The Cambridge Handbook of School–University Partnerships
edited by Dresden, Janna; Ferrera, JoAnna; Neapolitan, Jane E,: Yendol-Hoppey, Diane

DOI 10.1017/9781009285841.063

53

Global Perspectives on School–University Partnerships Between and Within Countries[1]

A. Lin Goodwin and Suzanne Pratt

Introduction

Education has long been seen as integral to social and economic progress as nations seek to climb up international league tables and enhance their standing in the global community. Central to education systems are teachers, with general acknowledgment that there can be no quality schooling in the absence of quality teachers. Thus, it is not surprising that attention to reform in education, teaching, and teacher education has become a perennial preoccupation among educators, policymakers, and government leaders. A focus on strengthening education and improving teachers is even more apparent in the twenty-first century as the forces of globalization simultaneously heighten cross-border comparison and competition, and encourage cooperation and collaboration given evidence that partnerships can support education reform and teacher quality (Burton & Greher, 2007; Hunt, 2014; Mincu, 2013) with school–university partnerships "the most frequently recommended approaches to educational reform" (Dyson, 1999, p. 411, cited in Handscomb et al., 2014. p. 12).

In the context of an ever-shrinking world, where education concerns are shared across borders, and the 2030 deadline to achieve the seventeen United Nation Sustainable Development Goals – specifically Goal 4: "inclusive and equitable quality education … for all" is looming, it seems timely to take a look at school–university partnerships from a global perspective. This chapter begins with a quick scan of school–university partnerships, primarily in the US. It then examines school–university partnerships in – or with – other parts of the world, using available – and accessible – literature. What are some examples of school–university partnerships across different countries and what kinds of conversations frame this phenomenon? It closes by discussing some enduring issues that plague school–university partnerships and suggests how global collaborations might generate new insights into perennial problems.

[1] Our deep thanks to Han Gil Kim, PhD candidate at Boston College, for his invaluable assistance with this chapter.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

School–University Partnerships: A Brief Overview

Partnerships between schools and universities have long been in place (Bevins & Price, 2014; Teitel, 2004; Walsh & Backe, 2013). Indeed, almost from the beginning of formal teacher training, partnerships between schools and tertiary education institutions engaged in teacher preparation have been a part of, if not integral to, the curriculum to ensure some form of practical experience for aspiring teachers (cf. Hughes, 1982; Robinson, 2006). These partnerships were typically local, connecting Normal Schools, and later Teacher Colleges, with neighboring schools for the purpose of developing teachers ready to serve the particular needs of the immediate community. Beginning in the late nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, Normal Schools/Teacher Colleges evolved into state colleges and then were absorbed or replaced by universities which took on responsibility for instructing would-be-teachers, as well as for teacher certification (Imig & Imig, 2008). Professional knowledge for teachers continued to emphasize a field component, which, over time, has not only been viewed by many, especially teacher candidates, as the most important aspect of learning to teach (Anderson & Stillman, 2013; Loughran & Hamilton, 2016) but has begun to dominate teacher preparation policy and practice such that extended student teaching or "clinically rich experience" has become normative (Roegman et al., 2023).

The press toward extended clinical practice is undergirded by two assumptions: "More time in P-12 schools leads to more learning" and "observing and participating in day-to-day practice outweighs other forms of learning" (Roegman et al., 2023, p.142). The "practice turn" in teacher preparation (Zeichner, 2012) gained momentum in the early 2000s, spurred by 2002 No Child Left Behind legislation that favored alternate routes into teaching which emphasized learning on the job and "significantly accelerated" school–university partnerships (Walsh & Backe, 2013, p. 594). The result was changes in state accreditation standards and program requirements (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2018; Espinoza et al., 2018), as well as federal funding to support new models of teacher preparation. One example was teacher residency programs (https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/effective-educator-development-programs/teacher-quality-partnership/) that couple immersion in a classroom for as long as a full school year with intensive academic study at a university, and mandates partnership between a university and a local education authority. But sizeable grants were also awarded to non-university providers of teachers via alternate routes, while the *Race to the Top* grant program (www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf) "cleared the way for providers other than institutions of higher education to independently offer teacher and principal certification programmes and confer Master's degrees" (Kosnik et al., 2016, p. 284). Thus, while school–university partnerships remain essential to teacher certification in the twenty-first century, the definition of "partner" is evolving, with a shift in the role-authority-balance between school and university as the curriculum is weighted toward practice, minimizing the contribution of university-based programs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

International School–University Partnerships: Practice and Perspectives

The US focus thus far might seem out of place in a chapter about school–university partnerships from a global perspective. Yet, it is unavoidable given the dominant role US scholars apparently play in generating relevant literature. In a wide search of peer-reviewed articles about school–university partnerships, 264 works were identified in the 10-year period from 2013 to 2022, the majority of which (194) originated from the US; Australia was a distant second with 18 articles. While we do not claim an exhaustive search, hampered by the fact that we could only access articles written in English, it was interesting to note whose voice(s) seemed most prominent in this conversation. The overwhelming US presence would have been more pronounced if we had included publications besides articles, such as syntheses of scholarship that delve into collaborations between schools and universities in this country (e.g., Nath et al., 2011; Neapolitan, 2011). Likewise, if we had lengthened the time frame for the search to include earlier decades when school–university partnerships were being invented and energetically (re)conceptualized by US academics, their perspectives would have been even more plentiful.

However, our time-frame decision was deliberate given our interest in more recent school–university partnerships. Recency is especially salient for many international contexts where school–university partnerships are a "relatively novel application in many developing countries" (Nasri et al., 2023, p. 3), and "the notion of collaboration has only permeated education reform policy discourse in the last 10 years" (Chan, 2015, p. 111). We also focused on peer-reviewed journals as a likely source of articles written in English, as international scholars are increasingly engaging in research and joining global conversations around education. We then sorted the sample of articles according to different definitions of "international" in relation to school–university partnerships. We saw two: (1) partnerships within various countries; (2) partnerships between countries. We begin our discussion by focusing on how school–university partnerships are operationalized in different places in the world to gain insight into practice as well as outcomes. We then look into partnerships that connect countries.

School–University Partnerships within Different Countries

School–university partnerships typically focus on three goals: teacher preparation and development; curriculum and instruction; or service learning (Walsh & Backe, 2013). Most of the partnerships we reviewed brought schools and universities together around the first two goals, with teacher development often centered on improvement in instruction and curriculum development. Almost all of the sources reported the outcomes of studies of school–university partnerships. This is to be expected since one criterion of our search was peer-reviewed articles that typically find outlets in scholarly journals. However, some of the articles centered the partnership, offering portraits of practice, while most centered research, with the partnership as the context for the inquiry. We organize the following discussion accordingly.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Portraits of Practice

An example of school–university partnership practice from Norway employing "a systemic approach urging all parts to pull in the same direction" was the "Secondary School in Development (SiD)" program sponsored by the Ministry of Education and Research (Midthassel, 2017, p. 135). The goal of the initiative was to address low motivation among students and improve teaching practice "by developing teachers' professional capital through school-based learning activities" (p. 135). The project was one of several initiated by the Ministry but represented one of the largest and most recent, running for five years and involving 22 universities and over 1,000 schools from 426 municipalities. The project took a "whole school approach ... encouraging all teachers to learn together" (p. 135). Through the partnerships, over repeating three-semester cycles, university faculty provided "research-based knowledge" on content or topics selected by school partners (numeracy or classroom management for instance), but in "agreement with the school districts and the schools concerning the practical work" (p. 135), supporting the translation of theory to enhance classroom instruction.

Similar to the Norway endeavor, a partnership in Malaysia also focused on developing teachers' research-based or theoretical knowledge undergirded by the assumption that empirical evidence can strengthen classroom practice and curriculum (Nasri et al., 2023). The year-long collaboration was simultaneously a research study and a school–university partnership involving teachers from primary schools from one state in East Malaysia. Forty teachers responded positively to an invitation from the State Department of Education and engaged with university faculty through a three-phase professional development program that emphasized first "reflective pedagogy and co-development of teaching interventions" then "focused on classroom teaching intervention and continuous feedback on teaching methods" and concluded with interviews of teachers (Nasri et al., 2023, p. 1). Through the partnership, teachers attended lectures on learning theories and pedagogy, engaged in dialogue sessions with university researchers, and co-created teaching resources where "both sides worked closely together to integrate the theoretical and practical knowledge of pedagogy" (p. 6). As teachers implemented their codeveloped materials and lesson plans, they were supported to develop the skills to video-record their lessons for sharing and reflection; they also participated in an online forum each week to reflect on their teaching and learning with one another and with university researchers.

In South Africa, a partnership with the provincial department initiated *Funda UJabule School* in 2010, the first "teaching school," affiliated with the University of Johannesburg, Soweto campus (Gravett et al., 2019). In this case, the school–university partnership was deliberately established by the university, using a grow-your-own approach, where the school was created by the university as a laboratory school to bridge the distance between theory and practice so-often bemoaned by critics of teacher education schools. The University of Johannesburg deliberately designed their teacher preparation baccalaureate "with a view of offering a program in which student teachers would experience congruence between coursework learning and practice learning in the school"

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Gravett et al., 2019, n.p.). Pre-service students' studies were grounded in child development and child study, with the teaching school affording them the opportunity, in tandem with their academic coursework, to concretely observe and follow children as they progressed in their development, up through the primary school grades. In this partnership, the school is framed as a "learning place," a "collective third space [that] enables university-based teacher educators and mentor teachers to grapple jointly with the challenges of guiding and supporting student teacher learning" (Gravett et al., 2019, n.p.).

A somewhat unique take on school–university partnerships is presented by Germany. The article describes a partnership model called "School Adoption" (Bach, 2019). This model was first conceptualized in Norway and has since been taken up or piloted by several other European and South American countries. At the University of Flensburg, School Adoption "has been offered for a small group of student teachers in primary schools annually since 2014 and is organized as a 10-week long-term internship in the final year before graduation" (Bach, 2019, p. 310). The adoption period, which lasts a week, is the culminating activity for master's students after they have completed ten semesters of study (undergraduate through graduate levels) and three internships. "School Adoption represents the final opportunity to complete a university-supported internship with authentic, job-related requirements" (p. 310). At the end of the final placement, there is "a ceremonial key handover" before "the student teachers take over the lessons and school tasks in the internship school," freeing all the teachers to "complete a specific professional development course" (p. 310). During the week, a school leader is appointed from a neighboring school to manage contingencies, but it is university faculty who support the student teaching dyads and "attend the school each day as contact partners, observe lessons and examine the student teachers' teaching and school experiences with them in afternoon reflection meetings" (p. 310).

Finally, we saw evidence of school–university partnerships focused on university faculty and teachers working together as co-researchers or co-creators of curriculum and instruction. In terms of joint research, research–practice partnerships (RPPs) were created between faculty from a public university in Chile and teachers from a network of seven schools connected to the university. The goal of the project was to support student learning and "question traditional ways of doing research, transitioning gradually from a vertical, hierarchical model to a horizontal, collaborative model, where teacher researchers are viewed as agents in alliance with university" (Guerrero-Hernández & Fernández-Ugalde, 2020, p. 428). The RPPs ran for a year and began with a call for proposals around school-based issues identified by teacher-partners. Proposals were selected by university researchers according to interest and expertise, after which researchers and teachers worked together to design action research projects to address questions. Teachers took the lead in selecting methods and approaches that aligned with their contexts, with the help of relevant academic literature and information supplied by university partners. Throughout, partners engaged in dialogue sessions, reflective discussions, and presentations of their findings. Collaborative action research was also the catalyst for a partnership in Hong Kong between a research-intensive university and

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

partner schools. Teacher educators supported teachers through two rounds of school-based action research projects over a 6-month period. As with the Chilean partnership, "the teachers chose their own research focus, interventions and data collection methods" (Chan, 2015, p. 111), and collaborated with faculty to learn more about their practice.

Finally, a model employed to support school-based research was "Researcher-in-Residence." One example from England paired university faculty with interested schools (Passy et al., 2018). The guidelines and criteria governing the partnership pairs were quite open ended, allowing collaborators to determine project focus, meeting frequency, methods of inquiry, and ways of working together. Another example from Ireland used the same label for the activity, but with a very different purpose. In this case, the resident researcher's role was to support a pilot called "Partnership in Learning between University and School" or PLUS, involving four schools. Specifically, the researcher-in-residence was "to enable professional conversations and to progress a conception of a structured approach to school placement" (Young et al., 2015, p. 26). In essence, the role of the researcher was the success of the partnership by helping to navigate the complexities inherent in "border crossing between the diversity of cultural contexts" (p. 26). A third example also from England, established "research champions" among school personnel, teachers who were responsible for "creating a research culture in the school and supporting research-informed professional development" (Burns et al., 2021, p. 623). Besides working within their own schools, research champions from all the partner schools come together regularly to work together and with the university teacher educators.

Instances of university faculty and classroom practitioners co-creating curriculum typically were aimed at enhancing learning experiences for teacher candidates and bringing theory and practice into alignment. An example from New Zealand involved "the co-construction of one core course within a graduate ITE programme" with the goal of "help[ing] student teachers to make links between theory taught at the university, and day-to-day practices in classroom settings" (Sewell et al., 2018, p. 321). Response to "National policy in Ireland" which "is advocating integrated STEM learning experiences" was the impetus for a school–university partnership in Ireland focused on STEM in the primary school (Hamilton et al., 2021, p. 19). In a "multi-tiered partnership," in-service and pre-service teachers along with university teacher educators worked as partners to design and implement "meaningful classroom-based STEM learning experiences for primary children" (p. 19).

Research on/with Partnerships

All of the articles we have discussed so far provide a window into different interpretations and enactments of school–university partnerships. Each article also detailed research associated with the partnership, offering a side-by-side narrative of practice and an examination of that practice. In contrast, most of the articles we reviewed concentrated more so on understanding the impact of, or response to, school–university partnerships. Essentially, the partnership served as the context for research but was not the focus of the conversation.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Still, they afforded us a sense of the kinds of questions international peers are asking in relation to these collaborations.

Quite a few of the studies focused on the perceptions of participants – what they feel about such partnerships, what impact it has on their understanding of teaching and learning, how they assess the experience. Participants included students, pre-service students, teachers, school leaders, and university faculty, with pre-service students most frequently called upon for their views of school–university partnerships in the context of content teaching (Al Seyabi, 2017 – Oman); professional development (Guler-Yildiz & Erturk-Kara, 2016 – Türkiye); collaboration (Thant Sin, 2022 – Myanmar); and practice-teaching (Maskit & Orland-Barak, 2015 – Israel; Toe et al., 2020 – Australia). Teachers' responses were also sought. For example, a study in Iran examined teacher thinking about curriculum design and their roles within a school–university partnership (Rahimi et al., 2016), while another study looked at teachers' perceptions of the role of subject tutor partners from university-based initial teacher education programs (Crooks et al., 2021 – England). One study included students to ascertain their perception of learning STEM subjects through a partnership that connected the students themselves along with scientists and teachers (Fadzil et al., 2019 – Malaysia).

Included in the collection of articles were two evaluation studies which examined the outcomes of school–university partnerships after some period of implementation. In an example from the Netherlands, researchers from Utrecht University evaluated a school–university partnership that was created in 2004 to "help develop students' talents in STEM" (Chisari et al., 2023, p. 2). The "strong emphasis on student development" set this collaboration apart from other school–university partnerships in the Netherlands, where partnerships are, in fact, "common" (p. 2). The researchers collected data from the two universities and their forty-eight secondary school partners through document analysis, interviews, and surveys. This evaluation was particularly noteworthy as the partnership "invited" the evaluation because it was interested in how it was doing and how well it was delivering its programs. They were also focused on challenges, "perceiving them not merely as difficulties to prevent or solve, but as linked to expansive opportunities and as emerging insights of partners into what is and can be of relevance for the partnership in the future" (p. 2).

An overall assessment of the research studies we reviewed revealed mostly positive outcomes emerging from partnerships, with members assuming new roles, developing new skills, revising or expanding their beliefs, and gaining a new appreciation for the expertise of their partners. Undoubtedly there were issues and barriers caused by differing institutional norms and cultures, limited time, power differentials – whether real or assumed, and inadequate resources. Much of this was mirrored in US literature (Nath et al., 2011; Teitel, 2004), suggesting that the road blocks that can interfere with school–university partnerships are shared across international borders.

School–University Partnerships across Different Countries

Study-abroad programs have been in existence "as early as in the 1970s ... usually in the form of student exchange programmes, short study programmes,

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

teaching practicum, field experience, immersion programmes or even brief placements and attachments" (Kabilan, 2013, p. 199). Data gathered by the American Council on Education indicated that nearly half of the university respondents either had at least one international partnership, or were developing such collaborations (Helms, 2015). The same report referenced worldwide survey data from the International Association of Universities that showed the majority of nearly 800 institutions had programs with overseas partners. In fact, US students are increasingly choosing to study abroad, even while "only a small percentage of student teachers take advantage of global learning experiences during their college education" (Jiang et al., 2019, p. 40). However, our review revealed that among school–university partnerships that did span countries, the focus was primarily on initial teacher education, giving teacher candidates the option of an international practicum experience. Thus, in the context of university-based teacher preparation programs, whether in the US and elsewhere, we saw student teachers spending a period of usually a few weeks "in a 'similar but different' education system" (Tambyah, 2019, p. 105), bookended by orientation sessions prior to the experience, assignments such as reflection papers and dialogue journals alongside classroom practice during the experience, and some kind of debrief and/or sharing/presentation post the experience.

The goals for these "similar but different" learning experiences also repeated across partnerships. Chief among them was to "develop and increase [pre-service teachers'] sense of cultural sensitivity" (Quezada & Alfaro, 2007, p. 96). This involved immersing them in "disorienting experiences . . . for perspective transformation" (Trilokekar & Kukar, 2011) "creat[ing] opportunities for the pre-service students . . . to encounter difference and the Other" (Parr & Chan, 2015, p. 41), "confront their ethnocentric worldviews," and begin to consider "the ways culture influences teaching and learning" (Marx & Moss, 2011, p. 35). International student teaching placements are often presented by educators in the US as one strategy for developing social justice-oriented teachers given the assumption that what is learned from a "culturally diverse context" abroad will translate to quality teaching in local settings that are also culturally diverse, albeit in different ways (Jiang et al., 2019). Enriching student teachers' professional knowledge and development was another frequently mentioned benefit of international practica (Harfitt & Chow, 2018; Kabilan, 2013) – seeing and learning from different ways of teaching, enacting curriculum, and "doing school."

While international practica across international partnerships were similar in terms of the core activity and goals, there were a few partnerships that stood out because they were mature, lasting over several years, or because they aimed to support teacher development more broadly defined (i.e., beyond pre-service students). We share these as additional portraits of practice. The first is a partnership focused on experiential/service learning for pre-service teacher development. Next are two long-standing partnerships, both involving Norway – one with the US, the other with China.

Our first portrait is of a university–NGO (non-governmental organization) partnership to engage teacher candidates in experiential/service-learning opportunities. The University of Hong Kong requires all its PGDE (post-graduate

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

diploma in education) students to complete an "experiential learning block" for the purpose of "enhancing students' understanding of real-world environments, expanding their capacity to integrate theory and practice, and to broaden their local and global citizenship" (Harfitt & Chow, 2018, p. 122). The experiential learning component is integrated into the teacher preparation curriculum and is credit-bearing. The Faculty of Education partners with more than twenty organizations locally as well as abroad in countries such as Cambodia, India, and Australia, "including some powerful global advocates of social justice and education" such as "UNICEF (HK), OXFAM (HK), [and the] World Wildlife Fund" (p. 122). Pre-service students participate in a six-week long placement "under the supervision of local and regional NGOs" and "work in interdisciplinary teams to initiate community-based tasks closely linked to education and their ongoing role as educators" (p. 122). They apply what they learn in their academic programs to support the partner organization by, inter alia, offering educational workshops to primary pupils visiting a local marine/science park, designing and presenting educational materials and curriculum for public education, or teaching in an orphanage in Cambodia.

The two international partnerships involving Norway are both several years old. The first is between the University of South Carolina, Auburn University, and the Romerike English Teachers Network in Norway (Virtue, 2022). The focus of the partnership has been "study tours for inservice English teachers from Norway and short-term study-abroad programs to Norway for U.S. preservice teachers" (pp. 99–100). This partnership exemplifies what can happen through the initiative of one person, a faculty member at the University of South Carolina, who served as a Fulbright "roving scholar" to Norway in 2008–2009, and "piloted the study tour concept in 2010" (p. 101). From the modest beginning there have been multiple study tours of in-service teachers from Norway, and reverse study tours to Norway by US faculty and their pre-service students over the past decade. Norway teachers are supported to develop "deep insight into culture, society, and daily life in the American South" (p. 101) through a rich array of activities that are educational, cultural, and community-based. US faculty and students' tours to Norway "engage [them] in an immersive, cross-cultural experience" that ensures "concrete experiences" (p. 104). For both groups, learning results from "cognitive dissonance" as they confront and revise "common stereotypes and misconceptions" (p. 105).

The second "partnership programme included Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Beijing Normal University, East China Normal University, and kindergartens in Norway and China" (Birkeland & Li, 2019, p. 458). The program, which began in 2015, is part of a larger Norwegian government push for collaboration with BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa), plus Japan, and centers early childhood education for sustainability (ECEfS), motivated by the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, especially Goal 4 which targets equitable education. In addition, both Norway and China were experiencing changes due to increased migration from rural areas to cities, which amplified the "call for ECE workers to have competencies in cultural sustainability focused on glocality (i.e., local situatedness and global awareness)" (p. 460). Program participants included university faculty, teachers, school

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

leaders and post-graduate students who embarked on a journey of mutual learning through a variety of activities such as hosting visitors/visiting classrooms, mentoring student interns, joint projects, and publications, and so on. Annual program meetings in each country also helped to strengthen understanding and deepen commitments. Through the partnership, teachers were "confronted ... with disorienting dilemmas that challenged their core beliefs and assumptions about themselves and the world" (p. 470), which in turn enabled them to reflect on their practice and consider possibilities for different pathways to achieve ECEfS.

International School–University Partnerships: Common Issues, Collaborative Possibilities

The call for school–university partnerships appeared quite prominently in the international literature reviewed given the key part they are presumed to play in school improvement and education reform. Consequently, there is high level endorsement from organizations such as OECD and the European Commission that command international attention (Farrell, 2021), encouragement from government bodies, such as in Australia, for "formal partnerships between tertiary providers, schools and education systems in delivering teacher education and professional development" (Betlem et al., 2019, p. 327). There is also more directive "national policy-driven changes [that] have increased schools' responsibility in initial teacher education" (White et al., 2022, p. 282), notable in England and the Netherlands, as well as the US. The prominence of US perspectives notwithstanding, the range of countries – from Myanmar to Oman to Chile – generating scholarly literature and research focused on school–university partnerships is indicative of widespread interest, and application. Still, implementation does seem to vary along a continuum ranging from large-scale and long-term enterprises supported by government agencies, to smaller, more ad hoc efforts that might involve a handful of teachers and university faculty working on a specific content area or topic over a period of months.

A clear pattern across the articles was initial teacher education as the nucleus of the majority of school–university partnerships. This is unsurprising given the turn to practice described earlier, coupled with the fact that teacher preparation programs in more than fifty industrialized nations mandate a teaching practicum where teacher candidates learn under the mentoring of an experienced practitioner (OECD, 2022). Indeed, many countries, such as Singapore and England, have increased the amount of time student teachers spend in school placements. In line with this focus, teaching or university schools – akin to professional development schools (Neapolitan, 2011) – were mentioned frequently, with such schools in place for years in several countries including Finland, Japan, and Hungary. Thus, "school as workplace" (Farrell, 2021, p. 4) emerges as the most common model for school–university partnerships around the world, supplying the practical experience necessary to illuminate the theoretical study offered by the university.

The "critical intersection of theory and research with implementation and practice" (Walsh & Backe, 2013, p. 595) was repeatedly named as a benefit of

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

school–university partnerships. Parallel with the narrowing of the theory-practice divide, the vast majority of authors frequently mentioned a "third space" to "initiate new signs of identity" and open "innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 2). This space is "an interactive space in which new meanings are generated and then explored through new forms of practice" as norms and assumptions are surfaced and challenged (Jackson & Burch, 2019, p. 141). It is a space that simultaneously allows – yet also comes into existence when school and university players are able to achieve – symbiosis, dismantling the "asymetric relationship" (Midthassel, 2017, p. 134) that oftentimes characterizes the (uneasy) interactions between school and university personnel (Bevins & Price, 2013). The tension between research-based knowledge and practice-based knowledge is perpetuated by hierarchical definitions of knowledge that place some forms of knowing above others, such that the complex knowledge of/in classroom practice is unacknowledged. This tension continues as a barrier facing school–university partnerships, and the recent shift in balance where "the needs of schools are increasingly driving the formation of school–university partnerships" (Walsh & Backe, 2013, p. 594), has not evened the balance but perhaps created a new imbalance in "favor" of school knowledge. The space connecting schools and universities needs to be more porous, allowing for collaboration and the melding – and valuing – of different kinds of expertise and knowledge to ensure quality teacher preparation (Burns et al., 2021; Nasri et al., 2023). But this integration and mutuality is a universal challenge of school–university partnerships around the world, surmounted only by trust, time, interpersonal relationships, resources, shared goals – and benefits – along with a reimagining/revising of the cultural norms that govern each institution and shape how members behave and think.

As collaboration and mutuality are documented to be challenging for discrete school–university partnerships within countries to achieve, collaboration across national boundaries may offer the possibility of transcending the "knowns" and trials of local implementation by affording a wider view of the taken-for-granted and igniting new perspectives for enduring problems. Making the familiar strange could begin with an international conference or retreat focused on school–university partnerships to support conversations, professional exchange, and joint problem-solving. We know context matters, but as the world shrinks and we are all drawn closer, it is obvious that locations may differ but the questions are remarkably in sync. Educators globally are wrestling with the same concerns around achieving equity and justice for so many vulnerable children, and around building, nourishing, and keeping their teaching force. Surely we have much to learn from and share with one another; "the reflective mirror presented by other people, practices, ideas, norms and realities can cause us to re-examine what we thought we knew" (Goodwin, 2020, p. 14). And, one *gift* of the COVID-19 pandemic is the ubiquitous use of digital technology to facilitate communication and collaboration across distance. This is not to ignore the lack of infrastructure and digital devices in many parts of the world, but to take advantage of systems and supports that are in place to support easy and economical dialogue, and begin the process of cross-world talk.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A second possibility lies in collaborative research. Our review indicated that research is very much a valued activity and that there are many inquiries pointed in the same direction – and coming to similar conclusions. How might these separate lines of research be joined together such that isolated findings associated with a common question can be connected to produce more robust and trustworthy results? Finding articles to review for this chapter was not easy, especially work on partnerships outside the US, Australia, and the UK. Perhaps there should be an international clearing house for work on this specific topic – not just empirical, but conceptual and descriptive as well, a repository for collective wisdom so that we can learn from the work of others and build on what is already known. Finally, there is a need for mentoring – across the professional continuum of educators whether school- or university-based. How might mature school–university partnerships support those that are struggling or nascent? How might research mentoring be provided by established research universities to those who are coming up and developing their research expertise – new faculty, teacher researchers, post-graduate students, teacher candidates, and so on?

These are thoughts that might move school–university partnerships to add a global dimension that can enrich, but not replace, what we know and do. We are living in the midst of an era of globalization, the forces of which both threaten human existence and offer great promise for growth and learning (Asia Society, 2018; Aydarova & Marquardt, 2016; Goodwin, 2020). Consequently, there are many calls for global competency among students and teachers (Goodwin, 2020; OECD, 2019; Wang et al., 2011; Zhao, 2010). As teacher educators, we cannot urge our students and teacher candidates to embrace a global mindset if we remain unwilling to take the first step.

References

Al Seyabi, F. (2017). Students' and teachers' views on school–university partnership in the Omani EFL context. *International Education Studies*, *10*(3), 125–133.

Anderson, L. M., & Stillman, J. A. (2013). Student teaching's contribution to preservice teacher development: A review of research focused on the preparation of teachers for urban and high-needs contexts. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(1), 3–69.

Antony, J. S., & Nicola, T. (2020). The tricky terrain of global university partnerships. In A. Al-Youbi, A. Zahed, & W. Tierney (Eds.), *Successful global collaboration in high education institutions*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1070/978-3-030-25525-18.

Asia Society & OECD (2018). *Teaching for global competence in a rapidly changing world*. OECD. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264289024-en.

Aydarova, E., & Marquardt, S. K. (2016). The global imperative for teacher education: Opportunities for comparative and international education. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, *3*(1), 23–41.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009285841.063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bach, A. (2019). School adoption by school–university partnerships: An example from Germany. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *45*(3), 306–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1599510.

Betlem, E., Clary, D., & Jones, M. (2019). Mentoring the Mentor: Professional development through a school–university partnership. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *47*(4), 327–346.

Bevins, S., & Price, G. (2014). Collaboration between academics and teachers: a complex relationship. *Educational Action Research*, *22*(2), 270–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2013.869181.

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

Birkeland, A., & Li, M. (2019). Building a sustainable future through international ECE partnership programmes. *ECNU Review of Education*, *2*(4), 458–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531119893480.

Burns, K., Conway, R., Edwards, A., & Harris, E. (2021). The role of school-based research champions in a school–university partnership. *British Educational Research Journal*, *47*(3), 616–633.

Burton, S. L., & Greher, G. R. (2007). School–university partnerships: What do we know and why do they matter? *Arts Education Policy Review*, *109*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.3200/AEPR.109.1.13–24.

Chan, C. (2015). Tensions and complexities in school–university collaboration. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, *35*(1), 111–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2014.906386.

Chisari, L. B., Bakker, A., & Akkerman, S. F. (2023). Seeing and seeking relevance in the challenges of a STEM school–university partnership. *International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement*, *13*(2), 99–115.

Crooks, V., London, L., & Snelson, H. (2021). "Singing from the same hymn-sheet": Exploring school-based mentors' perceptions of the role of HEI subject tutors in ITE partnerships partnerships. *Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal*, *13*(1), 3–16.

Espinoza, D., Saunders, R., Kini, T., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). *Taking the long view: state efforts to solve teacher shortages by strengthening the profession*. Learning Policy Institute.

Fadzil, H. M., Saat, R. M., Awang, K., & Adli, D. S. H. (2019). Students' perception of learning STEM-related subjects through scientist-teacher-student partnership (STSP). *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, *18*(4), 537–548.

Farrell, R. (2021). The school–university nexus and degrees of partnership in initial teacher education. *Irish Educational Studies*, *42*(1), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2021.1899031.

Goodwin, A. L. (2020). Globalization, global mindsets and teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, *42*(1), 6–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1700848.

Gravett, S., Petersen, N, & Ramsaroop, S. (2019). A university and school working in partnership to develop professional practice knowledge for teaching. *Frontiers in Education*, *3*, Article 118. www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.

Guerrero-Hernández, G. R., & Fernández-Ugalde, R. A. (2020). Teachers as researchers: Reflecting on the challenges of research–practice partnerships between school and university in Chile. *London Review of Education*, *18*(3), 423–438. https://doi.org/10.14324/LRE.18.3.07.

Guler-Yildiz, T., & Erturk-Kara, H. G. (2016). Pre-school teachers' opinions about professional development applications and teaching partnership. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, *2*(2), 494–508.

Hamilton, M., O'Dwyer, A., Leavy, A., Hourigan, M., Carroll, C., & Corry, E. (2021). A case study exploring primary teachers' experiences of a STEM education school–university partnership. *Teachers and Teaching*, *27*(1–4), 17–31, https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1920906.

Handscomb, G., Gu, Q., & Varley. M. (2014, May). *School–university partnerships: Fulfilling the potential*. Research Councils UK. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10065168/1/Handscomb_et_al_2014_schools_university_partnerships_literature_review_final.pdf

Harfitt, G. J., & Chow, M-L. J. (2018). Transforming traditional models of initial teacher education through a mandatory experiential learning programme. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *73*, *120–129*.

Helms, R. M. (2015). *International higher education partnerships: A global review of standards and practices*. American Council on Education. www.acenet.edu/Documents/CIGE-Insights-Intl-Higher-Ed-Partnerships.pdf.

Holmes Group (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers*. Author.

Hughes, R. (1982, January). Student teaching: The past as a window to the future. In Griffin, G. A., & Edwards, S. (Eds.), *Student teaching: Problems and promising practices* (pp. 3–24). Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hunt, C. S. (2014). A review of school–university partnerships for successful new teacher induction. *School–University Partnerships*, *7*(1), 35–48.

Imig, D. G., & Imig, S. R. (2008). From traditional certification to competitive certification: A twenty-five year retrospective. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.; pp. 886–907). Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Jackson, A., & Burch, J. (2019). New directions for teacher education: Investigating school/university partnership in an increasingly school–based context. *Professional Development in Education*, *45*, 138–150.

Jiang, B., Lim, W., DeVilla, R. A., & DelaCruz, S. (2019). Effects of international student teaching on U.S. classrooms practice: Understanding instructional transfer, adaptation and integration. *Educational Planning*, *26*(3), 39–59.

Kabilan, M. K. (2013). A phenomenological study of an international teaching practicum: Pre-service teachers' experiences of professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *36*, 198–209.

Kosnik, C., Beck, C., & Goodwin, A. L. (2016). Reform efforts in teacher education. In J. Loughran & M. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *The international handbook of teacher education* (Vol. 1; pp. 267–308). Springer.

Loughran, J. J., & Hamilton, M. L. (2016). Developing an understanding of teacher education. In J. Loughran and M. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *The international handbook of teacher education* (pp. 3–22). Springer.

Marx, H., & Moss, D. M. (2011). Please mind the culture gap: Intercultural development during a teacher education study abroad program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(1), 35–47.

Maskit, D., & Orland-Barak, L. (2015). University–school partnerships: Student teachers' evaluations across nine partnerships in Israel. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *41*(3), 285–306.

Midthassel, U. V. (2017). University-school partnerships as arrangements in policy implementation. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, *2*(3), 134–145. https://doi-org.tc.idm.oclc.org/10.1108/JPCC-06-2017-0014.

Mincu, M. (2013). Teacher quality and school improvement: what is the role of research? *Oxford Review of Education*, *41*(2), 253–269.

Nasri, N. M., Nasri, N., & Talib, M. A. A. (2023). An extended model of school–university partnership for professional development: Bridging universities' theoretical knowledge and teachers' practical knowledge. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *49*(2), 266–279. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2022.2061338.

Nath, J. L., Guadarrama, I. N., & Ramsey, J. (2011). *Investigating university-school partnerships*. Information Age Pub.

Neapolitan, J. (Ed.) (2011). Taking stock of professional development schools: What's needed now. *National Society for the Study of Education*, *110*(2), 486–510.

OECD (2022). *Education at a glance 2022, OECD indicator*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en.

OECD (2019). *PISA 2018 assessment and analytical framework*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/b25efab8-en.

Parr, G., & Chan, J. (2015). Identity work in a dialogic international teaching practicum. *Teaching Education*, *26*(1), 38–54.

Passy, R., Georgeson, J., & Gompertz, B. (2018). Building learning partnerships between schools and universities: an example from south-west England. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *44*(5), 539–555. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1516346.

Quezada, R. L., & Alfaro, C. (2007). Biliteracy teachers' self-reflections of their accounts while student teaching abroad: Speaking from "the other side." *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *34*(1), 95–113.

Rahimi, M., Zhang, L. J., & Esfahani, N. N. (2016). Advocating school–university partnership for responsive teacher education and classroom-based curricula: Evidence from teachers' cognitions about principles of curriculum design and their own roles. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *41*(12), 83–96.

Robinson, W. 2006. Teacher training in England and Wales: Past, present and future perspectives. *Education Research and Perspectives*, *33*(2), 19–36.

Roegman, R., Goodwin, A. L., Reagan, E. M., Vernikoff, L., Ahn, J., & Hoang, A. P. (2023). Advancing racial equity in extended clinical practice. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, *57*(2), 139–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2022.2158395.

Sewell, A., Cody, T-L., Weir K., & Hansen, S. (2018). Innovations at the boundary: An exploratory case study of a New Zealand school–university partnership in initial teacher education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *46*(4), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2017.1402294.

Tambyah, M. (2019). Intercultural understanding through a "similar but different" international teaching practicum. *Teaching Education*, *30*(1), 105–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2018.1453795.

Teitel, L. (2004). Two decades of professional development school development in the United States: What have we learned? where do we go from here? *Journal of In-service Education*, *30*(3), 401–416.

Thant Sin, K. K. (2022). School–university partnership: Perceptions and experiences of school teachers and student teachers on current collaboration in teacher education in Myanmar. *Journal of Adult Learning, Knowledge and Innovation*, *4*(2), 62–75.

Toe, D. M., Ure, C., & Blake, D. (2020). Final year preservice teachers' views of professional experience in partnership schools. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*(2), 104–127.

Trilokekar, R. D., & Kukar, P. (2011). Disorienting experiences during study abroad: Reflections of pre-service teacher candidates. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(7), 1141–1150.

Virtue, D. C. (2022). Exploring experiential learning processes in the context of an international school–university partnership. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20485.

Walsh, M. E., & Backe, S. (2013) School–university partnerships: Reflections and opportunities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *88*(5), 594–607. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.835158.

Wang, J., Lin, E., Spalding, E., Odell, S. J., & Klecka, C. L. (2011). Understanding teacher education in an era of globalization. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *62*(2), 115–120.

White, E., Timmermans, M., & Dickerson, C. (2022). Learning from professional challenges identified by school and institute-based teacher educators within the context of school–university partnership. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *45*(2), 282–298.

Young, A. M., O'Neill, A., & Simmie, G. M. (2015). Partnership in learning between university and school: Evidence from a researcher-in-residence. *Irish Educational Studies* *34*(1), 25–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2014.1001203.

Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *63*(5), 376–382.

Zhao, Y. (2010). Preparing globally competent teachers: A new imperative for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *61*(5), 422–431.