A Sustainable Teacher Residency:

Designing Paid Internships for Teacher Education

Abstract

The purpose of this case study research is to describe how one teacher preparation program constructed a pilot program to compensate teacher candidates for their work in school classrooms. The program provides teacher candidates with opportunities to work in schools year-round, including semester breaks, the months of May and June, and in extended year programs during the summer. The program is intended to replace part time work outside of education with work in P-12 school classrooms that better prepares teacher candidates for their teaching careers. Forty-one participants volunteered for the program during spring semester 2017. This study reports on initial data collected five months after the pilot began in the fall semester, 2017. Data were collected through interviews and surveys of teacher candidates and interviews with supervisors. The findings indicate that participants spent more time in schools, felt more confident about teaching and better prepared to teach, and would recommend the program to others.

Introduction

Declaring a common goal of increasing P-12 student learning has brought the Monmouth University Partnership together in common cause. Each new and current initiative is evaluated based on its capacity for increasing P-12 student learning. The result has been greater buy-in for the partnership, increased collaboration, and a shared responsibility among partners for P-12 student learning and teacher preparation. New partnership initiatives that have facilitated student learning are longer clinical

experiences, the implementation of co-teaching, and the assessment of teacher candidate impact on student learning (For a fuller description, see Henning et al., in press).

During the past three years and prior to the development of the Teacher Residency pilot program, the Monmouth University Partnership has been piloting and implementing a yearlong clinical internship experience. During the yearlong experience teacher candidates remain in one placement during an entire year. In the first semester, they complete a minimum of a hundred hours of clinical experience, and in the second semester, they engage in a full time clinical internship, formerly known as student teaching. The added value of the longer clinical experience has quickly been recognized by teacher candidates, teachers, and administrators. Teacher candidates build stronger relationships, become more involved with school events, and have a greater impact on student learning. In short, they become members of the school community (Foster et al, 2018).

However, expanding the number of clinical hours has put added pressure on teacher candidates in regards to balancing their time. Many teacher candidates have to work to subsidize the cost of college. Between their coursework, their clinical experiences, and their jobs, students are hard pressed to meet all their obligations. Between jobs and coursework, we found that conflicts with work were more common than schedule conflicts. It became clear from our work with the yearlong experience that further expansion of our clinical experiences could be limited by teacher candidates need to meet their financial obligations.

In response to the concerns of teacher candidates and as part of our larger effort to further expand our clinical experience, the Teacher Residency program was created to

engage sophomores, juniors, seniors, and initial licensure graduate students in an extended apprenticeship in P-12 school settings over a two- to three-year period. As part of the program, teacher candidates perform functions traditionally given to substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors. In turn, monies from school budgets to compensate these positions are invested into the teacher residency program. Other sources of funds include professional development monies, summer enrichment programs, university scholarships, and graduate assistantships.

The purpose of this case study is to further explore an enhanced level of mutual benefits through a teacher residency program. The study shows how the design of the Teacher Residency program addresses the financial burdens of students, meets local school district needs for substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors while further expanding clinical experiences. Through interview and survey data, teacher candidates, school principals, district superintendents, and university leadership will tell the story of how they started the program, what has guided their design of the program, what results have been obtained to date, and what they see for the future.

Literature Review

The design for the teacher residency pilot program was influenced by four areas of the research literature. Each of these is explained below, the first of which is the design thinking, an approach to innovation that governed the design, implementation, and evolution of the pilot project. Driving the change was our teacher candidates' desire to gain as much experience in schools as possible and the Monmouth University Partnership's move to clinically-based teacher education. Our purpose is to expand

Monmouth's clinical experiences by providing a financial incentive for teacher candidates to spend additional time in the field.

Design Thinking

The change process for this innovation in teacher education was guided by the design thinking process (Brown, 2009). Design thinking is characterized by three stages: Inspiration, Ideation, and Implementation. The Inspiration phase is characterized by a fresh idea, one that prompts a new design followed by an action such as a pilot project. During Ideation, which is the second phase, the pilot project evolves through a succession of pilot tests. The pilot tests provide an opportunity to adapt and refine the design as problems are encountered. The use of a pilot enables problems to be solved while they are at a small scale. The third stage is Implementation, which is characterized by the full implementation of the new innovation.

The new design typically becomes more complex as it evolves and new criteria are added in response to problems encountered. The original design is refined through cycles of enactment and reflection. Gradually the pilot grows larger and the design becomes increasingly refined on a large scale. Over time, patterns of behavior within the new system become increasingly predictable and stable, thus leading to full implementation. Initiating and expanding pilot projects provides a great opportunity to learn how to manage a new system while simultaneously developing the design and minimizing the chances of failure (Brown, 2009).

Clinically-Based Teacher Education

A design thinking approach was used at Monmouth University to implement yearlong clinical experiences, which were piloted for two years before full

implementation in the third year. The pilot taught us what we needed to know in order to develop the expectations, communications, and professional development needed to support teacher candidates, mentor teachers, and supervisors. The gradual expansion of our clinical experiences is also a reflective of a worldwide trend towards more time spent in the field during preservice teaching (Gut, Beam, Henning, Cochran, & Knight, 2014).

This trend is also congruent with the recent release of the Clinical Practice Commission's (CPC) recommendations, which have provided an important affirmation of the Blue Ribbon Panel's call to turn "teacher education upside" (Clinical Practice Commission, 2018; NCATE, 2010). In their report, the CPC delineates 10 proclamations and their associated tenants for strengthening clinical experiences. In a clinically-based program, practice is situated at the core of the preparation program, and coursework is organized to support those experiences (Henning et al., 2016; Henning, Gut, & Beam, 2015). Preservice teachers are introduced to the practical work of teaching through the sustained, critical feedback of their mentor teachers during early clinical experiences (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987; Zeichner, 1996).

Teacher Development

Our understanding of teacher candidate development in a clinical setting is based upon the following three premises: 1) Teachers and teacher candidates always learn to teach in a specific context, 2) they gradually acquire more complex skills within that context, and 3) over time, their actions are internalized as thinking processes. These premises are consistent with sociocultural and experiential theories of learning that assert that social interactions gradually become internalized as thought processes (Vygotsky, 1986).

The context for learning to teach plays a critical role in teacher development. It includes the time, place, students, activities, and dialogue that occur within the school setting (Borko and Putnam, 1996). The types of interactions that teacher candidates have within this environment will enhance or limit the potential for learning. For example, a richer, more open, student-centered environment with a high level of student dialogue and participation will offer more learning opportunities than a teacher centered, directive approach to instruction.

As they gain familiarity with the context for their teaching, candidates gradually acquire an increasingly complex set of skills as they become more and more autonomous in the classroom. These skills are acquired through recursive cycles of learning that involve both action and thought. Numerous theorists have described models of this cyclic learning, including Kolb (1984): Concrete Experience, Reflective Observation, Abstract Conceptualization, and Active Experimentation; Lewin (1946,1948): Plan, Do, Observe, and Reflect, and the new field of Improvement Science (Langley et al., 2009): Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA). In each of these models, learning occurs through action followed by the internalization of the action as thought.

Initially, teacher candidate thinking is fuzzy and based on impressions, what Korthagen refers to as “gestalts.” As teacher candidates develop an increasingly extensive network of schemas, they are better able to generalize from individual episodes of teaching; they are better able to predict student behaviors; and they are better able to connect their practice to either research or theories (Korthagen, 2001, 2010). With increasing practice, they develop a more conscious awareness of their strategies, which gives them greater control of their practice.

Sustainability

As the field moves towards clinically-based practice, there has been an expansion of clinical experiences. The additional hours spent on school sites has put an increasing financial pressure on teacher candidates, who often must work during college to pay their tuition and residential bills. These additional financial challenges can serve as a significant barrier to teaching for first generation students and students from lower socio economic backgrounds. Recently there has been a call for a more sustainable model of teacher residency program that would include paid residencies (DeMoss et al, 2017; The Sustainable Funding Project, 2016).

Methods

This study used a qualitative case study approach to data collection (Yin, 2018). Interviews were used to determine the perceptions of the program by teacher candidates, teachers, school administrators, and university supervisors. In addition, a survey was administered to teacher candidates.

Participants

Six New Jersey school districts supported the program by utilizing funds from substitute teaching, paraprofessional work, tutoring, summer enrichment programs, and professional development monies to pay teacher candidates. A total of 41 teacher candidates participated in the pilot program, including 8 Master of Arts in Teaching students, 19 seniors, 8 juniors, 4 sophomores, and 2 freshmen. Nine candidates were interviewed for the study including one man and eight women. Of those interviewed, there were two graduate students, six seniors, and one junior. Ten of the forty-one teacher candidates who received an email invitation completed a brief survey on the pilot project.

In addition, six pilot project supervisors were interviewed, including, one superintendent, one principal, one teacher, one Director of Curriculum Supervisor, and two university supervisors,

Instruments

The interview consisted of seven groups of questions: demographic, substitute teaching, yearlong experience, other experiences, a comparison among experiences, financial questions and program evaluation questions. The questions were intended to elicit rich description of the teacher candidates' experiences and then to compare their relative value. In addition, we wanted to discover how the financial aspects of the program had worked for the teacher candidates.

The survey consisted of ten questions related to the experience and compensation for the teacher candidates. Participants were asked to respond on a four point Likert scale for which 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree. The responses were averaged for each question and are presented in the Results.

Data Collection and Analysis

The interviews were collected after five months of conducting the pilot program. Each interview took about one hour. They were transcribed and analyzed by grouping the findings into five categories: design, clinical experience, teacher development, sustainability, and program evaluation. The design category uses a narrative to describe how the project unfolded. The sections that follow provide descriptive responses to the key features of the program.

Results

In the following sections, case study data is used to describe the development of a pilot teacher residency program through the voices of principals, superintendents, and university leaders. The development of the Teacher Residency pilot program will be illustrated through a narrative that describes its conception, the creation of a budget, the recruitment of students and the addition of new features to the already existing yearlong experience. In the sections that follow, interview and survey data will be presented on the expansion of clinical experiences, the development of teacher candidates, the sustainability of the program, and the evaluation of the program by teacher candidates, school leaders, and university supervisors.

Design

The initial inspiration for the Teacher Residency program came through conversations with Karen DeMoss, the leader of the Sustainable Funding Project at Banks Street (DeMoss et al, 2017; The Sustainable Funding Project, 2016). The project began without grant funding or specified budget so our approach depends on using existing budgets more efficiently. As part of the residency, teacher candidates perform functions traditionally given to substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and tutors. Monies from school budgets to compensate these positions were invested into the teacher residency program. These budgets are available because teacher candidates in New Jersey can obtain a substitute teaching license or a paraprofessional substitute license after the completion of sixty credit hours. That makes it possible for undergraduate juniors and seniors to work as substitute teachers while in their preparation program.

Other sources of funds might include professional development monies and summer enrichment programs. In addition, Monmouth University provides funds through scholarships and graduate assistantships. As dean of the School of Education, the first author approached two superintendents (the second and fourth authors) with the idea, and both agreed it was feasible and within their existing budgets. The idea was appealing because it did not require an additional expenditure, and it addressed a shortage of substitute teachers. As two school administrator participants commented, "We had to provide a substitute teacher in that classroom anyway at that same rate of pay, so it was neutral. There was a neutral effect," and "…it supplements our supply of substitute teachers, as well as provides remuneration to student teacher candidates."

Originally, our intent was to pool the money from substitute teaching and the other paid positions, then pay it out in a stipend intended to cover all the work done in a school. However, we had not reached a place in our pilot where it was feasible to pay a stipend. We decided in the first year to simply compensate teacher candidates the way other substitute teachers are compensated, which is to pay them at the time they perform the service. Inevitably, this meant that teacher candidates would earn different amounts of compensation based on their time available and their interest in working in a school setting.

The substitute teaching budget was the initial source of funds for the project, and the shortage of substitute teachers was one of the primary draws for school participation. However, as our thinking evolved, we began considering other sources of revenue available to compensate teacher candidates. One of the schools developed a new program

that offered teacher candidates a half day of paraprofessional work on the days that substitute teaching was not needed. One of the superintendents connected the partnership to the YMCA, which offered paid positions to our teacher candidates for their work in after school programs for elementary children. Another superintendent invited teacher candidates to apply for his after-school tutoring program, and we began to look more deeply into how we could use the university's work study and graduate assistantship programs as new sources for our Teacher Residency.

The purpose of compensation was to increase teacher candidates' engagement in school settings by providing an incentive to spend time in the field during Christmas break, after the spring break and before the end of the school year, during the summer and during the school year. The intent was to make teaching in school a part time job that frees students from having to do part time jobs outside the field. The goal of the program is to enhance the teacher candidates' practice knowledge, to make them fluent in their practice, and to socialize them to the work of teaching in a school setting. The Teacher Residency program provides teacher candidates the opportunities to work in schools year-round, including semester breaks, the months of May and June, and in specialized programs in the summer. This is intended to help them replace their part time work outside of education with work in school classrooms that better prepares them for their teaching careers.

To actually start the project required attracting students to the program. The first author began by inviting Honors School students in education to participate. The response was generally positive although not everyone chose to become part of the pilot. Gradually, however, word of the program spread over several months in the winter and

spring of 2017. Most of the students were recruited through various forms of email communication in February to April, but it was not unusual for an individual student to express an interest after talking to a friend. The numbers eventually climbed to 41 participants by the fall 2017-18 academic year, including 8 graduate students, 19 seniors, 8 juniors, 4 sophomores, and 2 freshmen. The interest on the part of teacher candidates has been the driving force for moving the program forward. Without committed teacher candidates, the pilot program would not be possible.

The design process utilized an initial design to begin the pilot, then added new features as needed. For example, as teacher candidates increased their number of days as substitute teachers, we began treating substitute teaching as a significant opportunity for learning and recognized the need to provide more support for them. As a result, we implemented a Substitute Teaching Academy. The focus of the academy was on building relationships with students, developing classroom management strategies, and learning flexible instructional strategies for times when the teacher's lesson plans were completed earlier than expected or were missing altogether. We also added supervision so that our teacher candidates could be observed while substitute teaching. The focus of these observations was to provide feedback on how well they delivered the teacher's lesson plans and managed the class.

The Teacher Residency program was developed as an added layer to an already existing yearlong experience program. The yearlong experience requires a first semester of at least 100 clinical experience hours (although many students complete more than 100 hours) and a semester of full time clinical internship. Design features of the yearlong clinical experience also served the teacher residency program. These would include

partnership projects designed to foster P-12 learning, the seminar for yearlong teacher candidates, supervision for the first semester of the yearlong experience, and a mentoring academy designed to support mentor teachers. Also in place is a clearly articulated plan for the development of teacher candidates in clinical settings. This plan is based on the New Jersey (InTASC) standards and high leverage teaching practices. Two tools have been developed that help make explicit the expectations for teacher candidate development, the *Developmental Curriculum* and *High Leverage Teaching Tasks* (Henning et al.,2016; Henning, Gut, & Beam, 2015). The purpose of these tools is to specify the specific skills to be learned so they are explicit and clear to teachers, schools, university faculty, and the department of education (See Henning et al, in press, for a further description.).

Clinical Experiences

Participants in the Teacher Residency program spent more time in their clinical experiences than their peers. During the first semester of the year long experience, the seniors and graduate students in the program averaged 129 hours in their clinical experience and an additional 8.5 days of substitute teaching. At an estimated 7 hours per day for substitute teaching, that adds an additional 60 hours of experience to their original 129 hours for a total of 189 hours. At the high end of the range, one teacher candidate reported 179 hours of clinical experience and 30 days of subbing (or an additional 210 hours) for 379 hours of total experience. Another reported 100 hours of clinical experience plus 25 days of substitute teaching (175 additional hours) for a total of 275 hours. The junior in the program had a 40-hour placement plus 12 days of substitute teaching for a total of 124 hours of clinical experience. At the low range, one teacher

candidate had 200 hours of clinical experience, but due to a misunderstanding concerning the nature of the program, never had an opportunity to substitute. Another candidate on the low range had 150 hours of clinical experience, but did not sub.

Teacher Development

Teacher candidates in the study were surveyed about the level and quality of experience in the program. On a four point Likert scale most candidates agreed (3.0) or strongly agreed (4.0) the Teacher Residency pilot increased both the quantity and quality of their experience. See Figure 1 for their responses to specific items. All the participants

The Teacher Residency Program …	
Increased my time in the classroom setting	3.8
Better prepared me to lead my own classroom	3.5
Engaged me in professional development activities with full time employees.	3.5
Provided me with sufficient supports and feedback to help improve my teaching.	3.5
Increased my confidence level in assuming control of classroom environment	3.5
Improved my classroom management techniques	3.7
Provided me with the opportunity to collaborate with other school professionals	3.6
Increased my knowledge of the teacher's role within the school community.	3.8

Figure 1. **Survey Results for Items Related to Experience**

in the study were interviewed about the yearlong experience, substitute teaching, and paraprofessional work. These findings are organized in the sections below.

Yearlong Experience

When talking about their yearlong experiences, teacher candidates consistently talk about being a part of the school community. The longer time in the school allows to build stronger relationships with their students, their mentor teachers, and their other colleagues in the school. As one administrator said, "They [Students] really just see them [teacher candidates] as just teachers in the school, no different."

The result is a sense of a belonging. As one teacher candidate stated, "I really feel like part of the school, which I didn't expect. To feel like, they make me feel like, not like I'm an intern there. They make me feel like part of their staff, even though technically I'm not. "

With this belonging comes a sense of commitment to follow the lead of their peers to do the work of the school. They find themselves involved with all aspects of their school's process and often beyond school hours. As one of the school administrator commented, "I think that they know that they have to be involved, not just during the school day, but beyond the school day."

Substitute Teaching Experience

Participants in the Teacher Residency program spoke very positively about their substitute teaching experience. Their comments have been organized into three main categories below, including comments related to autonomy, breadth of experience, decision-making, and classroom management. Combined, these four categories suggest that the autonomy provided by substitute teaching led to more practice with decision making, especially concerning decisions about classroom management. As a result, they became more flexible, were more confident in their decision making, and felt more prepared to handle classroom management.

Autonomy. In recent years, there has been a shift towards co-teaching during the clinical internship. This change has had many beneficial effects, especially for P-12 children, who now have two teachers rather than one. But the practice time for teaching alone has been greatly reduced. Substitute teaching can provide a means for teacher

candidates to experience the classroom without the support of a co-teacher. Their increased independence is reflected in the comments from school administrators below.

> I think that they're able to fly on their own. In other words, they're in charge of the classroom and they're seeing different children. They're looking at different behaviors. They're managing those behaviors, they're working with children well, and they just have to hone those skills.

Many of the candidates expressed the benefits of having to solve problems by themselves. It increased their awareness, their responsiveness, and their flexibility.

> Subbing, you're by yourself in the room, so like I said, responsibility is on you. If something happens in that room, you have to report it. Why did it happen? It's all on you. Whereas when you're in the yearlong program and you're with your cooperating teacher, it's a team effort. You know what I'm saying? If you have a question, there's someone right there for you to ask.

Yet when first encountered, they also found it somewhat daunting. Lacking in experience, they found themselves to be an unknown, and they were not certain how they would react to difficult situations.

> I thought, at first, they were looking around for who would help them, so that was one challenge, and they had to be coached through that. Another challenge would be how each different teacher runs their room and they were expecting, I think, more uniformity, and among 24 teachers, there's 24 personalities, and there's 24 different ways to provide the craft of teaching structure. And I think that they were surprised that everybody wasn't the

> same. And the last the thing would be the difference between first grader, third grader, and a fifth grader.

Breadth of Experience. They also received a great variety of experiences, thus enabling them to engage with a wider variety of students at different grade levels and of different classroom arrangements and processes. The variety of experiences added breadth to their clinical experience by showing them a number of alternatives. As one school administrator said: "Absolutely, because you're getting a better breadth of experience in terms of grade level, especially in the structure that we set up, so it's one through five, you're seeing everybody."

This exposure was very beneficial for teacher candidates who were exposed very quickly to a wide variety of classroom processes and procedures. Potentially, each could help plant a seed for teacher candidates' future classroom.

> I'd have to say, just like how the different classrooms kind of run, and like the different techniques teachers do.

Decision making. Through substitute teaching, teacher candidates become more confident, more flexible, and better able to handle the unexpected, as stated by one teacher candidate, "The most important lesson I've learned is that things don't always go as planned. It's a lot of on-the-spot decision-making." Through experience they learn processes for dealing with situations that are never discussed in methods classes, such as the following:

> You learn that teachers really do collaborate. It's all collaboration. You are not on your own. I had a second grade classroom last week, actually, where the teacher had an emergency with her son. So obviously, no plans were left

> for three days. So I didn't panic. I was like, okay, what did I learn in the substitute teaching workshop that we held at the university? I went next door. They were super helpful. Just show you're capable. Just show you're confident. They don't have time to calm you down and say "Don't be nervous," because they have their own classes to worry about, too.

Classroom Management. One of the biggest benefits of substitute teaching was classroom management. This benefit was mentioned by almost every teacher candidate, as described by one student, "I guess subbing, in general, has taught me classroom management. I don't think without it I would have any classroom management, honestly. It's really hard to learn about in class, and I feel like it's just something you have to experience. And being a sub, is like you're thrown in there." Substitute teaching gave teacher candidates an opportunity to use or invent management strategies that addressed specific problems in their particular setting.

Performance. The teacher candidates performed their role as substitute teaching roles effectively. Part of the reason was because the teacher candidates were familiar with the school and its culture through the 100-hour experience. Thus, teachers would specifically request them to ensure greater continuity of instruction. One administrator commented on the substitute teaching evaluations of teacher candidates at his school.

> What I do have is substitute teaching reports, though, on all the classrooms that this candidate was in. They all came back excellent. We do get reports on every sub every day that someone's out and a comparative analysis of that

> shows that they're the only person that got excellent remarks from everybody they substitute taught for.

Paraprofessional Work

One of the schools in the pilot program provided teacher candidates an opportunity to work as a teacher's assistant on the days they were not subbing. This experience was helpful to the school for providing additional one-on-one support for students. It was helpful to the teacher candidates because it provided a compensated position that could be used to back up substitute teaching, as described below by the school administrator who ran the program.

> They gave us the days that they were available. If they were not called for a sub they were able to come in. We limit it to six hours a week just because budgeting wise we had to do that. So, they were able to come in, they were assigned a teacher, whether it be a basic skills teacher or a classroom teacher they were assigned to go to that teacher and then, from there, that teacher used them as support inside the classroom.

In most cases, it consisted of working with individuals or small groups of students, one-on-one, in small groups, or in reading groups. Teacher candidates could also work with the teacher during small group instruction, worked with the teacher, reading groups, one-on-one remediation. One teacher candidate commented that "the teachers were able to accomplish things that maybe they weren't able to accomplish every day."

During this experience, the teacher and teacher candidate formed a strong bond, united by their concern for the children, sometimes causing teacher

candidates to act against their own financial interests.

> And sometimes, even the – I know the teacher residency, they would actually say sometimes, they would turn down some subbing experience because they knew the teachers needed them

In response to a question about the benefits of the teacher candidate's paraprofessional work. one school administrator attested to the potential impact on student learning, "We do our benchmark and we definitely saw an increase in our reading levels from the year before."

Comparison

When comparing differences among earlier clinical experiences, the yearlong experience, the teacher residency program, one candidate said, "Experience. It's so simple. It really is." As candidates increase their hours in school classrooms, they become more confident and feel more prepared. According to the participants in the study the result is better job interviews, "I just think on the interview that makes them a superior candidate." Often during job interviews, teacher education graduates are asked for specific examples of their teaching, about situations they might have to handle or questions about school programs.

> Where you really see the difference is on the demo lesson and the interview, both components of hiring, if you do demo lessons and you also do in a district, a comprehensive interview. You see the difference in their answers because they have examples to back up their statements.

The additional experiences in the Teacher Residency program provide a greater breadth of experience, which translates into better interviews:

> ....that's (subbing in TRP) giving them experience to see what they would like, where if you're just doing your clinical hours, you're stuck into that one environment that you're placed in. So, this gives them, just an opportunity to be able to see everything.

Sustainability

There was wide variability in compensation for the teacher candidates. In most cases it varied due to their schedule. For example, graduate students in the Master of Arts in Teaching program had more time during the day because their classes were at night. Therefore, teacher candidates at the graduate level could substitute multiple times per week. For undergraduates with a heavier schedule demand during the day, this was much more difficult. The variability in opportunity caused some variability in response.

While not uniform in effect, there were clearly students who were well served by the opportunity for compensation, as reflected in the statement of this teacher candidate:

> It absolutely did. I think I'm somebody who always – who has worked all throughout college, like I said because college doesn't pay for itself. And I did struggle with my state exam, so financially, the money from subbing did help. And I think, no matter what, no matter how much money you make in whatever district, not only are you making money, you're gaining more experience. So I think the two together make it completely worth it.

Others did not view the compensation as making a significant difference for them. At this point, it can be safely said that the program is not at a place where it can

replace other part time jobs. The opportunities and compensation are not consistent enough and must be improved as we move forward.

The Teacher Residency Program …

Afforded me the opportunity to earn money while honing my teaching skills	2.7
Replaced my part-time employment with meaningful paid employment in a school setting	2.3

***Figure 2*. Survey Results for Items Related to Compensation**

Our intent was to put teacher candidates at the top of the substitute list. The results from that strategy were mixed. Schools varied in their approach to selecting subs, some relying on a professional service and other utilizing a sub caller. Regardless, the process in place had an inertia that often made it difficult to get teacher candidates called first. Due to the limited opportunities and some schedule constraints, some teacher candidates received minimal compensation. Since the program was limited to existing budget monies, there were only a limited number of ways to compensate teacher candidates for their clinical hours. The superintendents were able to improve the process through communication and reinforcement with their staff. In addition, demands for substitutes varies by month. For example, there is greater need for subs closer to the winter holidays than there is in September. Conducting the pilot project has helped us expose this problem and work towards solutions.

Program Evaluation

Overall, the evaluation of the program by both teacher candidates and school personnel was very positive. All of the participants commented on teacher candidates' increased confidence, and said they would recommend the program to their peers. Every candidate said they chose the program to acquire more classroom experience, and all said they felt better prepared.

The administrator participants agreed with the teacher candidates' self-assessment of their abilities as one states below.

> I think it gives that student a heightened sense of achievement, and therefore more confidence because they've already established themselves in classrooms as a teacher and they feel comfortable and confident and it's not like that growing into the role after nine weeks of student teaching, kind of thing.

One school administrator commented on the difference between the effectiveness of the Teacher Residency program and his own preparation:

> The traditionally prepared student teachers, which I was one of, 23 years ago, were ill prepared for the classroom setting for which they had wait until they actually got their first position to really learn the craft, and that is no longer the case. They're coming in two to three years ahead of where anybody else that I would hire comes in. So, the year-long with the two day a week, the first semester is better than the old one semester, 14 weeks, and here you go, good luck to you. And this now with the teacher residency coupling to the year-long, I think that's really much better. I don't think you can compare the candidates.

All were agreed on the power of the experience for learning how to teach. The results were more mixed for the compensation. Due to variability in scheduling, opportunities, and interest, some teacher candidates were not able to fully realize the potential benefits of the program. However, the potential of the program was demonstrated by the teacher candidates who were satisfied with the compensation.

For example, one teacher candidate said the following when asked what the Teacher Residency program added for her:

> A lot. Um, definitely a great experience, I was able to save money and make money. And I was able to get into different schools in the district that I would love to be a teacher in. So, that was like the best thing. I got to meet different staff, and like, they were very friendly, usually. Especially, once I said I was in this program, they would try to request me to be a sub. Because [the superintendent] says, "We want them in here."

Discussion

This study is intended to extend the current conversation about developing sustainable funding for clinical practice. Compensating teacher candidates for working in schools could greatly expand the scope of clinical experience and offer many new opportunities for strengthening clinical practice. The purpose of this paper was to share the Monmouth University partnership's initial steps towards creating paid internships for teacher candidates.

The data from this study demonstrates the benefits of a paid residency and key points for implementing such a program. While the number of hours varied among teacher candidates, the data clearly indicated the potential for such experiences to significantly increase teacher candidate participation in schools. Further, it showed that historically compensated activities, such as substitute teaching and paraprofessional work, can be performed well by teacher candidates and simultaneously play an important role in their development as teachers. However, more pilot work needs to be done to

eliminate the distinction between uncompensated and compensated activities within the residency.

While the potential for the pilot program is promising, it is also clear that improvements need to be made, especially in regards to compensation. For next year, we plan to ask for a greater commitment from both partner schools and teacher candidates. For teacher candidates who can find time in their schedules, we will create a Memorandum of Agreement that will specify the exact days they will be working in the school, including winter break and the months of May and June, when the university semester ends, but P-12 schools are still in session. In return, schools will guarantee that students will have paid work on those days, whether or not there is a substitute teaching opening. They will also provide a stipend that addresses the total experience of the teacher candidate in the schools. Monmouth University will provide additional funding through scholarships and graduate assistantships so that the compensation is more than what the teacher candidate would earn by substitute teaching alone. For teacher candidates and schools who are unable to make that level of commitment, they can continue with the program as we have structured it this year.

The purpose of this effort is much more than simply trying to employ teacher candidates. Our goal is not to get substitute teaching jobs for teacher candidates. Rather, it is to create a paid internship in which teacher candidates do some substitute teaching, paraprofessional work, and tutoring. Neither should these activities be done for the sole purpose of earning remuneration. Rather, they should be brought under the umbrella of our teacher preparation program, examined for what skills they provide teacher candidates, and incorporated into the curriculum. There should be a well-grounded

understanding of how each of those roles contribute to teacher candidate learning and in what proportion they are the most effective. In addition, professional development should be offered to mentor teachers and schools to provide instruction on how teacher candidates can become more effective in those roles.

An understanding of how and why such programs are implemented is important when advocating for policy changes in teacher education. Currently, there are many local and state policies that are based on the understanding that internships in teacher preparation are unpaid. In many cases, those policies are not favorable for implementing and supporting a paid internship. Although it will always be important to protect teacher candidates from exploitation, we need to rethink our current assumptions so that we can provide new guidelines that meet this goal while still allowing paid internships. The field of teacher preparation should study, then advocate for the types of legislative changes needed to better support the implementation of paid internships.

A cornerstone of sustainable funding for teacher residencies is the value that teacher candidates add to schools. They bring their passion, a career commitment, and a daily determination to invest in learning about their profession. It is what prompts them to spend hours and hours of unpaid, volunteer time in schools. Each day they spend in a P-12 school increases their value to that school. Our vision is to engage teacher candidates in a multiple year apprenticeship, during which time they are compensated for their efforts to become as profession ready as possible. Teacher candidates who acquire this level of clinical experience while still in their preparation program will become established in the classroom at a much higher level and much more quickly than their

predecessors. Further, we believe this is a powerful vision for teacher preparation that will inevitably become the standard in the profession.

References

Borko, H., & Putnam, R. T. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. C. Berliner, & R. C. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 673-708). New York: Macmillan.

Brown, T. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation.* New York: HarperCollins.

Clinical Practice Commission. (2018). *A pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

DeMoss, K., Easton-Brooks, D., Hofman, A., Henning, J.E., & LeCelle-Peterson, M. (March, 2017). Sustainable funding for residency programs: Moving beyond grants for financial support. Panel Presentation at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Tampa, FL.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3,* 255-273.

Foster, L., Aldarelli, E., Bragen, B.F., Jr., Duffy, G., George, W. O., III , Mulvaney, T., Gut, D., Beam, P., Henning, J. E., Cochran, D., & Knight, R. (2014). Teachers' perceptions of their mentoring role in three different clinical settings: Student teaching, early clinical experiences, and entry year teaching. *Mentoring &*

Tutoring: A Partnership in Learning, 22(3), 240-263. doi:10.1080/13611267.2014.926664.

Henning, J.E., & Harriott, W. (2018). The Yearlong Clinical Experience: Design and Implementation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Baltimore, MD.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 3,* 255-273.

Henning, J.E., Gut, D., & Beam, P. (2015). Designing and implementing a mentoring program to serve a clinically based model of teacher preparation. *The Teacher Educator 150,* 145-162. doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2015.1011046

Henning, J.E., Erb, D., Randles, H.S., Shoener, H. Fults, N., & Webb, K. (2016). Designing a curriculum for clinical experiences. *Issues in Teacher Education 25* (1), 23-38.

Henning, J.E., Bragen, B.F., Jr., Mulvaney, T., George, W.O., III., Duffy, G., Aldarelli, E., Grabowski, W., Riddle, M., Falco, J., Heaney, P. Earle, C., Foster, L., and Borlan, C. (in press). The Monmouth University Partnership: Redesigning practice. *School-University Partnerships.*

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2010). Situated learning theory and the pedagogy of teacher education: Towards an integrated view of teacher behavior and teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*, 98-106.

Korthagen, F. A. J., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001).

Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Langley, G. J., Moen, R. D., Nolan, K. M., Nolan, T. W. Norman C. L., & Provost, L. P. (2006). *The improvement guide: A practical approach to enhancing organizational performance* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues 2*(4), 34-46.

Lewin, K. (1948) *Resolving social conflicts: Selected papers on group dynamics.* G. W. Lewin (Ed.). New York: Harper & Brothers.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers*. Report of Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

The Sustainable Funding Project. (2016). For the public good: Quality preparation for every teacher." New York, NY: Bank Street College of Education.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Yin, R.K. (2018). Case study research: Design and methods (6th ed.) . Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zeichner, K. (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences for prospective teachers. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215-234). New York: Teachers College Press.

Exhibit 5.5.B