban teachers. Haberman (1993, 1995, 1996) found that preservice teachers who already possess positive dispositions toward working with culturally and linguistically diverse students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds are more capable of addressing urban students' academic needs than preservice teachers who do not. However, a number of researchers have shown that given both preservice coursework and a supported and sustained clinical practice, preservice teachers who came to education with negative dispositions can and do modify their dispositions toward a more positive perspective on urban students, families, and schools (Leland and Harste 2005; Wiggins, Follo, and Eberly 2007; Zygmunt-Fillwalk and Leitze 2006).

³ These themes reveal the predispositions of candidates accepted into the Residency program. As Groulx's (2001) work suggests, candidates do not come with negative preconceived notions about students; instead admitted candidates provided evidence that they had already framed education as an issue of social justice and expressed a desire to become a teacher motivated to impact the social inequality in the lives of many urban students. This is not a common conceptualization of teaching according to Tamir (2009), but it is one that serves urban education and aligns well with the NCATE Standard 4. However, teacher dispositions are not enough to prepare preservice candidates to adequately promote and respect diversity in their classrooms. In addition, Residents must develop the requisite knowledge and skills through a curriculum that connects theory to practice, offers coursework aligned with field experiences, and situates opportunities for self-reflection that address diversity issues directly and continually (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1993; Jennings 2009; Ladson-Billings 1999; Lynn and Smith-Maddox 2007; and Sleeter 2008).

⁴ Community mapping is a tool grounded in a school-to-careers research that can enhance educators' efforts, knowledge base, and awareness of community assets to create an approach to instruction that considers the community context and connects instruction to students' experiences and cultures base (Sears and Hersh 1998).

⁵ Mapping is followed by three months of in-depth research into the community's potential role in instructional planning for authentic lessons.

⁶ NCATE (2008) describes field experiences as "...a variety of early and ongoing field-based opportunities in which candidates may observe, assist, tutor, instruct, and/or conduct research. Field

experiences may occur in off-campus settings such as schools, community centers, or homeless shelters” (p. 86). Clinical practice is defined as follows: “Student teaching or internships that provide candidates with an intensive and extensive culminating activity. Candidates are immersed in the learning community and are provided opportunities to develop and demonstrate competence in the professional roles for which they are preparing” (NCATE 2008, 85). It should be noted that in residency programs field experiences and clinical practice often overlap.

References

- Bergeron, Bette. 2008. Enacting a culturally responsive curriculum in a novice teacher’s classroom. *Urban Education* 43 (1): 4-28.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1996. Ecological perspective of human development. In *Theories of adolescence*, ed. Rolf Muuss, 312-338. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Christensen, Linda. 2000. *Reading, writing, rising up*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, and Susan Lytl. 1993. *Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Finn, Patrick. 1999. *Literacy with an attitude*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Foote, Chandra, and Catherine Cook-Cottone. 2004. Field experiences in high needs urban setting: Analysis of current practice and insights for change. *The Urban Review* 36 (3): 189-210.
- Grant, Carl, and Maureen Gillette. 2006. A candid talk to teacher educators about effectively preparing teachers who can teach everyone’s children. *Journal of Teacher Education* 57 (3): 292-299.
- Groulx, Judith. 2001. Changing preservice teacher perceptions of minority schools. *Urban Education* 36 (1): 60-92.
- Haberman, Martin. 1993. Predicting the success of urban teachers (the Milwaukee trials). *Action in Teacher Education* 15 (3): 1-6.
- _____. 1995. *Star teachers of children in poverty*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- _____. 1996. Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In *Handbook of research on teacher education*, ed. John P. Sikula, Thomas J. Buttery, and Edith Guyton, 747-760. New York: MacMillan.
- Jennings, Louise, and Heidi Mills. 2009. Constructing a discourse of inquiry: Findings from a five-year ethnography at one elementary school. *Teachers College Record* 111 (7): 1583-1618.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria J. 1999. Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education* 24: 211-247.
- Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal childhoods: Class, race and family life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Leland, Christine, and Jerome Harste. 2005. Doing what we want to become: Preparing new urban teachers. *Urban Education* 40 (1): 60-77.
- Lynn, Marvin, and Renee Smith-Maddox. 2007. Preservice teacher inquiry: Creating a space to dialogue about becoming a social justice educator. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23 (1): 94-105.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Preparation (NCATE). February 2008. *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions*. Washington, DC.
- Sears, Susan Jones, and Susan B. Hersh. 1998. Contextual teaching and learning: An overview of the project. In *Contextual teaching and learning: Preparing teachers to enhance student success in and beyond schools*, 1-18. Columbus, OH, and Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Center on Education and Training for Employment, College of Education, The Ohio State University; and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.
- Sleeter, Christine. 2008. An invitation to support diverse students through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 59 (3): 212-219.
- _____. 2001. *Culture, difference, and power*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tamir, Eran. 2009. Choosing to teach in urban schools among graduates of elite colleges. *Urban Education* 44, 5: 522-544.
- Suskind, Ron. 1999. *A hope in the unseen: An American odyssey from the inner city to the Ivy League*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Wiggins, Robert, Eric Follo, and Mary Eberly. 2007. The impact of a field immersion program on pre-service teachers’ attitudes toward teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies* 23 (5): 653-663.
- Zumwalt, Karen, and Elizabeth Craig. 2008. Who is teaching? Does it matter? In *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts*, ed. Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Sharon Feiman-Nemser, D. John McIntyre, and Kelly Demers, 405-423. New York: Routledge.
- Zygmunt-Fillwalk, Eva, and Ann Leitze. 2006. Promising practices in teacher education: The Ball State University urban semester. *Childhood Education* 82 (5): 283-288.