MONICA TAYLOR AND EMILY J. KLEIN

1. A YEAR IN THE LIFE OF A THIRD SPACE URBAN TEACHER RESIDENCY

A PROLOGUE

In March 2014, T. Bone Burnett organized a collective of musicians who had never before worked together to develop an album based on the newly uncovered 1967 handwritten lyrics of Bob Dylan. Elvis Costello, Marcus Mumford, Taylor Goldsmith, Jim James, and Rhiannon Giddens were invited to work on the album, *Lost on the River: The New Basement Tapes,* because, as Burnett (2014) explained, "Not only do they have the talent and the same open and collaborative spirit needed for this to be good, they are all music archaeologists. They all know how to dig without breaking the thing they are digging" (para. 4). Each artist received 16 lyrics prior to their two-week recording session at Capitol Records in Hollywood. Some came with a couple of melodies, others came with more, but once together they received an additional eight lyrics. As Burnett (2014) emphasized, those additional lyrics, "which no one had time to think about, led to some of the freest recordings" (para. 4). The interesting aspect of this creative project was the collaboration among the musicians. Each created his or her own music for many of the lyrics so that the end result was multiple versions of the same song, allowing what Lewis (2014) described as "a perspective on the ways different artists respond to Dylan's lyrics. Each artist [took] the lead on the tracking of his or her song, and all provide[d] suggestions and whatever instrumental and vocal support the others require, with Burnett overseeing final production" (para. 9).

We were struck when we read this by the kinship we felt between the creation of the secondary cohort of the Newark Montclair Urban Teacher Residency (NMUTR) and the creation of *The New Basement Tapes.* They have both been constructed in what we, and others, refer to as a third space—a place located between other entities and continually under construction. In the case of *The New Basement Tapes*—the third space allowed for a new kind of musical creation as it brought together artists outside their traditional individual studio realms; in the case of the NMUTR, the residency was conceptualized as a third space and it brought together educators from the district, school, and university to think differently about teacher education. This negotiated third space has attempted to combine the features of the formerly separate domains through multi-vocal dialogue with one another, and has become an entirely new and unique territory. We borrow the concept of third space from the fields of cultural studies, post-colonial theory, geography, and most recently critical

literacy (Bhabha, 1994; Gutierrez, 2008; Moje et al., 2004; Moles, 2008; Routledge, 1996; Soja, 1996). Much like Oldenburg (1999) who describes the "third place" as a social setting that is neither home nor the workplace/school where members of a community can be involved in civic engagement, we hoped that our residency would be neither governed by the university (first space) nor led by the schools (second space). We envisioned that the residency would exist in a unique and new third space that was perpetually negotiated. It strives to be an epistemological space, "a site of praxis, a place where the theory and the method meet … where theory and method blur together, where theory is method and method is theory" (Moles, 2008). Routledge (2006) notes that too often in the academy, we produce "theory that is distanced from … direct, lived experience" (p. 401). We considered a third space to be a process that would allow for the potential to "live theory in the immediate" (Routledge, 1996, p. 401) and "deconstruct the barrier between the academy and the lives of the people it professes to represent" (Routledge, 1996, p. 400). Rather than privileging the university over the school or vice versa, the residency as a third space always under construction could act as a hybrid program which embraced the essential elements of each space while also having room to build new features, practices, and tools. Like in *The New Basement Tapes,* in the NMUTR, faculty, mentors, community organizers, residents, and students have collaborated to prepare urban preservice teachers and incite change in schools, but we are located in a space that is neither the purely theoretical realm of the university, nor what is considered to be the traditionally practice realm of the classroom. Our interactions have not been limited by rigid hierarchical parameters which often situates the university in a position of power, determining what knowledge is valued and how it is operationalized; rather we have attempted to nurture a fluidity that allows for new and multiple inventions and interpretations. We are educational archeologists, digging at the roots of teacher preparation and school/university partnership without destroying them. Just as Dylan's 1967 original lyrics served as the inspiration for the project, our third space work derives from a long-term partnership between Montclair State University (MSU) and Newark Public Schools (NPS) involving preservice and inservice teacher education. For both *The New Basement Tapes* and the NMUTR, the third space has become "a place of invention and transformational encounters, a dynamic in-between space that is imbued with the traces, relays, ambivalences, ambiguities and contradictions, with the feelings and practices of both sites, to fashion something different, unexpected (Bhabha, 1994)" (Routledge, 2006, p. 406). It allows us to construct multiple versions of how to prepare urban teachers and foster teacher leadership and change in schools, rather than projecting that there is one singular linear process to become an urban teacher. Inviting a continuum of approaches, ways of knowing, and interpretations, which are continually being reinvented, challenges the rigid dichotomized perspective of "good" teaching and "bad" teaching often espoused in academia and schools. Just as this musician collective created multiple song versions of the same Dylan lyrics, so too could one mentor/resident relationship, for example, look completely different

than another. These different renditions, in our third space production, all may exist within the same program.

Similar to *The New Basement Tapes,* this NMUTR third space work has not been easy or simple. Bhabha (2004) likens a third space to "a stairwell" in terms of its "hither and thither" and "the temporal movement and passage that it allows, prevent[ing] identities at either end of it from settling into primordial polarities" (p. 5). Ours has been a continual construction, a utopian prospect that we have not fully achieved. Many versions of how to do this work have emerged as we negotiate across multiple entities and honor the voices and perspectives of all of the participants. We have understood that to attempt to do this third space work well there has needed to exist, what Burnett (2014) called "a deep well of generosity" (para. 6) from all of the participants. We are thankful for the trust and generosity of all of our partners who have contributed to the secondary cohort of the NMUTR. We know that this work could never have been accomplished without them.

This book, like *Lost on the River: The New Basement Tapes,* weaves together voices of faculty, residents, mentors, administrators, community organizers, and students who have lived together in an urban teacher residency program in Newark as they reinvent math and science teaching through the lens of inquiry. Each chapter includes narratives from multiple perspectives – the faculty, mentors, residents, and administrators – as well as tools we have used within the program to support and build change, providing readers with both real cases of how an urban teacher residency can impact school systems, and concrete tools and examples to help the reader understand and replicate aspects of the process. We have intentionally chosen to include this multivocality as it attempts to put into practice the tenets of a third space, where multiple narrations of this negotiated space are constructed and many understandings of a single concept may exist. More concretely, the authors of each chapter navigated the writing process in their own unique ways. Some authors co-wrote their chapter, while others allowed one author to take the lead incorporating the prompted narratives of their partner authors throughout the text. In other chapters in which the lead author indicated that they collaborated "with" others, the representational voices of their partners were drawn from interviews, field notes, and resident artifacts. Again in the spirit of a third space always under construction, each chapter has a unique interpretation of multivocality.

Capturing both the successes but also the tensions and challenges, we offer a kaleidoscopic view of the rich, complex, and multi-layered ways in which multiple participants work together to make enduring educational change in urban schools. As Goldsmith, one of the musicians, reflected:

> But what I really learned from this project—and not just from Dylan's words, but from everyone involved, who I'm sure took inspiration from him, too—was that everything is better when you don't treat things too preciously. Instead, you get in there and do what you do, and work hard, and hope for the best. (Slate, 2014, para. 7)

Our third space NMUTR has been a fragile utopian enterprise that requires continual tedious tending, one that has relied on a shared commitment of all involved and a deep sense of hope that working collaboratively has the potential, even if not perfect potential, to make a difference.

INTRODUCTION

We, Monica and Emily, have been colleagues at MSU in the Secondary and Special Education Department for the past nine years. Our official collaboration began when we worked with a team of departmental faculty to create and teach a Masters program in Teacher Leadership. But as we look back at that now, we realize that in many ways our collaboration then was superficial compared to what it would become during our work in the NMUTR. Working within a third space construction has helped us to invent a collaboration that blurs lines between scholar, teacher, administrator, leader, friend, and team member, as well as build on our strengths in all of those areas.

In November, 2009, we, as well as Cindy Onore, were approached by Ada Beth Cutler, our Dean at the time, to conceptualize, design, and teach in the urban teacher residency program to prepare math and science teachers for Newark's middle and secondary schools. MSU and NPS were one of 28 partnerships that had just received a five year Teacher Quality Partnership Grant from the Office of Innovation and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education to create an urban teacher residency program. As we sat in the initial meetings with our MSU colleagues and NPS partners, Ada Beth enticed us when she emphasized that this was an opportunity to reflect on our past research and teaching experiences, think outside of the box, and put our dreams into practice. She urged us to "radically imagine" (Greene, 2000) what this residency program could become.

We were daunted by the task of developing this program in six months, writing and processing the new curriculum, finding schools and teachers with whom to work, recruiting and admitting students, and getting it all off the ground by June 2010. That said, we were comforted by the fact that we knew we shared similar orientations to teaching and learning and deep commitments to urban teacher preparation and partnerships with schools. None of us, not Monica, Emily, or Cindy, was willing to take this project on individually, but as a team we knew that it could be accomplished. Monica agreed to be the lead faculty and Emily and Cindy agreed to work alongside her.

And so we began…

In this chapter, we provide a foundation for navigating the second cohort's year in the life of a third space urban teacher residency through the upcoming chapters. True to the qualities of this third space we attempt to create, we narrate this chapter in three voices: each of our own individual voices as well as a collective voice. It begins with a dialogic description of our own backgrounds and theoretical histories to this work. Bringing our voices together in order to simulate a third space, we

then explain the principles of the secondary cohort of the NMUTR in the context of the urban teacher residency movement in the United States. A brief exploration of the ways in which we conceptualized the program using inquiry in the third space follows. Finally we outline the details of our program and we share our vision for this book as well as the rationale and format of each chapter.

WHO ARE WE AND HOW DID WE BECOME URBAN TEACHER EDUCATORS?

Monica

To begin with, I think it is really important for us to share a little bit about how we became urban teacher educators and what our beliefs are about urban teaching. Sharing this sets the stage for our collaboration and background to the NMUTR. It illustrates some of the rationale behind our goals and objectives for the third space inquiry framework, which guided the work of the residency. So Emily, tell us a bit about how you became an urban educator.

Emily

I grew up in Queens attending PS 101 there and middle and high school in Manhattan at Hunter College High School, fondly known as the brick prison. For years I trained to be a ballet dancer and it never occurred to me that I could love anything as much as I loved dance. I would later attend college at Barnard in New York as well and go through their teacher education program, but I attended the program mostly because it had been ground into me that I should have a career when I graduated. However, the day I walked into my student teaching classroom, I knew I had found the profession I was meant to be in; it was love at first lesson plan. In many ways, teaching was like dance – it was all encompassing, intellectual, and creative, and even physically exhausting. When I was working with teenagers I thought of nothing else. After graduation I spent two months driving cross country and as I was traveling back and forth in a beat up Buick, I knew that I wanted to teach in an urban, rather than suburban, classroom, and that I was interested in how schools could get better.

After I got my MA in education I started looking for teaching jobs, and I remember walking the streets of Manhattan in August with my resume in hand going from school to school smiling at rather grim school secretaries. One day I found a job at Norman Thomas HS, but by the time I made it to the district office I was bumped by someone senior to me. Finally I got a position teaching 9th grade English at Martin Luther King Jr. High School in Manhattan. Despite all my fancy degrees I had no idea what I was doing. That first September I would ride the subway home and cry the whole time. I had a boisterous 9th period class that I could never get to all sit down in their chairs at one time. One day teaching them with a fever of 102 I burst into the classroom and lectured them, "You guys don't know! This is your future. I care about you and I want your lives to be better!" After my outburst they were all silent for a moment and I

thought, “Wow I really got to them. I reached them.” After a beat, one student noted to the others, “Dude do you see how blue her eyes get when she cries?” and they all burst back into chatter. And yet still, by the end of the year I was hooked. I loved the job, the school, and the kids. But I knew there had to be a better way to teach teachers so that first year wasn’t the disaster for them that it was for me.

Monica

I grew up very close to my maternal grandmother, Nanny, who was a kindergarten teacher in the Bronx for 25 years. Although she would have never called herself a social justice advocate, she had a deep commitment to her students and an openness to their cultures and identities. She understood, perhaps because she was the daughter of immigrants, the school classroom needed to be a place where students and their families were valued and appreciated. She loved her students unconditionally and she found great delight in their observations and insights. She never raised her voice and she was always warm and loving.

As a young child raised by a single divorced working mother, I often ended up with Nanny in her classroom when I had days off from my own private elementary school. Watching her engage and interact with her urban kindergarten students was the foundation of my teaching career. Not much older than her students, I was given small teacher like tasks like reading to a small group, putting out the peg boards, or reviewing number work one on one with a child. I loved everything about teaching! The principal at the time adored me and said that I should come and talk to her when I was ready to be a teacher because she would hire me in a heartbeat. Of course, at 8, this seemed like an impossible promise.

But of course, when I graduated from Penn, I decided that I wanted to be a teacher even though I only had a couple of education courses under my belt. Why teaching was not my goal throughout college I will never totally understand. Throughout my schooling, I always opted to work with younger children, either as an assistant in a classroom or as a tutor after school. Even in college, I worked with urban children in a local elementary school in West Philadelphia. So at graduation, I asked Nanny to give me advice about finding a teaching job in New York City. Retired, she reached out to her former principal who was also retired, and asked for some advice. She was reminded that Mr. Mazza, who had replaced her principal, was now an assistant superintendent in District 3 in Manhattan and well the rest is history. He met with me and I was hired within two weeks to teach Spanish and French at Lincoln Academy, an alternative progressive middle school.

Emily

The turning point in becoming a teacher came at the end of year one when I got involved in a professional development program called the American Social History

Project (ASHP). Paired with a history teacher, we spent a few days in the summer and a series of weekends during the school year, receiving professional development on how to create and implement interdisciplinary curriculum in the classroom. There were four teams of teachers at King led by an experienced team who mentored us as we stumbled our way trying to figure out how to navigate team teaching, interdisciplinary English and Social Studies curriculum, and shared assessments. The opportunities for community and collaboration were invaluable, but mostly I learned from watching my co-teacher interact with kids in ways that taught me how I might build relationships more effectively. I stopped trying to control students through threats of failing grades and punishments. I started asking them to engage in projects and work that mattered to their lives and asking questions about who they were. I watched my colleagues, I collected ideas from them, and I opened up my classroom. I began to learn how to teach.

Monica

My years at Lincoln Academy made me realize how naïve I had been about urban life and how much of the city I really did not know at all. My middle school was made up of African American, Caribbean American, and Latino students who opened their worlds to me. They invited me to visit their families, neighborhoods, and communities. They helped me to see the complexities of their lives and cultures and the importance of understanding and valuing their identities for our teaching/learning community.

It was in my second year of teaching that I met Cindy Onore who changed my teaching career forever. Having become a teacher through alternate route, I was required to take several courses to maintain my certification. Determined to be independent in this next stage of my life, I decided to take courses at City College. An incredibly different university culture from Penn, I was overwhelmed and intimidated as I tried to navigate the hallways there. Seeking some educational foundations courses, I stumbled into Cindy's office and that detour changed my life. Cindy took a look at my transcript, heard that I was teaching languages at Lincoln Academy, and said emphatically as only Cindy can, "I know what you should do. You should take my course in Language and Literacy." And so I did and it was the perfect beginning to my educational career. We read Freire, Dewey, and Vygotsky, theorists to whom I return over and over again. Cindy's course provided the space for me to develop as an urban educator. All of her students were struggling as urban teachers and she facilitated deep honest reflection about our teaching, how to address our students' needs, how to make up for the lack of resources in our schools, and how to teach in empowering ways. She modeled a true democratic pedagogy that focused on negotiating the curriculum and promoting authentic inquiry. She was the real deal and helped me explore theories that supported many of my teaching instincts in the classroom.

Emily

After a number of years at King and at ASHP, where I eventually became a professional development teacher leader in the organization, I became curious about the role of professional development and learning in the lives of teachers. I truly felt that without this organization I would not have survived those early years of teaching. As I became more interested in figuring out how to support and help other teachers in the organization, I began to think about the work of teacher education, and I sought out doctoral programs that would let me pursue these questions. I ended up at New York University and spent the next five years looking at innovative teacher education designs that support teacher learning. My dissertation work and a book published in 2009, looked at the Big Picture Learning schools, a fascinating and innovative school design. My research examined how educational organizations support teachers in doing innovative and student centered teaching, both in terms of curriculum, but also in terms of coaching, leadership, and training.

Monica

Once I completed my Masters in Language and Literacy, it was pretty clear that I wanted to become Cindy Onore and hence I pursued a doctorate at the University of Arizona in Language, Reading, and Culture. Studying with people like Dana Fox, Ken and Yetta Goodman, and Luis Moll extended the theoretical foundation that I had begun to build with Cindy into the areas of whole language and teaching for social justice. For my dissertation I worked with Mexican American adolescent women around how they constructed their identities through multiple sign systems. Feeling marginalized in school, these women invited me to conduct ethnographic research in every aspect of their lives including their families, peers, work settings, and communities. Building reciprocal relationships with them helped me to understand the value and importance of their "funds of knowledge" (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) and the limited perception of what knowledge was accepted in schools.

Emily

When I started at MSU, I knew I wanted to continue to work with teachers, both inservice and preservice teachers, but I was not sure how to do that. Although research had been deeply interesting to me and I was thrilled to be applying all that I had learned to preservice education, I also knew that I wanted opportunities to work with teachers along the continuum of their careers. While there were opportunities to teach in the MA program, I missed the experience of working in and with whole schools. A few years into my work there, Cindy Onore invited me to teach some of my classes on site in Newark and I began to build relationships there, hopeful there would be more opportunities to work with inservice teachers.

Monica

Leaving Tucson and beginning my career as a teacher educator first at Wagner College in Staten Island and later at MSU, I wanted my courses to be field based. Being mentored by Cindy in the early days of my teaching career and then working alongside Ken and Yetta Goodman who always valued the professional knowledge base of teachers, I was worried that the ivory tower implicitly constructed a hierarchy of expertise with university faculty being favored over teachers.

At MSU, I was hired to start a professional development school partnership with Grover Cleveland Middle School in West Caldwell, New Jersey. My first opportunity to work with a privileged school, I was unclear how to address social justice issues in this setting. Working collaboratively with Gennifer Otinsky in her sixth grade class, we brought together sixth graders and preservice teachers to explore issues of injustice and racism through inquiry in the language arts and social studies curriculum. This was particularly important for the preservice teachers as many of them had never examined these issues and were uncomfortable with the idea of doing so with middle school students.

Emily

I would have been extremely hesitant to take on the NMUTR without Monica and Cindy. While I had worked with both pre and inservice teachers, I still knew I lacked some of the necessary knowledge and skills to take on a project like this on my own. Yet it also brought me back to the work I wanted most to do in the place I wanted most to do it. I felt that between us we would be able to draw on each other to create this program, but still it felt overwhelming and unknown.

Monica

And yet when we were asked to potentially design and lead the secondary cohort of the NMUTR we jumped at the chance. Drawing from our experiences of doing partnership work, we wanted to foster a much more explicit partnership with schools where our mentors were valued as teacher educators. Continually concerned with the disconnect that seems to pervade teacher education between theory and practice, we hoped to create a space where residents would be able to focus on the ways in which theory and practice intersect. We knew that this was going to be a messy and non-linear experience but we were willing to take the plunge.

THE URBAN TEACHER RESIDENCY

> We also have our social imagination: the capacity to invent visions of what should be and what might be in our deficient society, on the streets where we live, in our schools. (Greene, 2000, p. 5)

As will be discussed in much more detail in Chapter Two, our NMUTR was constructed in the context of a long-term, strong, and rich partnership between MSU and NPS. These already established partnerships helped us to identify schools in which the program could reside. Interestingly, in the cohort two year, we worked primarily in two schools: East Side High School and Arts High School. Although East Side High School was a relatively new site for us, we had only been there for the first year of the residency, we felt welcomed and supported by Mario Santos, the principal, as well as the faculty. In fact, Mario generously, and strategically, allowed the mentors a load reduction as a way to show his support and acknowledgement of how time intensive working with a resident would be. Because our numbers doubled, we expanded to Arts High School for the second cohort. This was a natural decision as Emily had been working at Arts for several years prior to the residency and had a productive relationship with some of the mentors, like Kim, an experienced master math teacher. We purposely selected schools that were representative of Newark's diverse population (See Appendix 1 for demographic details of each school) but also were high functioning and had strong administrators who were committed to high student achievement and innovative teaching. Both East Side High School and Arts High School seemed to meet those criteria. As is discussed in Chapter Two, this was not originally the intention of the superintendents who requested that residents be placed in higher needs schools. Aligned with the research on urban preservice teacher education, we knew that during that residency year, it was essential that residents were apprenticed in high functioning schools (Ronfeldt, 2012) with mentors who were successful and had effective math and science teaching practices even if some of those were traditional.

The Urban Teacher Residency model was developed in 2007 as a means of addressing urban teacher shortage and quality (Berry, Montgomery, & Snyder, 2008). Created in the image of medical residencies, residents serve a one-year clinical apprenticeship under the tutelage of an experienced co-teacher in a district school (Solomon, 2009). Coursework and training are tailored toward preparing residents for the specific district in which they are teaching. Although there is only preliminary research on this work, there is already an indication that retention rates for residency graduates are higher than for graduates of other traditional and alternate route programs (Papay, West, Fullerton, & Kane, 2012; Urban Teacher Residency United, 2014).

As we sat down to brainstorm what we hoped for this residency, we first looked to the original UTRs in Denver, Boston, and Chicago to get a sense of their structures. Interestingly their programs tended to be led by community organizations that were affiliated with a teacher education program at a university but not led in collaboration with one. We wondered what our role would be in the NMUTR as teacher educators and how we could work collaboratively with our partners in NPS.

INQUIRY IN THE THIRD SPACE

> And then the line was quiet but not dead. I almost felt like he was there in my room with me, but in a way it was better, like I was not in my room and he was

> not in his, but instead we were together in some invisible and tenuous third space that could only be visited on the phone. (Green, 2012, p. 73)

While we embraced some of the features of other UTRs, we saw the NMUTR as having the potential to become a third space in teacher education (Zeichner, 2010). In fact, although we were already familiar with the third space theory, it was Zeichner's article, that came out just as we began to design our residency vision for the program, which pushed us to dialogue across the three separate entities of MSU, NPS, and Newark community organizations and construct the NMUTR, a potentially new democratic negotiated third space that had its own characteristics and features. We hoped to disrupt the traditional power relationships and participate in a space where the roles of the university, school, teacher candidate, and community were reimagined. We wanted the NMUTR to invite faculty, mentors, community members, residents, and students to share and construct knowledge and cross customary role boundaries. For example we knew that mentors did not set curriculum in university courses and we knew that faculty did not teach in high school classrooms. We wondered if maybe those types of boundaries could be crossed in this program (and in fact both would be). We realized that for this to work we would need to allow the third space to be dynamic, ambiguous, ever-shifting, and always under construction. That required continuous generative conversations among all participants to determine roles and responsibilities, common goals/objectives, instructional strategies, assignments, and assessment tools. We hoped that asking participants to share their knowledge, experiences, and expertise would lead to the co-construction of a blueprint for the program. We were not exactly sure what our final product would be but we understood that there was no other process.

As we mentioned earlier, we each had extensive experience with inquiry and negotiating the curriculum (Boomer, Onore, Lester, & Cook, 1992; Freire, 2000; Onore, Goeke, Taylor, & Klein, 2009), and realized the NMUTR generative process would take on a similar form. In a sense, we asked all of our partners to be inquirers in a third space and shift their identities from being passive receivers of knowledge to active knowledge constructors, problem posers, and problem solvers (Freire, 2000). We knew this would involve listening, dialogue, and action. It would be complicated and it was – in many of the chapters within we detail the ways it could be complicated, the ways we would get stuck, and some of the ways we got "unstuck." We also wanted to extend this negotiation to the residents themselves and so we hoped to invite them to help us co-construct the curriculum. Engaging as co-teachers and co-learners, the faculty, mentors, and community representatives had opportunities to model inquiry for the residents and residents in response were able to be inquirers for themselves. Some non-negotiable assignments were designed to provide residents with ownership of their learning. These included: developing UBD units that would be taught in their classes, conducting action research to examine teaching practices, and designing Inquiry Cycle Experiences (ICE) to explore social justice issues with their students. However much of the NMUTR curriculum was

emergent and negotiated with the residents (Boomer, Onore, Lester, & Cook, 1992). Our mentor meetings, observations, instructional rounds, and class discussions provided us with a window into the needs and questions of the residents. These would often grow out of experiences in the NPS classrooms with mentors and students. Our insights would help us to construct formal curriculum or at other times we would add additional workshops to address the residents' concerns. For example, during cohort two, the residents were anxious about socially just classroom management. In response, Katie, one of our doctoral students, designed a multi-part workshop on the topic.

Creating this third space residency also involved negotiating key equally valuable roles for mentors and faculty (Klein, Taylor, Onore, Strom, & Abrams, 2013), yet we had few blueprints to help guide us in constructing this new dynamic. Our program was unlike traditional teacher education programs where the cooperating teacher is only responsible for the clinical experience and often invites the student teacher into her classroom for part of one semester during which time she gradually hands over her class preparation and teaching. In the NMUTR, the mentors acted as primary teacher educators and invited residents to work alongside them for an entire school year. They were involved in the co-construction of preservice teacher education curriculum, co-teaching and co-planning with their resident, and learning alongside the resident through joint participation in workshops, collaborative action research, and instructional rounds.

Shifting roles took time. It was not a simple process of just naming the mentors as teacher educators (Bullough Jr., 2005), although we were very deliberate about giving them that title as well, knowing that language is powerful. They were looking for a set of concrete roles, defined and discrete tasks, and top/down professional development. We began by rethinking what the mentor/resident relationship would be in the classroom. We thought that co-teaching models (Friend & Cook, 1996) might feel more appropriate for a third space. We hoped that the residents would take the lead *for* rather than *take over* the classes gradually during the course of the school year and recognized that we needed to put structures in place to enable this. Initially, mentor-resident relationships resembled the more familiar student/teacher model but as we, and they, continued to transform the relationship between mentor and mentee, we all moved to more of an apprenticeship model. Working alongside the mentor, rather than in tandem, provided access to her moment-by-moment thinking and decision-making.

Striving for a third space also required a different type of relationship between faculty and mentors. We needed to build trusting and authentic relationships that allowed for honest and open communication, something that can be challenging when we are inhabiting each other's work spaces and often struggling and taking big risks – with new practices, new teacher/student relationships, new identities, and new curriculum. This meant positioning ourselves in ways that were, at times, unfamiliar and uncomfortable with constant attention to language and actions and whose voices are privileged. We realized that we had to find a means to open a true third space for the mentors and the faculty, where we could share our experiences and think about

our practices as teacher educators. Reflecting on the first year, as we moved into the second year of the residency, we developed a more formal meeting structure for the mentors and the faculty. It was in those meetings where we began to position ourselves as active knowledge-creators and full subjects in our own learning as we provided support and critique of one another. We were transparently examining our practices together and being vulnerable to critique and change. This was the start of a shift in power and authority over how to nurture new teachers (Taylor, Klein, & Abrams, 2014). This dynamic is discussed in more detail in Chapters five and seven, which address some of the pedagogical strategies led by the mentors, like action research and video protocols.

THE NMUTR SECONDARY COHORT PROGRAM

We now turn briefly to the details of the program, in order to provide the appropriate backdrop for the book. Our NMUTR secondary cohort focused on preparing math and science teachers for NPS over a period of twelve months. During this time, residents received a $26,000 stipend as well as free tuition for a Masters of Teaching from MSU. In exchange, they were required to commit to three years of teaching in NPS with NMUTR induction support. During their residency, they were guided through the certification process and received mentoring and support for hiring.

We began our program in June with an intensive week-long course at MSU which we co-taught with Fernando Naiditch. We asked residents to reflect on their own learning experiences, analyze learning theories, unpack issues of identity and social justice, and develop their own goals for the summer. In the second week, they participated in a professional development workshop on inquiry based learning facilitated by the staff at the Newark Museum. These first two weeks provided residents with some useful teaching strategies for their six-week internships at the Newark Museum, La Casa De Don Pedro, and the Newark All Stars. Beginning to see themselves as "public professionals" (Onore & Gildin, 2010), residents taught science and math inquiry lessons at the summer camps at both the Newark Museum and La Casa De Don Pedro, helped to organize the Newark All Stars Talent Show, and acted as "relationship managers" with the Newark All Stars interns.

In August, residents began to meet with their mentors to curriculum map and develop lesson plans for the upcoming school year. Residents helped mentors set up their classrooms and reported to their schools for beginning of the year professional development workshops. On the first day of school, mentors and residents greeted their students as co-teachers. Residents would spend the next ten months completely immersed in their NPS school communities. Once a week, they would meet with faculty for three hours as a formal "university" class. These were held onsite at East Side High School, Arts High School, or American History High School.

As we moved into the regular school year, the mentors were involved in all aspects of the program including curriculum development, observations, and evaluation. Together we created new processes for writing and reviewing lesson plans, conducting informal

and formal observations, and ultimately evaluating the residents. We developed a lesson plan format that would scaffold the kinds of thinking that the mentors and faculty valued for instruction. Periodically, towards the later part of the first semester, we collaboratively analyzed lesson plans in depth, looking for how they supported students' inquiry. We used a modified version of the tuning protocol (McDonald, Mohr, Dichter, & McDonald, 2003) when we would ask residents to present the lesson plan, mirror what we heard in the presentation, share warm and cool feedback, and then have the residents respond. In general, the tuning protocol enabled mentors, residents, and faculty to engage equally as authorities of teaching in the third space.

We also had to adjust how we approached resident observations. We emphasized scripting the lesson, or writing down everything that was said by the resident and the students during the lesson. This helped mentors and faculty have discussions about concrete moments in the lesson rather than making statements that were judgmental or based on assumptions. We used a modified version of "Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol" (RTOP) (Piburn, Sawada, Falconer, Turley, Benford, & Bloom, 2000) – a tool developed at Arizona State University in support of constructivist math and science inquiry teaching and supported by the standards in those fields. This tool was also used collaboratively during instructional rounds (City, Elmore, Fiarman, & Teitel, 2009), a valuable and productive addition to cohort two that facilitated important conversations that were generated from the deconstruction of a shared teaching observation. These moments seemed to provoke the most "aha" moments for residents as they had a chance to observe action, collaboratively reflect, and act again by tweaking their teaching practices. In the fall, we began the instructional rounds by observing mentors and then gradually moved to observe residents. We divided the cohort in half and each individually led four instructional rounds.

In the spring, we continued to observe each resident through both instructional rounds as well as individual observations. We purposely made sure that residents were observed by a variety of faculty so that they have different lenses on their practices. Additionally, the residents participated in a series of workshops, which addressed the learning needs and modified instruction of English Language Learners and of Students with Disabilities. Our spring curriculum also involved two significant projects aside from rounds and teaching, both of which are detailed in the book. Residents engaged in designing and implementing an action research project as well as a social justice inquiry project. The year ended with presentations of artifacts from the year that reflected their growth and learning. Finally, we spent the last months preparing the residents for the job market through writing resumes and educational philosophy statements, conducting mock interviews, and generally debriefing about the job application process.

A YEAR IN THE LIFE: THE ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

The book is organized around a year in the NMUTR and shares the various key moments during the learning trajectory of the residents.

Chapter two, written by Jennifer, Ada Beth, Julianne, Mathew, Marisol, Carolyn, Roger, and Sue, traces the history of the partnership between MSU and NPS that led to the development of the NMUTR.

Chapter three, composed by Emily, Monica, Walt, Marc, and Dave, details the admissions process that was co-created between the university and the district to choose residents for the program.

In Chapter four, Monica, Alex, Janae, Katie, and Gail discuss how the residents developed their social justice stance as urban educators. They explain the Inquiry Cycle Experience (ICE) project and share the graphic organizer created for that assignment.

Chapter five, written by Emily, Suzanne, Antonio, and Erin, describes the mentor led action research project residents engaged in during the spring semester. Mentors guided residents, drawing from their own experiences of conducting action research alongside faculty. At the end of the chapter they include the graphic organizer that supported this research.

Chapter six, by Fernando and Alex, narrates the ways in which theory and practice can be interwoven to address the needs of and modify instruction for English Language Learners (ELL). They provide both the assignment of the portrait of an ELL as well as some concrete examples of work produced by residents.

In Chapter seven, Emily, Kim, William, and Linda depict how the faculty, mentors, and a doctoral assistant created a video protocol to help them make transparent the often unspoken decisions and actions teachers make throughout a lesson. It includes a sample video protocol.

Chapter eight is narrated by Doug, Karina, and Suzanne. It examines the development of science pedagogical content knowledge in building science educators. They share the assessment module as a tool used to rigorously strengthen practice.

In chapter nine, Monica, Emily, Alex, Pri, and Suzanne describe how the summer internships in Newark community organizations like the All Stars Talent Show Network and La Casa de Don Pedro influenced the residents in their first years of teaching.

Chapter ten, written by Katie and Rosie, focuses on the secondary induction program for resident graduates in their first year of teaching. The Artifact Package Project, a teacher inquiry project, is also discussed in detail.

In Chapter eleven, Monica, Karina, Cristina, Michael, and Mario tell the story of how our residents and mentors have developed as socially just teacher leaders through the support of NMUTR faculty and administrations. Blending multiple personal narratives, it provides a longitudinal perspective of the work of the NMUTR.

Finally the book concludes with updates about our residents in their schools and our thoughts about the implications of our third space work not only for Newark, but for preservice teacher education programs in the United States.

REFERENCES

Berry, B., Montgomery, D., & Snyder, J. (2008). *Urban teacher residency models at institutes of higher education: Implications for teacher preparation*. New York, NY: Center for Teaching Quality.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, UK: Routledge.

Boomer, G., Onore, C., Lester, N., & Cook, J. (1992). *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bullough, Jr., R. V. (2005). Being and becoming a mentor: School-based teacher educators and teacher educatoridentity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(2), 143–155.

Burnett, T. B. (2014). T. Bone Burnett: How I set lyrics for Bob Dylan's new basement tapes to music. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/music/shortcuts/2014/jul/20/lyrics-bob-dylan-new-basement-tapes-t-bone-burnett

City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1996). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Green, J. (2012). *The fault in our stars*. New York, NY: Speak.

Greene, M. (2000). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gutierrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *43*(2), 148–164.

Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. W. (2013). Finding a third space in teacher education: Creating the MSU/NPS urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education*, *24*(1), 27–57.

Lewis, R. (2014). Lost Bob Dylan lyrics make for 'new basement tapes' project. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved November 11, 2014.

McDonald, J., Mohr, N., Dichter, A., & McDonald, E. (2003). *The power of protocols: An educator's guide to better practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Moje, E., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *39*(1), 38–70.

Moles, K. (2008). A walk in thirdspace: Place, methods, and walking. *Sociological Research Online 13*(4), 3. Retrieved February 9, 2012, from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/13/4/2.html

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect home and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, *31*(2), 132–141.

Oldenburg, R. (1999). *The great good place: Cafés, coffee shops, community centers, beauty parlors, general stores, bars, hangouts, and how they get you through the day* (1st ed.). New York, NY: Paragon House.

Onore, C., & Gildin, B. (2010). Preparing urban teachers as public professionals through a university-community partnership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *37*(3), 27–44.

Onore, C., Goeke, J., Taylor, M., Klein, E. J. (2009). Teacher leadership: Amplifying teachers' voices. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *13*(2), 78–83.

Papay, J. P., West, M. R., Fullerton, J. B., & Kane, T. J. (2012). Does an urban teacher residency increase student achievement? Early evidence from Boston. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *34*(4), 413–434.

Pilburn, M., Sawada, D., Falconer, K., Turley, J., Benford, R., & Bloom, I. (2000). *Reformed teaching observation protocol (RTOP).* Tempe, AZ: Arizona Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers.

Ronfeldt, M. (2012). Where should student teachers learn to teach? Effects of field placement school characteristics on teacher retention and effectiveness. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *34*(1), 3–26.

Routledge, P. (1996). The third space as critical engagement. *Antipode*, *28*(4), 399–419.

Slate, J. (2014). What Bob Dylan's basement tapes teach us. *Esquire*.

Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston teacher residency: District-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *60*(5), 478–488.

Taylor, M., Klein, E. J., & Abrams, L. (2014). Tensions of re-imagining our roles as teacher educators in a third space: Revisiting a co/autoethnography through a faculty lens. *Studying Teacher Education*, *10*(1), 3–19.

Urban Teacher Residency United Report. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.utrunited.org/EE_assets/docs/14102-UTRU_Building_Effective_Residencies-Full-ingle_Pgs.pdf

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(2), 89–99.

Monica Taylor
Department of Secondary and Special Education
Montclair State University
Montclair, New Jersey

Emily J. Klein
Department of Secondary and Special Education
Montclair State University
Montclair, New Jersey

APPENDIX

ARTS HIGH SCHOOL 2012–2013

Free/Reduced Lunch Programs: 82.2% of student population
Limited English Proficiency: 0.1% of student population
Special Education Programs: 6.3% of student population

Linguistic Diversity	
2012–2013	Percentage
English	75.5%
Spanish	18.0%
Portuguese	5.3%
Haitian Creole	0.6%
Igbo	0.3%
Creoles and Pidgins	0.2%
Other	0.2%

Enrollment of Students by Ethnic/Racial Subgroup	
Black	52.7%
Hispanic	38.8%
White	7.9%
Asian	0.3%
American Indian	0.3%

College Readiness Test Participation		
2012–2013 Percent of Students	School Average	State Average
Participating in SAT	85.9%	75.3%
Participating in ACT	100%	20.6%
Participating in PSAT	0%	52.5%

Composite SAT Score			
2012–2013	School Average	Peer Average	State Average
Composite SAT Score	1,241	1,205	1,512
Critical Reading	398	396	495
Mathematics	426	413	521
Writing	417	396	496

AP/IB Courses Offered		
AP/IB Course Name	Students Enrolled	Students Tested
AP Physics B	50	17
AP Chemistry	20	2
AP Art—History of Art	15	7
AP English Literature and Composition	13	7
AP U.S. History	13	10

Postsecondary Enrollment Rates by Racial Subgroup		
Racial Subgroup	2 Year Institution	4 Year Institution
Black	32.1%	67.9%
Hispanic	38.5%	61.5%
Economically Disadvantaged	40.7%	59.3%

EAST SIDE HIGH SCHOOL 2012–2013

Free/Reduced Lunch Programs: 85.9% of student population
Limited English Proficiency: 17.9% of student population
Special Education Programs: 14.3% of student population

Linguistic Diversity	
2012–2013	Percentage
Spanish	39.2%
English	39.2%
Portuguese	19.4%
Bengali	0.6%
Gujarati	0.3%
Arabic	0.2%
Other	1.2%

Enrollment of Students by Ethnic/Racial Subgroup	
Hispanic	53.8%
White	30.5%
Black	14.6%
Asian	0.7%
American Indian	0.3%
Pacific Islander	0.1%

AP/IB Courses Offered		
AP/IB Course Name	Students Enrolled	Students Tested
AP Calculus AB	23	23
AP Spanish Language	19	19
AP English Language and Composition	18	18
AP Statistics	13	14
AP Spanish Literature	11	9
AP U.S. History	11	11
AP English Literature and Composition	10	10
AP U.S. Government and Politics	8	8
AP Biology	8	8
AP Physics B	5	5

College Readiness Test Participation		
2012–2013 Percent of Students	School Average	State Average
Participating in SAT	50.2%	75.3%
Participating in ACT	81.3%	20.6%
Participating in PSAT	17.5%	52.5%

Composite SAT Score			
2012–2013	School Average	Peer Average	State Average
Composite SAT Score	1,239	1,205	1,512
Critical Reading	399	398	495
Mathematics	437	413	521
Writing	403	398	496

Postsecondary Enrollment Rates by Racial Subgroup		
Racial Subgroup	2 Year Institution	4 Year Institution
White	56.1%	43.9%
Black	63.6%	36.4%
Hispanic	73.2%	25.6%
Students with Disability	78.6%	14.3%
Economically Disadvantaged Students	66.7%	32.6%