

**PORTRAITS OF SECONDARY PARTNER SCHOOLS  
IN THE  
NATIONAL NETWORK FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL  
1996-1999**

**Reflections on Practice Series no. 3  
Center for Educational Renewal  
University of Washington**

*Expanded and Updated  
June 1999*

***Contact Information:***

**CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL**  
College of Education  
Box 353600  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195-3600  
(206) 543-6230

**OREM HIGH SCHOOL**  
175 South 400 East  
Orem, UT 84097  
(801) 227-8765

## OREM ORIGINAL PORTRAIT:

# Secondary Partner School Portrait: Orem High School

By Project Team: John Childs, John Gardner, Bus Gillespie, Merrell Hansen,  
Tina Howard, and Nancy Wentworth

### Scene 1, Orem High School Faculty Room:

*"These new student teachers can't do anything. What do they teach them up at BYU? It's a waste of time. I have to start over with each one I get."*

*"Agreed. And when was the last time you talked to a supervisor? Last semester I told my student teacher to ignore what he said and do what I said. I am about out of energy for any of this after all these years."*

*"It is pretty old, alright. I told mine no one looks at university evaluations when they hire teachers. They only look at what the cooperating teacher says. I've been doing the same thing with student teachers for ten years with no problem."*

*"Why don't they just turn them over to us? We'd train them and stop wasting all this time. What do we get out of this, anyway?"*

### Scene 2, Brigham Young University Education Office:

*"How are your new preservice students working out? Any problems this semester?"*

*"Oh, just the usual. I don't know why some people take student teachers. They seem pretty bored with it. It would help if the cooperating teachers would at least stay in the room. One teacher gave the student teacher the textbook and told her to cover the chapters."*

*"One student teacher at Orem High is really*

*having a hard time. She's a good kid, but has four different preparations. The classes were hard to discipline from the beginning. How do the teachers survive those killer schedules?"*

### Scene 3, Student Teacher Car Pool:

*"I'm exhausted. I had no idea how hard this would be. I still have hours of work to do tonight to be ready for tomorrow."*

*"Me, too. But I'm also confused. My supervisor and my cooperating teacher aren't on the same page when they give me advice. I just stand and smile at each one, then try to figure it out later."*

*"What good were all those education classes? Most of it was busy work. I need some heavy work on discipline and motivation right now, not two semesters ago. I didn't even know the questions to ask back then. Now that I have met fourth period, I have plenty! My cooperating teacher doesn't have much use for the university program. He's pretty cynical."*

*"Mine doesn't do any group work or work with learning styles or any of those things we've studied. I have to assign chapters and give tests on Fridays. The kids hate it. I'm not sure I'll survive this on-the-job training."*

Change in high schools does not come easily. Teachers can become insulated from current research and even from careful thought. They often speak as authorities

rather than as learners. Other viewpoints, such as those of the professors and student teachers in the university's teacher preparation, are not heard at all. Because conversations such as those above have been all too frequent at Orem High School, the principal, some teachers, and a few university professors have implemented a new kind of professional development centered on preservice certification. Those involved in this project believe it has been successful in beginning a process of renewal. This paper presents the details of the project, the lessons learned, and some specific issues related to the four traditional partner school functions: preservice, inservice, curriculum, and inquiry. Because the partner school role was essential for this project, viewpoints representing the school, the university, and the student teachers are consistently presented; all three played important roles in implementing these changes.

As in every attempt at change, history must be acknowledged. Orem High and the BYU School of Education have been designated partners since 1994. That designation, coupled with participation by both university and public school people in the BYU Leadership Associates' Program, provided dialogue beginning in 1995. Those relationships and discussions have been critical in project development. Although no systemic change took place during the first two years, staff members shared frustrations and hypothesized solutions. During the same time, Orem High School faced a dilemma of its own: reinvigorating its teachers after approximately 25 percent of its students and staff transferred to a new school. Student numbers dropped from 2,500-plus to about 1,750 students. When the opportunity arose to participate in the Arthur Vining Davis Secondary Partner School Project, those who had been discussing the possibilities of renewal saw a chance to address some of the challenges facing OHS or any professional development school. The informal school-university discussion group decided to move ahead, focusing on professional development through a new preservice program. These

were the main ideas:

1. The student teacher and cooperating teacher form a team; grading and planning are genuinely cooperative efforts. The university supervisor takes an active role on each team.
2. Teachers develop professionally during the times the student teacher "solos," using a continuous learning model rather than a "project."
3. Student teaching is an entire semester. Preservice teachers begin the first day of second semester and stay with the program until after school ends. (They spend June with their university instructors. Registration is for winter semester and spring term. Nine hours of education classes are taught concurrently with the twelve hours of student teaching credit.)
4. Teachers work with a multidisciplinary cohort, a new concept in BYU secondary education.
5. Student teachers take education courses during their student teaching. Courses are taught at the high school site, involving practicing teachers as well as professors.
6. Student teachers work with a department rather than with a single teacher. They attend weekly seminars during the school day and may not teach a full schedule.
7. Supervision of student teaching and instruction in education classes crosses subject/ discipline lines. Subject specific supervision still occurs and some supervision is in the hands of arts and sciences professors not usually associated with preservice or with the School of Education.
8. Teachers work closely with supervisors who become familiar with the school culture and are seen as partners. Teachers, student teachers, and supervisors

meet in a Professional Development Classroom.

9. Education course curricula is shaped by cooperating teachers' involvement and by student teaching experiences.

10. Disciplines in the project are limited to math, science, and social studies. This is partly by design and partly because some of those teachers showed the most interest at the school and at the university.

The first lesson learned was that there is no such thing as enough communication. Meetings were held with the cooperating teachers where the plans were discussed and put into a broader context. What was not sought, however, was the input of enough of them in shaping the program. Although public school administrators and teachers had been part of designing the project, dialogue about the changes had not occurred widely enough. While some teachers knew the project design very well, others initially saw it as a university-imposed program. That reaction, which should have been anticipated, led to a firm commitment to early and frequent dialogue with the teachers who are added to the 1997-98 school year cohort.

The second lesson learned was that there is no such thing as enough communication. (For emphasis, see lesson one above.) This time, the lack of clear purpose showed up the first day of the student teaching experience. One teacher changed his mind and left a student teacher in tears with no place to go. Another teacher turned the class over to the student teacher immediately and informed her she could not leave for seminars because now she was the official teacher. A university supervisor not in agreement with the project talked two preservice candidates out of being part of it, leaving one discipline with no student teachers. Professors teaching the education classes at school were not issued keys and had to find someone to let them in the room every day.

The consistent presence of the university

professors facilitated the transition into the project. Although there were a few rough days, relationships soon were established, roles were clarified, keys were issued, and management details were sorted out. A science professor recruited two student teachers from among his students; a program was developed for the student teacher who had been rebuffed; and the cooperating teacher remembered that this was a new program requiring school-day seminars and a different level of involvement. Everyone began to settle into the new routine.

#### **Scene 4, OHS Faculty Room:**

*"Where are you headed? I thought you had a student teacher. You don't have to get back to class so fast."*

*"Yes, I do. My student teacher has seminar tomorrow, so I'll be teaching her lesson. I have to go over this new activity with her so I can do it right."*

*"So now the university is pulling student teachers out during the time they are supposed to be teaching? When did that happen? And why did you agree to be part of it?"*

*"Actually, this is a pretty good idea. Two professors, Dr. Merrell Hansen and Dr. Nancy Wentworth, are around to help all the time. We have had some good discussions with my student teacher about what's going on in the class. They have some ideas I haven't tried before that will help my students learn more."*

#### **Scene 5, BYU Education Office:**

*"I actually observed in eight classes in two days. I get a lot more done when I don't have to drive between schools to see student teachers. Some semesters I logged more driving time than observation time. Who are you visiting today?"*

*"I have two math classes and one French class to visit. The French class is working out well. It's*

*nice to teach in your minor. One math class is giving him a hard time, though. Maybe you could sit in and offer suggestions."*

*"Yes, I can do that. The history and science people are OK today. Both cooperating teachers said things are going OK so far. I talked to them yesterday and we have a meeting tomorrow so I can get details. I'll see if one of them could observe with us."*

*"Good idea. Have you readjusted the curriculum plans for the seminar?"*

*"I had to! That was quite a discussion with the math teachers. I have checked the list of topics we have talked about in the classes against the required areas. We're covering it all, but the order and intensity is very different from my campus classes. I can really show them how theory informs practice – and have them try it the next day. There's nothing like a challenging Intermediate Algebra class to increase the desire to learn."*

### **Scene 6, Student Teacher Car Pool:**

*"Did Dr. Hansen come in your class today? He was in mine, along with Dr. Wentworth and Mr. Jensen. That's real pressure."*

*"No, I didn't see him today. I met with three other student teachers who are having problems with kids sluffing. It was good to talk it over. They had some ideas I can try. One of the regular math teachers met with us for about thirty minutes to give us some background on all of the things that have been tried in this school. At least I feel better knowing this isn't a problem just in my class."*

*"The supervisor visit wasn't bad; it just made me nervous. But I think it will help because we talked about some things I can do to make the cooperative learning groups work better. They all had ideas that might help, so I picked the one I liked best and we planned a lesson for tomorrow. Mr. Gillespie is going to help me teach it."*

*"Let me know how it works. The last time I did groups, I wasn't too happy with them. But my cooperating teacher was thrilled! She said she didn't have much experience with grouping, so we're kind of learning together. It's comforting to know teachers continue to learn."*

Although teaming in public education has been through many iterations, teachers in the project had little experience with it. For them, the relationships with student teachers had been instructors-to-students rather than co-teachers working together to increase student learning. Early dialogue with cooperating teachers indicated some hesitation about working as a team. Part of the concern expressed was that "the real teaching world doesn't work that way." Although that is true, teaming has remained an important focus in the project and is necessary for classroom teachers to renew themselves professionally. The variety of activities makes teaming essential. Because of the school-day seminars, the classroom teachers remained an active part of the classroom team. Even though these student teachers were in place much longer than regular student teachers (eighteen weeks compared to fourteen weeks), the teachers actually left the classrooms far less than during the usual student teaching program. Student teachers also had the opportunity to participate in supervisory activities not related to the classroom, such as planning school-wide Literacy Week activities. Although one of the original ideas was for the cooperating teachers to complete a kind of professional development project, the teaming experience itself provided that experience. The teaming model created in this project may also help teachers take active steps to reduce teacher isolation, an acknowledged problem present in teacher burnout.

The project has benefited classroom teachers, according to self-reports and interviews. Teachers take student teachers for a variety of reasons; some genuinely want to help an inexperienced teacher while others see it as a break to do other things. Many

excellent teachers avoid student teachers completely because they dislike giving up their students. Although the opportunity to team was always there, teachers felt the pressure of tradition or habit to leave the student teachers alone for a significant part of their experience. They were then disconnected from their high school students whom they had to “retrain” after the student teachers left. Moreover, taking classes back for the last five weeks of school was not an enviable task when student contact had not been substantial. Some teachers initially resisted their roles as team members. They were more comfortable withdrawing from the classroom and meeting with the student teachers after school to talk about what had happened. Some hinted at impatience with student teachers and their new ideas; they preferred continuing as they had in the past. By the end of the project, however, all teachers found teaming and closer work with the supervisors to be a valuable learning experience.

Extending student teaching time without pressure to have all classes taught by the student teacher allowed teachers to develop new instructional patterns. One teacher developed a small group learning experience for eight students who had received failing grades the previous two quarters. He met with those students regularly in another classroom, providing them with individual help and attention. At the end of third quarter, six of the eight passed. Other teachers had student teachers become experts in specific subjects, teaching only small sections of the total curricula. Student teachers also had the opportunity to work with different teachers, to see different styles, and to come to conclusions about their teaching preferences.

The initial concerns of the cooperating teachers began to fade as the project progressed. They began to express that the seminars were helping because the students had a chance to think about what was going on. One particular teacher, described by students as very set in his ways, commented that he liked the chance to team because he

got good ideas from the student teacher and then was part of putting them in place in the classroom.

The relationship between the cooperating teachers and the university faculty grew steadily stronger. One cooperating teacher said his student teacher had been visited at least once a week, sometimes twice. This was a considerable improvement over previous experiences when student teachers were often seen only two or three times during the entire fourteen weeks. The cooperating teachers were also pleased with the quality of university supervisor involvement. Teachers and supervisors gave the same kinds of information and assistance to student teachers, omitting the common problem of mixed messages. Teachers also began to view professional growth as a process rather than a project due at the end of the year. One experienced teacher said, “This has been a chance to rethink my teaching. I never thought much about why I graded the way I did until my student teacher asked me about it. I’m not sure that has happened with any other student teacher. I am thinking more about what I do and why I do it that way.”

Student teachers also grew professionally during this project. Their seminar questions changed from mechanics and management of the program (How do I stop the kids from talking? What kinds of rules can be established for verbal usage in class?), to instructional questions (How do I pace myself for the 84-minute block class so I don’t have a ton of extra, unplanned time?), to individual concerns about ability to continue in the program because of the time commitment. While this progression is usual in student teachers, the shared nature of the cohort experience and the immediacy of the concepts discussed in the university classes were, according to the university supervisors, more exciting and deeper than these same things discussed in campus-based classes. By the end of the student teaching part of the project, student teachers were saying that they could not imagine doing it any other way. The word spread on campus as numbers of preservice candidates began to

contact professors to see if they could be a part of the next cohort.

University faculty felt much more connected to their students and to the schools in this program. The topics that are a part of classroom theory and methods course are the same but the school setting changes many things. One faculty member commented, "It's not that we're in the school that's important. It's that the kids are. They see why thinking about evaluation and learning styles when planning instruction is essential to good teaching. They're not separate topics as they are on campus. They make better connections this way." The content area professor participant added, "This is changing the way we teach, not just where we teach."

The university supervisors are also becoming part of the school culture. Their frequent presence is important to working in a school. They are now known by name rather than by job description and seen as important resources for quality teaching. The designation of a Partnership Classroom provides a physical center for professional development for everyone. This can be enhanced over time as the relationship between the university supervisors and the teachers continues to grow. Trust is essential if renewal is to continue and flourish.

The project, of course, also faces challenges. Some have been alluded to earlier in this paper. Others emerged as the first year came to a close. These challenges include the already mentioned communication difficulties and the ever-present challenge of time. Teachers, supervisors, and student teachers would benefit from reflective dialogue around many of the issues that arise during student teaching. Dialogue before, during, and after student teaching would enrich and enhance the experience. Because management becomes such an overwhelming issue for beginning teachers (indeed, for all participants), reflection and dialogue should be a more prominent part of the program. The challenge will be to provide and value consistent dialogue with many voices. The goal is thoughtful practitioners, not good

technicians.

Another need is for a liaison at the school, an individual (probably a teacher) who can be a kind of "operations manager" for this university/school partnership venture. If management of details can be streamlined, it will allow for more time to be involved in issues of substance. Scheduling, inviting, coordinating, and data collecting are all important aspects of the project; it would be helpful to have a chief worrier for those details. This probably implies a further financial commitment for professional development schools by either the university or the school district.

There are also challenges at the university. Many professors chose not to be involved because of the changes. The traditional demarcation lines limiting the roles of the university professor, the cooperating teacher, and student teacher are acceptable, even desirable, to many.

Questions now arise about expanding the program. Resources of the school and the university are finite; programs such as this one have implications for partner schools and for the universities with which they partner. Although the project was successful and will be repeated during the 1997-98 school year, it impacted only 20 percent of the Orem High teachers and only three secondary education certification areas with the eight students in the cohort. A quality standard may need to be identified and clarified before other subjects and schools are added.

The four professional development school functions are apparent throughout this project. Preservice is the vehicle through which the other elements happen. Teacher renewal (inservice) is a natural outgrowth of teaming and leads to professional development as a natural part of teaching. Inservice has traditionally been difficult, even ineffective, in secondary schools. This project has implications for a new way of thinking about professional development; it becomes an ongoing learning model instead of an inservice course taken after school or on Saturday. Future programs will continue to explore this idea. Curriculum changes

naturally in this kind of project because relevancy is critical. The challenge is to maintain the high degree of interest while providing intellectual rigor and encouraging reflective thinking. Inquiry led to this project as possibilities were discussed, revised, and proposed. The basic reason for change is deeply rooted in inquiry as new ways are developed to provide the best program for those in the university and those in the schools. Interviews and analysis of collected data will be an ongoing part of moving this project forward. Inquiry must now extend to individual teachers as part of professional growth. These four functions are not separate; they are as intertwined and essential to the learning spiral as are the three parties involved in the project.

#### **Scene 7, OHS Faculty Room:**

*“Having these student teachers in the classroom until the end of the year is a good idea. They have felt a major responsibility for the learning that takes place – and the added difficulties the end of the year brings.”*

*“And having two people available in the classroom this time of year isn’t bad either! The student teachers have really stayed in there. Merrell and Nancy said the seminar comments have become quite reflective. They are looking back from a learning perspective rather than just from survival. I think a lot of it rubbed off on me.”*

*“I have learned several new things from my student teacher. It will be great to try them first semester and even better to know there will be a new student teacher coming second semester. I am looking forward to working with one instead dreading it.”*

*“It’s a good change. It’s been good for the kids and for me. I would like to spend more time in three-way dialogue next year. We all have things to offer to make this better for our students.”*

#### **Scene 8, BYU Education Office:**

*“Have you noticed any big differences in your students since the public schools finished their year? My campus classes are moving along, but the cohort members are inquiring into things they know are important. It’s a different level of interest.”*

*“They’ve been actually quite emotional. They were as connected to their students as many first-year teachers. One of the big surprises for me was the cooperating teachers; wasn’t it great to be part of that enthusiasm! I’ve worked with some of them before and never seen anything like this.”*

#### **Scene 9, On Campus, After the Final Class:**

*“I didn’t know if I’d make it through this. I have never worked so hard in my life. How do people do it without the support system we’ve had? I’m glad I didn’t have one of those cooperating teachers my roommate had. She didn’t get much help at all.”*

*“I know what you mean. I’ve loved every minute. Well, almost every minute. I have a lot to do this summer before I start teaching. I know I will be fine and that I have people who will help. My cooperating teacher and I are sharing some things this summer that we didn’t have time to finish.”*

*“They were great, weren’t they? Just think. In a few years, maybe we can help new teachers the same way they’ve helped us.”*

## OREM UPDATE:

# Orem High School

**Bus Gillespie, Orem High School**

*with editing and contributions by*  
 John Childs, Orem High School  
 Tina Howard, Alpine School District  
 John Gardner, Brigham Young University  
 Merrell Hansen, Brigham Young University  
 Nancy Wentworth, Brigham Young University

### The Setting

Orem, Utah, is rapidly growing, making a transition from a rural community to a faster paced business/industrial city. Orem High School was built in 1958 to replace an aging school. It has undergone extensive remodeling a couple of times to expand its capacity to over 2,500 students. In 1980, a new high school was opened on the west side of Orem to accommodate the rapidly growing population. Within ten years, Orem High's student population was again more than 2,000 students. In 1995, a third high school was opened in North Orem, which absorbed about one-third of the students from each of the existing schools. The students of Orem High are overwhelmingly white, middle class, and from families that value education and are generally supportive of the public schools. Most of the faculty and staff live in and come from the surrounding area and share the attitudes of the community.

### Partnership History

Orem High is located about four miles from the campus of Brigham Young University (BYU) and has for many years enjoyed an informal relationship with professors and departments of the church-owned school. The idea of a formal partnership between the university and

several of the local school districts was conceived during the 1980s, and some programs were created to work more closely with elementary schools. When the opportunity to participate in the Arthur Vining Davis Secondary Partner School Project arose in 1995, it dovetailed nicely with some existing work that had already begun between Orem High and the BYU School of Education. Both institutions were experiencing specific challenges. Orem High was dealing with the loss of one-third of its students and faculty and pondering how to maintain its extensive programs and excellence. The School of Education was struggling with an ever increasing number of teacher candidates and trying to find ways to effectively teach, place, and find employment for them.

The participation of staff members from both institutions in the Institute for Educational Inquiry's Leadership Associates Program in 1994 initiated the dialogue of how the partnership could be used to improve education in general. Although no systemic change took place in the first two years, the dialogue was used to air frustrations, hypothesize solutions, and build relationships between individuals from the two institutions.

### The Vision

The partnership committee focused its efforts on the most visible aspect of our relationship, the training of student teachers. Both sides were disgruntled with the existing system and had long blamed the other institution for its shortcomings. As dialogue progressed, numerous ideas for improvement were presented. They crystallized into the following concepts:

1. The student teaching time in the public schools would be expanded and would match the calendar of the high school. *Student teachers spend the entire second semester at the school, allowing them to be involved with two grading periods and the end of school. The student teachers involved in the program are assigned to the high school or one of two junior high schools in Orem where they form a cohort. Students and teachers work together, learn together, and cement professional relationships.*

2. Certain university education courses would be taught, seminar-style, at the high school during the student teaching experience. *Presently, three courses (nine hours of education courses) are taught by two professors and a high school teacher, while students earn twelve hours for student teaching. They meet in a room at the high school each Tuesday morning for a three-hour seminar. It has been an energizing experience as the students see how the education theories they read about and discuss play out in an actual classroom setting.*

3. Supervision of student teachers must be the shared responsibility of the university's education faculty, the faculty of the College of Arts & Science, and the cooperating teacher. *The education professors of the partnership can visit numerous classes within the same building and have a much more open relationship with the cooperating teachers. The number of visits and the help available to the student teachers has increased. The students also view their professors and their cooperating teachers as a team, both working for their success in the classroom.*

4. Cooperating teachers should be able to

experience some professional growth and renewal as a result of their participation in the partnership. *After another year of discussion, the teachers and student teachers began participating in a "mini-associates" program. They met each Tuesday (after the students returned from their seminar) and used the NASSP publication, Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution, to guide their discussion of improving the school and their teaching. The discussions were led by the university professors, which fostered increased trust and shared concern for the survival of the student teachers in the building.*

When considering changes to anything in the hallowed halls of education, the change agents need to prepare for immediate and unremitting resistance by traditionalists who do not share the vision. The first lesson learned was that communication – personal, one-on-one communication – was essential. The changes we were proposing were not just fixing the old student teaching situation; they were systemic and altered the entire concept of what student teaching should be and how it should affect the stakeholders. Initial efforts to recruit good, solid teachers to accept student teachers in the cohort program were resisted because the teachers clung to their preconceived ideas of student teaching as a time during which they sat around and worked on crossword puzzles in the faculty room.

### **The Stakeholders**

As the program evolved, the committee found itself continually defending its vision to individuals from various levels. It slowly became obvious that a broader view was necessary to understand how the program affected everyone involved. When the network of people involved in the student teaching experience was exposed, it was nearly overwhelming. It included: the taxpaying parents of the high school students, the high school students, the district

policymakers and bureaucrats, school administrators, cooperating teachers and the faculty in general, student teachers, their education professors, the staff of the School of Education, professors in the colleges of arts and sciences, their staffs, and even the university leadership. In trying to find a common thread that all the stakeholders could agree on, we settled on the idea of how our program *improved the learning of students in the classroom*. This has been useful in guiding our efforts and appealing to others for their support.

### The Vision Expanded

As educators learn early in their careers, the ability to monitor and adjust is essential. The committee has made some alterations to help fit the actual practice to the original goals.

1. **The Draft** – In order to include more voices in the proper placement student teachers, we instigated a meeting in October of the department heads from the three public schools (and any other interested teachers) with the BYU education professors. The student teacher profiles were read and discussed; their preferences, strengths, and weaknesses were considered; and a placement was agreed upon by all those involved. This has greatly improved relations between BYU and the public school teachers, and has provided more lead time for the cooperating teachers and the student teachers to get together. The number of phone calls and amount of paperwork between the district, the schools, and the university has been reduced as well.

2. **Teaming** – With student teachers leaving at least once a week, the old model of totally turning the class over to the student teacher was not feasible. Also, considering our goal of improving the learning of students in the classroom, the old method was not compatible with having the experienced teacher leave the class to a

novice. So, we have been experimenting with ways to keep both adults actively responsible for the students in the classroom. One method is to place the student teacher with more than one teacher. That way the teacher continues to teach some of his/her classes, possibly having some extra time to develop better lessons and experiment with fewer students. The student teacher also has an opportunity to observe more teaching styles and deal with different levels of students in different settings.

Teaming is also seen as an answer to the most pressing problem in Utah education—large class sizes. With some classes exceeding thirty-five students, the student teacher and the cooperating teacher can work with smaller groups, giving additional help to slower students or dividing up the instruction so that the kids have a closer relationship with the teacher.

3. **Broadening the Experience** – With student teachers spending nearly twice the time in school than they had under the old model, they come to understand the total school experience better and have more chances to participate in a variety of activities. We have had a number of our student teachers accept positions as club advisors and coaches. They have also been able to oversee projects like our “Literacy Month” program. In the process, they learn how the politics of a school operate and they expand their network of allies in the school. The extended time also allows the administration to get to know the student teachers and offers opportunities to chaperone dances, take tickets at games, or help supervise student trips. Sometimes the student teachers are able to receive some pay for their efforts, a welcome change from their normal university experience, plus they get to know the students in various situations and are recognized by the students as an integral part of the school.

4. **Bridging the Gap** – This year, BYU and Orem High School will expand the partnership by moving Mr. Gillespie into a

half-time adjunct professor position. His time will be divided between his high school classes and the university, where he will help teach classes and supervise student teachers in the field.

The success of our program has not gone unnoticed. BYU's School of Education has been approached by a number of other K-12 schools interested in starting a cohort in their buildings. We face the problem of limited resources as many professors, both in the School of Education and in arts and sciences, cling to the old ways of doing things in their more comfortable networks. There are other problems related to scheduling, finding good cooperating teachers, and helping more people catch the vision, which we continue to work with. But we feel good about what has happened thus far and how it focuses the attention of all the stakeholders on the ultimate goal of improving learning in the classroom!