
Editorial: Exceptional research for school-university partnerships

School-University
Partnerships

217

The *School-University Partnerships* journal aims to publish rigorous research and cutting-edge scholarship related to school-university partnerships (SUPs). Now into our second year as the editorial team for the journal, we would like to reflect on that goal and what we can do moving forward.

In this editorial, we remind ourselves and our readers about the role of inquiry in SUPs and why we publish scholarship on SUPs. After reviewing several key systematic reviews of the literature, the 2007 framework for research on professional development schools (PDSs) and a 2023 research agenda for PDSs and similar SUPs, we introduce a framework for thinking about research *in*, *into* and *about* SUPs. Our framework emerged from conversations with doctoral students, school-based teacher educators and early career scholars doing SUP work and seeking an entry point into SUP research. Our intent in sharing this framework is to highlight the approachability, feasibility and need to conduct high-quality SUP research across multiple scales. With practitioner research at the center of PDSs, all partners should have access to the process of engaging in systematic inquiry.

The history of research in professional development schools

As the published articles in our inaugural year as editors of *School-University Partnerships* and those published in Volumes 1–15 have shown us, high-quality research happens in SUPs and especially in PDSs. A PDS is a partnership between a school and a university (at a minimum) that is guided by a set of essentials and “community agreements arrived at through collaboration and sustained by a respectful, fair, and reciprocal approach to addressing priorities” (National Association for Professional Development Schools, 2021, p. 10). There is no one model for a PDS.

Since the launch of the PDS movement through The Holmes Group (1990), research has always been an integral part of the partnership. References to schools as laboratories can be found in *Tomorrow's Teachers*, *Tomorrow's Schools*, and *Tomorrow's Schools of Education*. Valli, Cooper, and Frankes (1997) state that “a school would not be a PDS unless it systematically and simultaneously engaged in teacher preparation, professional development, and research on a school-wide basis” (p. 252). The nine essentials of a PDS reference inquiry, research and generative knowledge. Essential Five states that “A PDS is a community that engages in collaborative research and participates in the public sharing of results in a variety of outlets” (p. 4). Making inquiry public is part of the inquiry cycle outlined by Dana and Yendol-Hoppey (2020) and is linked to teacher leadership and change beyond the classroom. Moreover, an inquiry stance is one of collective change and transformation, community solidarity and contributing to larger social and political movements in education (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). Disseminating knowledge generated from inquiry is one mechanism for having the kinds of impact Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999) advocated for in their conceptualization of inquiry as stance.

© Megan Lynch, Katrina Hall and David Hoppey. Published in *School-University Partnerships*. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this license may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>



School-University Partnerships
Vol. 17 No. 3, 2024
pp. 217-228
Emerald Publishing Limited
e-ISSN: 2833-2075
p-ISSN: 1935-7125
DOI 10.1108/SUP-09-2024-053

Thousands of research studies have been conducted since the inception of the PDS movement, many of which emerged as inquiries into local problems of practice or the need to understand a PDS more in depth. Similarly, a great deal of research is conducted within or because of SUPs. In the sections below, we highlight what we know from synthesized literature on PDSs and SUPs.

Literature reviews on professional development schools and school-university partnerships

The 21st century has seen an expanded focus on studying the structures, opportunities and/or activities and impacts of SUPs. Several exhaustive literature reviews were conducted between 1997 and 2023 on PDSs, providing some consensus in the field about the research on PDSs. Two critiques extend across the literature reviews: (1) the kinds of PDS research made available vary in rigor and influence to scale and build policy and practice consensus in the field and (2) the lack of attention to equity and inclusion in the literature is regrettable. The critiques are elaborated on below.

Through a variety of reviews and meta-analyses of the literature, SUP scholars have critiqued the over-emphasis of studies that self-report, describe or relay testimonials of partners in particular activities in an SUP and the products of such activities (Breault, 2014; Edwards, Tsui, & Stimpson, 2009; Neapolitan & Tunks, 2009; Valli *et al.*, 1997; Yendol-Hoppey & Garin, 2023). Tunks and Neapolitan (2007) suggest that this type of research can be more common in emerging and developing partnerships that lack the infrastructure and trusting relationships to conduct what they identify as more rigorous research. These critiques are often made by scholars who wish to see large-scale impact studies and “rigorous” cross-comparison methods of SUP research. In the first of a three-part analysis of PDS dissertations, Garin and Yendol-Hoppey (2023) ask what’s new of the literature on PDSs by examining the newest generation of scholars’ research interests. Their ongoing analyses (Garin & Yendol-Hoppey, 2023; Yendol-Hoppey & Garin, 2023) suggest the need for more comparative research on PDS and non-PDS experiences and outcome or product research. It seems that in their quest to identify the newest trends of PDS research, they found what was already common to the field and PDS dissertations in steep decline (Yendol-Hoppey & Garin, 2022).

Likewise, the lack of theoretical frameworks in PDS literature has been pointed to in the literature reviews as well (Breault, 2014; Tunks & Neapolitan, 2007; Valli *et al.*, 1997); however, Edwards *et al.* (2009) note an emerging trend in their literature review towards increased use of theoretical frameworks to describe learning in SUPs. These theoretical frameworks tend to be aligned with sociocultural theories of learning at the individual, collective, and systems level, e.g. Vygotskian sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Vygotsky, 1934/2012; Wertsch, 1985) and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) theory of communities of practice and legitimate peripheral participation.

Valli *et al.* (1997), Breault (2014) and Breault and Lack (2009) conducted critical analyses of the PDS literature and each raised concerns about the PDS’s role in equity. Breault and Lack (2009) reviewed literature from 1999 to 2006, and Valli *et al.* (1997) reviewed literature published from 1992 to 1996. Across their two studies, we see that for a decade and a half, the research on PDSs did not attend to equity. PDS research has come a long way since these two literature reviews were published. A turn to social justice and equity has become much more central to PDS research. And while there is greater commitment and effort towards social justice and equity in PDS research today, it is still necessary to examine the past, learn from prior research and identify where the field is moving collectively.

Valli *et al.* (1997) reviewed the literature as it relates to the change efforts and aspirations of new PDS structures and the equity implications of such change efforts. They reviewed 59 research articles by drawing on Cuban’s (1988) concepts of first- and second-order change

and the distinctions between equity in access, opportunity, participation and outcomes. First, as it relates to first- and second-order change, they found a “portrait of reform disconnected from a broader set of social and political commitments” (p. 290). [Valli et al. \(1997\)](#) argue that the reviewed literature had very minimal explicit links to social justice, social and/or historical contexts and equitable teaching practices. They found almost no critical interrogations of how to recruit and (financially) support underrepresented students in poverty in college and/or internships, teacher selection into a PDS school or becoming a PDS school or reform in teaching practices and professional learning. [Valli et al. \(1997\)](#) ultimately concluded that PDSs – in the research between 1992 and 1999 – were not meeting the vision set forth by the [Holmes Group \(1990\)](#).

Similarly, in their review of the literature, [Breault and Lack \(2009\)](#) found that 78 of the 95 articles they reviewed made no reference to equity or social justice. Like [Valli et al. \(1997\)](#), they recognize that by centering PDS research in teacher change and professional learning as the mechanism for school change, the PDS model will continue “to operate within an apolitical conceptualization of equity that is devoid of how race, class, and culture connect to PDS goals,” leaving “little change of embracing a more emancipatory and empowering approach” (p. 162).

Part of this disconnect between developing PDSs and being sites for political, social change in education can be explained by the power and positionality of university and school-based faculty in the PDS literature. [Breault \(2014\)](#) found that the majority of literature they reviewed positioned classroom teachers in PDSs as the authority future to defer to. In the literature, university-based faculty felt that they had to hide or minimize their expertise and theoretical understandings of teaching and/or learning and schooling as well as lament about the university’s failings to prepare teachers just to establish partnerships with schools and teachers. When there are inequitable power structures in the PDS partnership, addressing social transformation and developing equitable teaching practices informed by critical pedagogies become much harder to do.

A review of the school-university partnership literature

While not exclusive to PDS research, [Edwards et al. \(2009\)](#) conducted a comprehensive review of over 400 journal articles and book chapters on SUPs published between 1988 and 2007. They found three themes particularly salient, and we believe their themes align well with the discourse on PDS research.

First, they found that the research tended to focus on describing or identifying the kinds of partnerships fostered between the school(s) and the university and/or universities. They note that over time, scholars have shifted from describing and studying SUPs that are collaborative and complementary to those that embrace the principles of community. To [Edwards et al. \(2009\)](#), this shift is not merely performative but suggests a movement to better study how the process of learning is understood and undertaken within SUPs.

Second, the reviewed SUP research emphasized the cultural dissonance and tensions that surfaced and were reified across partnering institutions. The stark contrast in schools’ and universities’ orientation to teacher education, for example, was a notable conflict. Dichotomies in approaches, philosophical stances and/or orientations from schools and universities led in many cases to insurmountable tensions that impeded strengthened partnership. Yet in other scholarship, [Edwards et al. \(2009\)](#) found that SUP research drawing on more critical analyses addressed the tensions and contradictions ([Engeström, 2001](#)), so that they could be overcome and allow expansive learning within the SUP system ([Engeström, 2001](#)).

The third theme highlighted the literature’s emphasis on the products of learning rather than the process of learning. The reviewed literature was in consensus that teacher candidates learn more/better when in strong SUP settings and mentor teachers engage in

more professional learning – seeing a turn in the literature to connect learning processes to theories of learning (e.g. communities of practice, SCT, etc.). This theme leads to [Edwards et al.'s \(2009\)](#) main argument from their review: there is a critical need to study learning processes in SUPs and document such learning as it occurs.

Frameworks and agendas for research on professional development schools and similar school-university partnerships

In addition to the multiple literature reviews on PDSs and SUPs, both a research agenda and a framework for research have been published in the past two decades. [Tunks and Neapolitan \(2007\)](#) presented a framework for research on PDSs. Their manual for researching PDSs provides “a means of aligning PDS developmental stages with research potential” (p. vii). It does so by merging the former National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education PDS standards that delineate partnership stages of development (Beginning, Developing, At Standard and Leading) with research methods recommended by the American Educational Research Association prior to 2007. The research framework does not set an agenda for the most pressing lines of inquiry. Instead, it is a “tool for decision-making and action” (p. vii) that PDS leaders can use to develop research questions and design studies in their PDS context that are “effective yet appropriate to partnerships’ developmental stages” (p. viii).

For [Tunks and Neapolitan \(2007\)](#), less intrusive, time- and resource-consuming and face-threatening methods should be introduced to newer PDS partnerships, with more experimental and quasi-experimental methodologies introduced to more established partnerships with deep levels of trust and more extensive research capacity. [Tunks and Neapolitan \(2007\)](#) suggest case studies (including action research), surveys and historical research methodologies at all levels of partnership. They argue the need for quasi-experimental and experimental studies as the primary study designs for At Standard PDSs. They recommend “philosophic” research approaches, which they categorize as hermeneutics and aesthetics, and ethnographic studies to be introduced at the developing stage or later.

In recognizing the need to envision future research for PDSs, [Dresden et al. \(2023\)](#) secured funding through the American Educational Research Association (AERA) for a conference grant for the Georgia State University-PDS Research Special Interest Group (SIG), following virtual and in-person meetings, “to craft a research agenda designed to mobilize, guide and support a collaborative and coordinated national effort to strengthen the quality and quantity of evidence related to Professional Development Schools (PDSs) as exemplars of school-university partnerships and to other School-University Partnerships” (p. 1). The research agenda published by [Dresden et al. \(2023\)](#) focuses less on recommended methodological approaches to research design and more on guiding principles for PDS-SUP research and topics of interest based on conference participants’ suggestions and recommendations. The four topic areas in the research agenda are (1) systems and structures, (2) equity and social justice, (3) the teacher shortage and (4) policy issues. For [Dresden et al. \(2023\)](#), these topic areas allow for compelling research questions that are either descriptive or focused on outcomes and impacts. The research agenda, as printed in the 2023 report, should advance the field in creating a vision for future PDS-SUP research that “will support individual studies along with an inclusive and expansive approach to the development of the field” ([Dresden et al., 2023](#), p. 4).

Research *in*, *into* and *about* school-university partnerships

The 2007 framework for research on PDSs, the 2023 research agenda for PDSs and other similar SUPs and two decades of implications from several literature reviews on PDS or SUPs provide the field with direction for researchers who are interested in building consensus on how SUPs are mechanisms for more equitable P-12 student outcomes and how SUPs provide

exemplary models of teacher education, which can, in turn, inform broader educational policy efforts. This research is what we categorize as “research *about* school-university partnerships” and reflects consensus-building research about SUPs generally. In our view, other kinds of research also take place related to SUPs: “research *in* school-university partnerships,” which draws on the SUP as a context to study particular phenomenon, and “research *into* school-university partnerships,” which places the SUP system – its features, structures, practices and/or processes – as the phenomenon under study.

Research conducted *in*, *into* and *about* SUPs holds value across the spectrum of SUP research. It is dependent on what the researcher(s) seek to understand and at what level of analysis. In all cases, research *in*, *into* and *about* SUPs can and should center equity, justice and inclusion in some form. Below, we elaborate on our typology of SUP research. See [Table 1](#) for an overview of the research framework and example questions for each level of research.

Research *in* SUPs utilizes the SUP as the background or context where the study took place. In this way, the methods and constructs in the research are limitless. Practitioner inquiry ([Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999](#); [Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2020](#)), a PDS essential, is research *in* SUPs. Specific phenomena, relationships, perceptions and activities that emerge from localized problems of practice can be investigated within the confines of a bounded SUP context. The kinds of inquiry within an SUP can also reveal insights into the SUP itself, such as its priorities and learning foci. Likewise, SUPs can provide the space, support and safety nets to serve as sites for testing innovations in educational research. For instance, a team of partners within a large SUP that wants to better understand the role of instructional rounds on learning translanguaging practices for teaching multilingual learners in general education classes can develop such a study as research *in* an SUP. Six of the *School-University Partnerships* Volume 16 regular issue manuscripts exemplify research taking place *in* an SUP (see [Curcio, Smith Hill, & Ascetta, 2023](#); [Dvir, Rutten, Butville, & Wilson, 2023](#); [Cormier, 2023](#); [Jones, Rogers, Rogers, McClinton, & Painter, 2023](#); [Smith, Shelton, Scholten, & McCall, 2023](#); [Zenkov et al., 2023](#)).

Research *in* SUPs is vital for understanding SUPs, should emerge from the material conditions of those conducting the research and should be shared publicly in efforts to support others facing similar dilemmas in their SUPs and contribute to a larger research base for SUPs. The National Research Agenda for PDS-SUPs shares sample questions such as “What kind of support do leaders in PDSs-SUPs provide to others so that they can enact equitable teaching practices?” and “How does an equity lens impact recruitment and retention, especially for teachers of color, in PDSs-SUPs?” ([Dresden et al., 2023](#), p. 10). These are morally imperative questions that can and should be answered locally by many SUP scholars through research *in* a particular SUP. Indeed, when conducting research *in* SUPs, we find the potential to look for generalizable implications to be particularly exciting. What was possible or not possible by being in a SUP? What features or structures of the SUP allowed such research to be carried out? By applying complex and nuanced methods to research conducted *in* SUPs, questions about the influence, impact and relationship of the features of an SUP can be readily answered by those who conduct research *into* SUPs.

Research *into* SUPs is centered on studying the SUP itself and the processes and outcomes within the SUP over time. Rather than investigating a distinct practice or phenomenon within a local SUP, research *into* SUPs focuses on the SUP as the phenomenon under investigation. Questions tend to focus on the processes of learning connected to how and why an SUP functions. Similar to program improvement and evaluation studies, research *into* SUPs provides insights into areas of strength and weaknesses. The study is of the SUP itself – how does it work, why does it work, what is happening because of the SUP and how do we know? Research *into* SUPs is analogous to an engineer opening up and taking apart a device to reveal and study its inner workings. Like tinkering, research *into* SUPs tells us about how parts of an SUP work together, yet they also identify gaps in the system. [Lynch \(2021, 2024\)](#), for instance,

Table 1.
Examples of research
in, into and about
school-university
partnerships

Context Partners in a long-standing, district-wide SUP want to test out a re-designed virtual teaching academy (VTA) through dual enrollment coursework for high school students in the partnering district. The VTA has a co-teach model with district high school teachers and university faculty paired together for each dual enrollment course in the VTA		
Level of research	Example research questions	
Research <i>in</i> school-university partnerships	Background or context where the study took place	• In what ways does participation in the VTA lead to changes in students' perceptions about the field of education? Need for advocacy for public education? • What co-teaching strategies are used in the VTA? • In what ways do enrollment and participation processes in the VTA create equitable access and opportunities for all high school students? • What impact does participation in the VTA have on a grow-your-own pathway to teaching?
Research <i>into</i> school-university partnerships	Studying the SUP itself and the processes and outcomes within the SUP	• What mechanisms in the SUP are impacting the implementation of the VTA? What barriers and catalysts for change are present? • In what ways in the SUP learning from the VTA implementation to impact teacher retention in the SUP? • What does the VTA data tell us about the SUP? How are concepts like social justice and inquiry approached in the VTA compared to other areas of the partnership (e.g., teacher preparation)?
Research <i>about</i> school-university partnerships	Generalized SUP research	• What role do SUPs have in dual enrollment initiatives? • Does this particular SUP have more equitable outcomes in dual enrollment than non-SUPs? If so, in what ways? • What are the signature pedagogies in SUP-supported VTAs? • What are the most promising and effective collaborative approaches in SUPs to designing a successful, equitable, and sustainable VTA?¹
Note(s): ¹ This question modeled from Taylor et al. (2022) Source(s): Created by authors		

studied a PDS system through the cultural historical activity theory to identify the mechanisms within the system that afforded and constrained interns' abilities to enact more socially just teaching. Similarly, [Schlaack \(2023\)](#) drew on aspects of the cultural historical activity theory to ask about mentor teachers' perceptions of a complex-wide PDS. [Schlaack's \(2023\)](#) study was the only one in volume 16 of *School-University Partnerships* that demonstrated research *into* SUPs as the focus.

A challenge in conducting research *into* SUPs is identifying research methodologies and theoretical frames for analysis that account for the often large, complex questions raised in this

type of research. Research *into* SUPs takes place over time and is longitudinal, in that it requires repeated collection times and/or measures. Data sets tend to prioritize a wider variety of sources from multiple perspectives over the collection and analysis of singular data sources or only reported data. While this may seem like research *into* SUPs is “large-scale,” in actuality, the size and scale of this kind of research can vary greatly as SUPs vary in size.

A second challenge for those who conduct research *into* SUPs is to not overly rely on descriptive research methods. The National Research Agenda for PDS-SUPs delineates research questions that focus on description versus ones that focus on outcomes and impact. Both are necessary for studying PDS and other similar SUPs. Descriptive and exploratory studies hold merit in research *into* SUPs; however, we would also encourage researchers to enact, document and study change processes within SUPs. This research may seek to (1) draw inferences or causality about structures that catalyze change within a SUP, (2) employ interventions to understand a phenomenon within an SUP and (3) conditions in an SUP that enable a particular theory of change. For example, researchers in an SUP may want to study the kinds of learning that develop across an SUP system and what structures led to that change by asking, “*What shared expertise of equitable teaching pedagogies develops among boundary-spanning educators within the school-university partnership, and what mechanisms led to the development of such shared expertise?*” Studying the SUP as a system may also involve questions like “*How do the structures and practices within a school-university partnership evolve as partners develop critical inquiry as stance?*” or “*In what ways is a school-university partnership influenced by local or state policies, and how does the partnership navigate such policy influences?*” Research questions into the SUP should emerge from the local SUP context.

Research *about* SUPs answers questions about the generalizability of SUPs. These are the questions addressed through cross-institutional research, large data sources and/or research databases. Studies of SUP impact on particular phenomena, generalized approaches and/or models to SUPs, comparative studies between SUPs and non-SUPs and multi-site research studies that provide insights *about* the concept of SUPs are found in this type of SUP research.

Research *in* and *into* SUPs informs research *about* SUPs. Research of the research, such as meta-analyses and systematic literature reviews, is also instrumental in researching *about* SUPs. This is evident in the second and third parts of a three-part dissertation analysis (Garin & Yendol-Hoppey, 2023; Yendol-Hoppey & Garin, 2023) that appear in Volume 16, issues 1 and 2, respectively, of the journal. Additionally, conceptual articles, such as Damiani and Elder’s (2023) article on the need to draw on DisCrit studies to be more inclusive in PDSs, also provide guideposts and direction to push the field in important ways to support the kinds of research *about* SUPs.

Typically, the kind of research *about* SUPs leads to changes in policy at federal, state and local levels. We cannot stress enough that the methods utilized in researching SUPs can and should support district-level changes if the SUP is being studied. Data on student achievement, school climate, teacher professional learning, teacher recruitment and retention can all be factors that inform broad SUP policies and local district policies. Large national organizations may also use research *about* SUPs to inform policy briefs, develop new or updated standards related to SUPs and teacher education, and seek grant funding to implement SUP work that appears scalable and demonstrates change. Handbooks like the forthcoming *Cambridge Handbook of School-University Partnerships* also hold promise for providing future direction on the research *about* SUPs.

Contributions to the research *in*, *into* and *about* school-university partnerships

In this editorial, we have briefly shared the history of inquiry in PDSs and some of the key findings from several systematic reviews into the literature on PDSs and other similar SUPs. The literature suggests that we have an abundance of research that shows first-order change

in SUPs (i.e. changes that support efficiency and optimization of organizational goals) and descriptions and classifications of kinds of partnerships. [Edwards et al. \(2009\)](#) also note a significant amount of published SUP research that only draws upon self-reported data and a lack of data triangulation across multiple sources. Furthermore, the literature shows a tension between calling for more outcomes-based research and processes-oriented research, perhaps indicating a need for more of both kinds of research. Meanwhile, the literature also suggests that SUP research must increasingly continue to address inequities and injustices. With a marked decline in dissertations in PDSs ([Yendol-Hoppey & Garin, 2022](#)), it is imperative that scholarship in SUPs flourish.

As we look forward to our next years as editors of *School-University Partnerships*, we hope to see a more expansive variety of methodological approaches and theoretical and conceptual frameworks within SUPs and second-order change that emphasizes iterative design-based changes to SUP structures, goals and purposes. Topics of study should reflect the intentional consideration of justice, inclusion, belonging, diversity and equity, among other socio-educational areas of emphasis.

Most importantly, we ask researchers involved in SUPs to consider ways in which their research could be framed as research *in*, *into* and/or *about* SUPs. Research *in* SUPs allows partners to inquire into phenomena, design and interventions and activities within the confines of a bounded SUP context. Research *into* SUPs extends beyond descriptions of partnerships to inquire into the SUP as a system – its processes, changes and structures/functions – which will build collective understanding of the impact and transformative possibilities in SUPs. Research *about* SUPs can guide future directions for SUP research while simultaneously impacting SUP practice and policy at a national level. Whether it is research *in*, *into* or *about* SUPs, research connected to SUPs is vital in improving the conditions of P-12 education and higher education for all partners.

In this issue

This issue contains eight articles from a range of SUPs, including research-practice partnerships and PDSs. The eight articles in this issue address social justice and inclusion, the teacher shortage and co-created professional learning experiences.

Research in school-university partnerships

Five articles in this issue represent research conducted *in* established SUPs or were extensions of a current SUP and investigated a new collaboratively designed structure within an SUP. Findings and implications from each study extend beyond SUPs and inform areas of study such as program design, teacher recruitment and the development of inclusive teaching practices through high-quality professional learning.

[Bowers, Young, and Speight \(2024\)](#) present a case-in-point of an integrated clinically based professional learning experience – an interprofessional experience – at an elementary school with students from elementary, special education and communication science and disorders programs. The design, implementation and facilitation of the yearlong experience are shared, as well as several lessons learned by the implementation team.

[Damiani, Unick, and Schultz \(2024\)](#) reveal insights from teachers engaged in tailored professional learning for coaching inclusive teaching related to supporting early childhood students' communication needs. They report that the professional learning approach was mutually beneficial to all partners and showed positive outcomes and progress for students and teachers.

[Hale, Wilson, Gibbs, Didier, and Ali-Khan \(2024\)](#) report on students' perceptions of a school-based cohort design for an M.Ed. in Elementary Education program. M.Ed. students,

who were educators at the same PDS, reported benefits to their working relationships with one another, organizational benefits and the ability to study program tenets (e.g., social justice, inquiry and student motivation) in depth.

Margot, Pierczynski, and Lormand (2024) share findings from a four-week summer camp for high school students hosted by school and university partners. The summer camp was designed as a grow-your-own pathway to encourage students from diverse communities to consider the teaching profession. Margot *et al.* (2024) found that the education camp participants were satisfied with the camp, found value in the pedagogical approach and had positive mentorship experiences. Margot *et al.* (2024) also learned more about the barriers that prevented some participants from seeing themselves in college and/or as teachers.

Sebti and Elder (2024) report on partners' reported perceptions and beliefs about inclusive education practices after participating in a critical, collaborative redesign within their PDS based on interviews with PDS partners and materials from action plan meetings. Because Sebti and Elder's (2024) study focused on the learning of inclusive practices within a critical PDS model, it is an example of research in SUPs.

Research into school-university partnerships

Only DiCicco and Faulkner (2024) research their SUP itself. They employed a case study design to seek to understand ways in which their emerging SUP was mutually beneficial for partners in the SUP. Drawing on the perceptions of middle school teachers and administrators in their emerging SUP, DiCicco and Faulkner (2024) found that the middle school educators believed there were benefits to the middle school and its partners and benefits to the university. The middle school educators also noted challenges stemming from the university.

Research about school-university partnerships

Bohannon, Connelly, Bigaj, and Wasielewski (2024) and Lentz, Ramirez, Pickett, Purinton, and Farley-Ripple (2024) draw upon feedback and insights from school and school district leaders to better understand how to develop and sustain SUPs. Because they collected and explored perceptions, preferences and beliefs from leaders across multiple SUPs, their studies provide insights for research *about* SUPs.

Bohannon *et al.* (2024) interviewed K-12 school leaders from their partner schools to “examine the dynamic nature, evolution and aspirations of partnerships between two institutions of higher education (IHEs) and their Educator Preparation Program (EPP) with six K-12 partner schools” (p. 2). They found that K-12 school leaders preferred dynamic, responsive, innovative partnerships that are regularly monitored as well as a preference for interns being treated as colleagues at partner schools.

Lentz *et al.* (2024) surveyed and conducted interviews with P-12 school and school district leaders statewide to develop a deeper understanding of best practices for university-based researchers to establish initial communication and relationship-building with school partners. Lentz *et al.* (2024) frame their work within research-practice partnerships and offer insights into how university-based researchers can begin partnerships with schools and school districts.

Megan Lynch, Katrina Hall and David Hoppey

References

- Bohannon, K., Connelly, V., Bigaj, S., & Wasielewski, L. M. (2024). Development and evolution of clinical partnerships: K-12 school leaders' perspectives. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 345–363. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0014](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0014).
- Bowers, L. M., Young, H. D., & Speight, R. (2024). Lessons learned through interprofessional education: exploring collaboration with elementary education, special education and communication sciences and disorders pre-service professionals. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 259–267. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0012](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0012).
- Breault, R. (2014). Power and perspective: The discourse of professional development school literature. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(1), 22–35. doi: [10.1080/1359866X.2013.869547](https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2013.869547).
- Breault, R. A., & Lack, B. (2009). Equity and empowerment in PDS work: A review of literature (1999 to 2006). *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 42(2), 152–168. doi: [10.1080/10665680902758303](https://doi.org/10.1080/10665680902758303).
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249–305. doi: [10.2307/1167272](https://doi.org/10.2307/1167272). Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1167272>
- Cormier, K. (2023). Dedication to the craft: Developing pre-service teachers into social justice advocates through PDS and poetry. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(2), 110–124. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0011](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0011).
- Cuban, L. (1988). A fundamental puzzle of school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 70, 341–344.
- Curcio, R., Smith Hill, R., & Ascetta, K. (2023). What we wonder: An iterative exploration of teachers' perceptions of social-emotional learning. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(1), 4–17. doi: [10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0002](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0002).
- Damiani, M. L., & Elder, B. C. (2023). A call for critical PDS: Infusing DisCrit into the nine essentials. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(1), 92–100. doi: [10.1108/SUP-03-2023-0016](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-03-2023-0016).
- Damiani, M. L., Unick, B. V., & Schultz, K. -J. (2024). A collaborative approach to professional development on inclusive practices aligned to preschool mandates. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 303–321. doi: [10.1108/SUP-08-2023-0026](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-08-2023-0026).
- Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2020). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry* (4th Ed.). London: Corwin Press.
- DiCicco, M., & Faulkner, S. A. (2024). Mutually beneficial? Middle school educators' perceptions about the benefits and challenges of a school-university partnership. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 244–258. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0006](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0006).
- Dresden, J., Burns, R. W., Catelli, L. A., Ogletree, S., Feinberg, J., Curlette, W., & Benson, G. (2023). A collaborative national research agenda for professional development schools and similar school-university partnerships.
- Dvir, B., Rutten, L., Butville, D., & Wilson, E. (2023). Partnering to support K-12 instruction of difficult topics through inquiry-based professional learning. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(2), 101–109. doi: [10.1108/SUP-03-2023-0017](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-03-2023-0017).
- Edwards, G., Tsui, A. B. M., & Stimpson, P. (2009). Contexts for learning in school-university partnership. In A. B. M. Tsui, G. Edwards, & F. Lopez-Real (Eds), *Learning in school-university partnership: Sociocultural perspectives* (pp. 3–24). Routledge.
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 133–156. doi: [10.1080/13639080020028747](https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080020028747).
- Garin, E., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2023). Is the past prologue? Part 1: A qualitative analysis of PDS dissertation research focused on learning. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(1), 18–39. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0007](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0007).

- Hale, E., Wilson, H. E., Gibbs, L., Didier, J., & Ali-Khan, C. (2024). Building a community of practice: shifting an M.Ed. Program to a PDS school-based cohort model. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 229–243. doi: [10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0003](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0003).
- Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Jones, L., Rogers, R., Rogers, D., McClinton, A., & Painter, L. (2023). Risk takers: PDS partners developing and sustaining antifragile teachers. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(2), 144–153. doi: [10.1108/SUP-04-2023-0018](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-04-2023-0018).
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.
- Lentz, A. K., Ramirez, A. G., Pickett, A., Purinton, A. B., & Farley-Ripple, E. N. (2024). Initiating and sustaining partnerships between research and practice: Lessons learned from school and district leaders. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 322–344. doi: [10.1108/SUP-10-2023-0042](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-10-2023-0042).
- Lynch, M. (2021). Understanding the development of socially just teachers through supervision in a professional development school partnership: an activity theoretical analysis. Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University. Available from: <https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/catalog/22735mel973>
- Lynch, M. E. (2024). More than formalized structures: towards shared understanding and a comprehensive mission of promoting social justice in professional development schools. In J. R. Feinberg & S. L. Ogletree (Eds), *Advancing school-university partnerships and professional development schools through national research: revitalized perspectives for social justice, equity, growth and inclusivity* (pp. 120–143). Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781003497721-9](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003497721-9).
- Margot, K., Pierczynski, M., & Lormand, K. (2024). Exploring careers in education and leadership (ExCEL): Outcomes from year one of a high school education camp. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 268–284. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0013](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0013).
- National Association for Professional Development Schools (2021). What it means to be a professional development school: The nine essentials. (2nd ed.). [Policy statement]. Author.
- Neapolitan, J., & Tunks, J. (2009). Exploring the “development” in professional development school research. *Action in Teacher Education*, 31(3), 3–10. doi: [10.1080/01626620.2009.10463523](https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2009.10463523).
- Schlaack, N. (2023). Creating a culture of learning – mentoring in a PDS. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(1), 40–55. doi: [10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0004](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0004).
- Sebti, L., & Elder, B. C. (2024). “Inclusion is definitely a possibility for all”: Promoting inclusive education through a critical professional development schools model. *School-University Partnerships*, 17(3), 285–302. doi: [10.1108/SUP-06-2023-0021](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-06-2023-0021).
- Smith, J., Shelton, R. N., Scholten, N., & McCall, M. (2023). Secondary preservice teachers’ critical reflecting practices: Examining perceptions of confidence using a two-part reflection. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(1), 56–70. doi: [10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0001](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-01-2023-0001).
- Taylor, J. L., Allen, T. O., An, B. P., Denecker, C., Edmunds, J. A., Fink, J., . . . Chen, W. (2022). *Research priorities for advancing equitable dual enrollment policy and practice*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah.
- Tunks, J., & Neapolitan, J. (2007). *A framework for research on professional development schools*. University Press of America.
- Valli, L., Cooper, D., & Franks, L. (1997). Professional development schools and equity: A critical analysis of rhetoric and research. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, 251–304. doi: [10.2307/1167377](https://doi.org/10.2307/1167377). Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1167377>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1934/2012). In E. Hanfmann, G. Vakar, & A. Kozulin (Eds), *Thought and Language*. The MIT Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Harvard University Press.

- Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Garin, E. (2022). A trend and content analysis of professional development school dissertation research between 1990 and 2018. *School-University Partnerships*, 15(3), 51–61.
- Yendol-Hoppey, D., & Garin, E. (2023). The past is prologue part II: A study of PDS comparison dissertations. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(2), 125–143. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0008](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0008).
- Zenkov, K., Taousakis, M., Goransson, J., Staudt, E., Ewaida, M., Stephens, M., . . . Kitchen, M. (2023). Positioned as pedagogues, finding their teaching personas: Critical, project-based clinical experiences in PDS/school-university contexts. *School-University Partnerships*, 16(1), 71–91. doi: [10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0005](https://doi.org/10.1108/SUP-02-2023-0005).

Further reading

- Goodlad, J. I. (1988). School- university partnerships for educational renewal: Rationale and concepts. In K. A. Sirotnik, & J. I. Goodlad (Eds), *School-university partnership in action: Concepts, cases and concerns* (pp. 3–31). Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. Jossey-Bass.