What We Know Now

Urban Teacher Residency Models, Teacher Shortages, and Equity

Katherine Herman
California State University, Bakersfield

Abstract

The teacher shortage currently plaguing the United States is exacerbated in the urban context. One particular model being adopted in urban school districts to address the teacher shortage and issues of educational equity is the urban teacher residency (UTR) model. The UTR model employs a collaboration between institutions of higher education (IHEs) and local education agencies (LEAs) to recruit, train, and retain high-quality teachers in high-needs urban schools. This synthesis of the literature highlights themes regarding known best practices in teacher residencies, particularly in the urban context, and also aims to highlight the UTR as a context-specific way to train new teachers. I discuss the implications of cultural mismatching between teachers and their students, and highlight components and critiques of the UTR model. Finally, I discuss the implications of these best practices for policy, practice, and future research.

Keywords: urban teacher residency, UTR, urban education, teacher preparation

---

Katherine Herman is a doctoral candidate in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership and a lecturer in Advanced Educational Studies in the School of Social Sciences and Education at California State University, Bakersfield. Email address: kherman3@csub.edu

© 2023 by Caddo Gap Press

Introduction

Pervasive teacher shortages across the United States are causing school districts to adopt substandard hiring practices to fill a rapidly increasing number of vacant positions (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016; Carver-Thomas & Darling-Hammond, 2017). In 2017, as many as 75% of school districts reported a shortage of qualified teachers, and these shortages tend to greatly impact school districts that serve higher concentrations of students from low-socioeconomic backgrounds and other historically marginalized communities such as English learners and students in special education (Carver-Thomas et al., 2020; Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). The schools most impacted by these shortages are often found in urban locales across the United States. One example of this disparity was in 2017-2018: that year, approximately 15% of California school districts that were not classified as low-income did not need to hire teachers on any substandard credentials, yet another 15% of districts serving primarily low-income families (with at least 72% of the student population being classified as low-income) needed to hire more than half of their new teachers on substandard credentials (Carver-Thomas et al., 2020). This shortage has clear, negative impacts on students in these areas such as decreased access to inclusive educational practices like Response to Intervention (RTI) or Multi-Tiered Support Systems (MTSS), and lack of access to teachers who have robust pedagogical knowledge (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). This shortage causes students to achieve at significantly lower levels, graduate at lower rates, have fewer employment opportunties, and have decreased lifelong earnings (Darling-Hammond et al., 2016). Teacher turnover is higher in these areas as well; teachers leave the profession for many reasons, including a lack of rigorous preparation, lack of meaningful mentoring, low salaries, and poor teaching conditions such as lack of administrative support, little access to resources, and lack of input into decision-making (Darling-Hammond et al., 2018; Carothers et al., 2019).

Perpetuating some of the aforementioned issues, teachers of Color leave the profession 24% more often than White teachers (Carothers et al., 2019). According to Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017), urban areas—particularly in the southern region of the United States—tended to have higher turnover rates than any other area of the country. In their analysis of two consecutive years of the nationally representative Schools and Staffing Survey, Carver-Thomas and Darling-Hammond (2017) found that turnover was much higher in Title I schools serving higher concentrations of low-income students (50%

higher than non Title I schools), schools with the highest concentration of students of Color (70% higher than schools with less diverse populations). In addition, teachers of Color had higher turnover rates overall (19%) than White teachers (15%). While there are many potential issues affecting the turnover, the present work explores how the Urban Teacher Residency (UTR) model can effectively prepare teachers to serve in urban school districts across the United States.

One model being adopted in urban districts across the country to recruit, prepare, and retain pre-service teachers in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs) across the United States is called the Urban Teacher Residency (UTR). A UTR is a collaborative model between IHEs and local education agencies (LEAs) in which the teacher preparation curriculum and practicum experience prepare teachers not only in best practices of pedagogy, but also in context-specific background and practices in hopes to retain them in those particular urban areas for longer periods of time (Hammerness et al., 2016; Ricci et al., 2019). In a UTR, future teachers learn as residents, practicing the instructional methods and pedagogies they learn in their coursework with a mentor teacher in front of students for several days per week for an entire school year (Berry et al., 2008; Boggess, 2008; Soloman, 2009). Residents begin the school year as an employee of the district, and are paired with skilled mentor teacher alongside whom they work for three-to-four days per week, gradually taking on more teaching responsibilities as the school year progresses. They spend the duration of an entire school year placed with one or two mentors in a clinical practice scenario until the last day of school. Residents work within one specific school district or school, receive a stipend, and take classes as a cohort (Hammerness et al., 2016; Soloman, 2009). Residents typically start at least one week before the school year begins to receive district training as an active participant in the preparation for a new school year, and they work closely with mentor teachers full-time on their clinical practice days (Soloman, 2009). Residents and mentors are closely supervised by affiliated staff and faculty employed by the residency and receive ongoing school-based supports.

The course sequence in most UTRs is designed in an effort to prepare teachers to teach in an urban setting as well link theory and practice in real time (Hammerness et al., 2016). Coursework at the university-level links the content from courses found in traditional teacher preparation – such as content-specific methodology and pedagogy, behavior and classroom management, and standards-based lesson planning – and link content with the four specific contexts of the residency: the classroom and school context, neighborhood context, school district

context, and the federal and state context, all of which have influences on how students and teachers work (Hammerness & Craig, 2016). Upon successful completion of the residency, residents are the first to be hired to fill open positions for the following school year.

Urban school districts who have previously implemented UTRs have indicated more success in recruiting and retaining talented candidates (Podolsky & Sutcher, 2016). Additional studies have found that UTRs address longstanding educational equity issues as well (Hammerness et al., 2016; Ricci et al., 2019). When residents are prepared in the context of an urban school district, they have been found to be better prepared to provide in-class solutions to learning barriers. For example, they are less likely to misidentify children of Color, students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and students for which English is not their first language as requiring special education services or as exhibiting problem behaviors in the classroom (Berry et al., 2008; Chou & Tozer, 2008; Hammerness & Craig, 2016; Hammerness et al., 2016; Klein et al., 2013; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Ricci et al., 2019).

The purpose of this synthesis of the literature is to highlight themes regarding known best practices in teacher residencies in the urban context. I also aim to highlight the UTR as a context-specific way to train new teachers, discussing the implications of cultural mismatching between teachers and their students and highlighting components and critiques of the UTR model. I conclude with a discussion about the implications of these best practices for policy, practice, and future research.

Methodology

This study follows a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology, using more qualitative analysis methods than a meta-analysis employs. The SLR defines inclusion criteria before the onset of any data collection and analysis, utilizes multiple databases and gray literature, and focuses on a specific question or topic; in this case the known best practices of the UTR model (Gough et al., 2012). The inclusion criteria identified for this study are:

1. Study pertains to teacher residencies found in urban, metropolitan areas and is available via the California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) database system, studies with open access utilizing Google Scholar, and gray literature. One study used was requested directly through the author when access was not open or available through my university's database system.

2. Study highlights the recruitment or retention efforts as it relates to the diversity of the workforce, the mismatch of student and teacher

demographics, and the teacher shortage in the urban setting of one or more UTRs.

3. Study highlights an outcome or outcomes related to equity as they relate to diversification of the teacher workforce or servicing students from low socioeconomic, culturally diverse, or special education backgrounds.

4. Study is empirical in nature, utilizing a quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods research approach.

Any studies located that did not focus on teacher residencies in a specific urban context (e.g., studies that focused on rural residencies or traditional teacher preparation programs) and studies that did not identify any outcomes related to equitable practices, diversification of the workforce, recruitment of teachers, or retention were excluded from the present analysis.

To conduct the present study, I first utilized the CSUB OneSearch database system and Google Scholar searching for the terms "urban teacher residency" and "teacher residency." In addition, I looked for gray literature using Google Scholar and Google search to identify state or policy reports pertaining to teacher residencies found in urban locales. After identifying several salient articles, I narrowed the search to residencies that are located in locales that meet the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of urban or metropolitan areas, even if they did not include the word urban in the name, as well as residencies that included a form of UTR in the residency named. From these identified articles, I conducted a forward search for articles citing these identified articles, focusing on the areas of equity, teacher preparation, and teacher shortages in the UTR context. In total, this review includes 13 qualitative and three quantitative peer-reviewed articles, nine pieces of gray literature, and three publicly-available data sets.

Once I identified the articles, I utilized a thematic analysis approach similar to Braun and Clarke's (2013) reflexive thematic analysis. I first read the articles to familiarize myself with the data and interpretation of the topic, then re-read articles searching for and identifying themes surrounding equity, diversification of the workforce, the teacher shortage, historic inequities in urban school districts, and curricula. Finally, I organized this synthesis targeting four main themes: the curriculum of the UTR as a context-specific training, the challenges of racial and ethnic demographic mismatches in the urban setting, components of UTRs, and critiques of the UTR model. From those themes, I postulated some potential implications for future policy, practice, and future research.

Urban Teacher Residencies as Context-Specific Training

Urban classrooms are by definition found in urban locales, so it is important to first acknowledge the conflict with the term "urban" itself because of hidden and explicit biases that exist and affect the way future teachers, particularly White teachers, perceive urban classrooms. The term *urban* has historically been used as a "code for cultural conflict that is grounded in racism and economic oppression" (Chou & Touzer, 2008, p.1). In dominant American culture, "urban" tends to be used as a shorthand for high-population-density metropolitan areas, which often have more diverse demographics than lower-population-density regions. The U.S. Census Bureau (2022) defines an urban area as a "densely developed territory… defined using measures based on population counts and residential population density," and the National Center for Education Statistics (2022) defines large cities as "territory inside an urbanized area with a population greater than 250,000". This history is important to note in the conversation about UTRs because of the implications of the mismatch between student and teacher demographics, particularly in urban school settings. Studies have found that White teachers subconsciously tend to perceive students of Color unfavorably, leading to inequitable practices in schools such as higher rates of suspension and expulsion of students of Color, increased referrals to special education for students of Color, and the adoption of more exclusive practices for these students once they are placed in a special education setting (Bates & Glick, 2013; Boveda et al., 2019; Cormier, 2022; Egalite et al., 2015; Gershenson et al., 2021; Voulgarides et al., 2017).

Kavita and Hammerness (2014) claimed that generic teacher education does not adequately prepare teachers for the urban context. Hammerness and Craig (2016) developed a framework highlighting the four contextual aspects that matter the most in urban teacher preparation. They posit that teacher preparation programs in urban areas should include instruction and exposure to (a) the federal and state context, referring to relevant policies and legislation, political, geographical, and historical factors influencing the immediate community; (b) the school district context, or the district-specific regulations, mandates, and history; (c) the neighborhood and community context, referring to the history, demographics, and culture of the surrounding communities; and (d) the school and classroom context, referring to the particular teachers and students found in the classroom or school community (Hammerness & Craig; 2016).

Traditional teacher preparation programs prepare candidates to work in generic settings that may not be representative of all settings

and because of this, they tend to struggle to bridge the gap between theory and practice in urban settings that have needs different from those introduced in traditional teacher preparation programs (Haberman, 1996). The UTR model works to address this gap by viewing all affiliated faculty and staff, including course instructors, mentors, site directors, and program staff, as teacher educators working together toward a common vision of effective teaching (Soloman, 2009). Adding to the difficulties of moving from theory to practice, urban communities are known to have perceptions of education that are in direct conflict with mainstream assumptions and attitudes about schooling, further increasing the need for a change in pedagogical design to prepare teachers to serve in this setting (Kavita & Hammerness, 2014; Cormier, 2022). Soloman (2009) notes that the UTR has a "responsibility to not only promote diverse viewpopints and perspectives to residents, but also to provide mechanisms for the resident to make sense of the viewpoints held by the many teacher educators he or she encounters" (p. 482). UTRs are designed to pair coursework and professional preparation, embedding extensive clinical practice for an entire school year (Berry et al., 2008; Solomon, 2009) and provide teacher candidates with a minimum of one-year, guided clinical practice and contextual training in the urban context. Guided clinical practice occurs with a trained mentor teacher inside the specific context of the urban setting where they will likely be employed, leading to increased recruitment and retention of teachers of Color in urban, high-needs schools (Solomon, 2009).

Challenges of Racial and Ethnic Demographic Mismatch

A crucial factor impacting urban areas is the mismatch of teacher and student racial and ethnic demographics in the United States; in short, students tend not to have teachers that look like them (Cormier, 2022; Egalite et al., 2015; Gershenson et al., 2021; Hines et al., 2021). The racial and ethnic diversity represented in school teachers and administrators does not match the diversity found among student populations and some first-year teachers report that they do not feel prepared to work with diverse student populations in urban schools (Carothers et al., 2019; Leavell, 2009). According to the California Department of Education (2022), only 21.7% of students in California public schools identified as White, whereas 61.2% of teachers identified as White, (see Table 1). Additionally, 55.3% of students identified as Hispanic or Latino and 5.2% identified as Black or African American, while only 21.2% and 3.9% of teachers, respectively, identified as such.

When teachers come from different racial and ethnic backgrounds

than their students, they tend to perceive students of Color unfavorably in the classroom, leading to increased referrals for unwanted behavior, decreased expectations for educational achievement, and a disproportionate representation of Black and Brown students in special education (Bates & Glick, 2013; Boveda et al., 2019; Egalite et al., 2015; Gershenson et al., 2021). This has the potential to have significant impacts on students of Color for several reasons, one of which being that student self-efficacy for learning is impacted directly by the way teachers interact with them (Gershenson et al., 2021). Teacher biases towards students of Color have been found to directly affect a student's level of academic achievement through their grading practices, by imparting their biased expectations into their classroom culture and affecting student self-efficacy, and lead to an ultimate underinvestment in a student's education, particularly in communities with fewer college graduates (Burgess & Greaves, 2013; Cornwell et al., 2013; Dee, 2015; Gershenson et al., 2021; Hanna & Linden, 2012; Lavy, 2008; Mechtenberg, 2009). Gershenson et al. (2021) also indicated that "teachers' stigmatization of information-poor racial minority students could create a feedback loop that functions like a self-fulfilling prophecy" (p. 211) and "teachers who stigmatize certain types of students may modify how they teach, evaluate, and advise them, again leading to poor educational outcomes for stigmatized students." (p. 212). When testing for systematic bias in White teacher expectations of their students of Color, Gershenson et al. (2021) found that hidden biases do underlie lower expectations for Black and Latino students. Partelow et

Table 1
Ethnic Distribution of Public School Teachers and Students in California

Ethnicity	*Percentage of Students*	*Percentage of Teachers*
African American, not Hispanic	5.2	3.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.5	0.5
Asian	9.5	5.8
Filipino	2.4	1.5
Hispanic or Latino	55.3	21.1
Pacific Islander	0.4	0.3
White, Not Hispanic	21.7	61.2
Two or more Races, Not Hispanic	4.1	0.9
None Reported	0.9	4.6

Note: These data were compiled from California Department of Education (2022) Ethnic Distribution of Public School Students: 2020-2021 data set and California Department of Education (2022) Ethnic Distribution of Public School Teachers: 2018-2019.

al. (2014), however, found that teachers of Color had more positive perceptions of the academic and behavioral performances of their students of Color, which higlights differences in how students of Color are perceived differently by White teachers and teachers of Color. This issue is exacerbated because teachers of Color leave the teaching profession at higher rates than White teachers, (Ingersoll, 2005).

In their review of the literature, Voulgarides et al. (2017) found several documented instances of the overrepresentation of Black and Brown students in special education. Additionally, several recent studies suggest that the cultural differences between teachers and students from differing ethnic groups are to blame for an overrepresentation of Black and Brown children identified for special education services (Cormier, 2022; Hines et al., 2021; Miles, 2016). One of the identified aims of the UTR model is to address educational inequities, such as those aforementioned, by diversifying the workforce.

Components of an Effective UTR

UTRs integrate teacher preparation coursework with intensive, full-year clinical practice with a trained mentor. This type of residency program is distinguished from traditional preparation programs because residents are grouped into cohorts, which allows for the formation of collaborative learning communities, and their clinical practice is more expansive and immersive, allowing for teacher residents get to experience the beginning and end of the school year and build relationships within the school community over the course of the year (Hammerness et al., 2016). Strong UTRs have ongoing collaboration between the IHE and LEAs to train teachers, closely aligning the coursework preparation with the strengths and needs of the schools and school districts in which they will serve as future educators (Boggess, 2010; Solomon, 2009). Berry et al. (2008) identified seven main components of an effective UTR: they (a) weave education theory and classroom practice together; (b) focus on the resident learning from an experienced mentor teacher; (c) organize teacher candidates into cohorts; (d) build effective partnerships between community organizations, LEAs, and IHEs; (e) serve the immediate community and school needs; (f) continue to support residents after they are hired; and (g) establish additional opportunities for the professional growth of veteran teachers.

Several authors have written about emergent findings from their investigations of UTRs. Hammerness et al. (2016) noted that teacher candidates who participated in a UTR saw their students as *individuals*, instead of generalizing students based on race or background, and

were able to provide individualized support for students. Residents in Hammerness et al. (2016)'s study also had exposure to contextual training when they learned about the developmental and historical contexts of the city and felt prepared to balance the federal and state context of their UTR, while simultaneously recognizing its impermanence. UTRs have shown promise in retaining graduates in the teaching profession as well. Hammerness et al. (2016) found that the first cohort of the New York City UTR retained 24 of 31 graduates in full-time teaching positions and the second retained 22 of 37 graduates over two years. DiNapoli (2022) found that 80% of teachers who completed their preparation in the San Francisco Teacher Residency Program remained in the district 5 years later, compared to only 38% retained in other teacher preparation programs. Importantly, when teacher candidates are engaged in UTRs, they have been found to be less likely to misidentify children of Color, low socioeconomic status, and students for whom English is not their first language as needing special education services and are more prepared to provide in-class solutions to learning barriers (Pugach et al., 2020).

Critiques of UTRs

The scholarship surrounding UTRs remains general, however, some notable critiques exist. Because of the context-specific nature of the training in UTRs, some critics question whether programs such as this may limit a teacher's ability to work across different contexts (Berry et al., 2008). Additionally, a challenge noted by Hammerness and Craig (2016) is the increasing options for public education alternatives in urban areas, such as charter schools and districts. These types of programs often have their own approaches to education but serve the same context as the public schools, so critics indicate a challenge in preparing teacher candidates for all of the educational programs that teachers may encounter in their specific urban context. Increasing the contextual preparation for teacher candidates implies that mentors, program faculty, and program leadership have a robust understanding of the four contexts as well and intend to integrate these contextual discussions into their curricula. Finally, and most notably, a potential barrier to completely understanding the impact of the UTR model is the implicit bias that may exist simply by coining a residency program as an *urban* residency program because of the racist and oppressive undertones of that word (Chou & Touzer, 2008).

Implications for Future Policy, Practice, and Research

Self- Study of Educational Context

First and foremost, in the planning and development process of a UTR, LEAs and IHEs should conduct a self-study to identify and evaluate areas of need and communicate those with core instructional faculty to develop strong, relevant goals before implementing a residency. They should consider the demographics of their student populations and their teacher population to identify racial and ethnic populations that are underrepresented in their teaching staff and faculty. They should consider adopting a "grow your own" philosophy, providing incentives to recruit teacher candidates from within the district and community. Candidates such as paraprofessionals, aides, and teaching assistants who already work within the district already have some contextual knowledge and/or training and should be viewed as an asset to the program. Likewise, parents or other community members that have a strong motivation to be involved in the teaching should be considered as potential recruits for participation in residencies. Additionally, in the development process, IHEs should evaluate their existing teacher preparation curricula to uncover any areas of implicit bias and to ensure the needs of the LEA are addressed.

Evaluate the Cultural Relevance of the Curriculum

Once program goals based on the LEA's needs have been established, program leadership should collaborate to ensure the curriculum includes training relevant to all four contexts outlined by Hammerness and Craig (2016): (a) the federal and state context; (b) the school district context; (c) the neighborhood and community context; and (d) the school and classroom context. Discussion surrounding federal and state educational policies should occur in the university-level preparatory coursework, as it typically already is. However, UTRs can specifically support teacher candidates in understanding the implications of these policies at the district- and school-level by including professional development and discourse about the meaning and specific execution of the implementation of such policies their particular setting. This may include, for example, a discussion about student-to-teacher ratios, free and reduced lunch policies and rates, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), or state standardized assessments and school- and district- level assessment data, among others. The process of contextual training regarding the surrounding neighborhood and community context requires extensive historical and cultural knowl-

edge. UTRs should consider integrating community representatives to be guest speakers or consultants for the program. Community representatives may include leaders from the local YMCA, spiritual leaders, community organizers, local politicians, behavioral service providers, and any other available community representatives. School and classroom contextual training should not only be offered to teacher residents by their university faculty, but also from their mentor teachers and any other district affiliates of the residency. University faculty should collaborate with mentor teachers and district affiliates during the planning of their courses to include relevant discussions surrounding school and district policy. For example, many schools have school- or district-wide Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) programs with unique implementations. This type of contextual training can include both theoretical instruction from university faculty and practical instruction and actual implementation guidelines from mentor teachers and district and community leaders.

Use Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in Teacher Preparation

To address racial and ethnic inequities and hidden biases, culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) should be central to the curriculum development and training of teacher candidates. Training future teachers in CRP is one potential way to address inequities and increase longevity in the profession; the use of CRP has been shown to reduce the chance of *othering* students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds and instead considers students' cultural backgrounds in the educational setting (Connor, 2017; Cormier, 2022). In its nature, CRP is not a step-by-step approach, and instead is a framework to guide instructional practices to facilitate meaningful connections for students that go beyond the classroom to a students' own reality outside of the school setting. Ladson-Billings outlined three main criteria defining CRP: "(a) students must experience academic success, (b) students must develop and/or maintain cultural competency, and (c) students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order," (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 160). This approach to instruction bridges the cultural norms and social barriers that influence learning (Gay, 2000). Powell et al. (2016) found that CRP positively impacts the academic achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

In 2005, Siwatu established culturally responsive teaching standards to help guide teachers in developing instruction following the CRP framework. These standards fell into four categories: curriculum

and instruction, classroom management, student assessment, and cultural enrichment (Siwatu, 2005). The curriculum and instruction standard requires teachers to make connections between classroom activities and a students' own cultural identity through the development of culturally relevant materials and activities which are accommodated to maximize achievement. Additionally, the standard requires that instruction addresses the diverse learning styles and cognition represented in the student population being served (Siwatu, 2005). The classroom management standard requires that teachers create a classroom climate that is welcoming to all students' cultural backgrounds by creating a sense of belonging, community, and fosters communication (Siwatu, 2005). The assessment standard requires that any type of assessment related to student learning is differentiated and any analysis of results is evaluated with a lens that acknowledges one's own biases (Siwatu, 2005).

Finally, the cultural enrichment standard requires that teachers promote a student's cultural identity while intentionally fostering a student's success (Siwatu, 2005). The standards of CRP lead well into the inclusion and differentiation required in a special education setting and increases the equity of access and outcomes for students of historically marginalized and often overrepresented groups in special education. Chu (2016) utilized a scale to investigate how special education teachers perceive their own efficacy in utilizing CRP to teach students with disabilities who come from culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) backgrounds. Teachers with high efficacy in CRP were more willing to utilize different teaching strategies, share responsibilities for student achievement, and persevere through challenges, create meaningful and responsive learning environments, believe that all students can learn, hold students to rigorous standards, request professional development to respond to needs, and are more willing to collaborate with colleagues (Ford et al., 2014; Knoblauch & Hoy, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001; Ross & Gray, 2006).

In addition, residents should be trained in the analysis of their own implicit biases. Frameworks such as Milner's (2007) *Race, Culture, and Researcher Positionality: Working Through Dangers Seen, Unseen, and Unforeseen* were developed to guide researchers to process racial and cultural awareness, consciousness, and positionality and could be adapted for teachers and included in the UTR curriculum to support the self-analysis of future teachers regarding any biaseses they may bring to the table. This may allow for more of an in-depth implementation of CRP for future teachers engaged in a UTR. Additionally, there is a great need for further studies to evaluate how the context-specif-

ic training in the UTR model may impact a teacher's self-efficacy for implementing inclusive practices, particularly in urban areas, which would be insightful for understanding how the UTR addresses misidentification for and overrepresentation of Black and Brown students in special education.

Central to all of these recommendations is a strong collaborative relationship and contextual goal-setting within residency leadership between LEAs and IHEs. The contextual needs of a particular district should be used as a roadmap for the development of a strong residency in which teachers enter the profession with a toolkit of knowledge and skills that will help them begin their careers with adequate preparation to handle their classroom context.

Conclusion

This review synthesizes information from the literature base surrounding how the UTR model leverages context-specific training and collaboration between LEAs and IHEs to build a stronger workforce in high-needs urban areas throughout the United States. The UTR model has the potential to impact student achievement by diversityfing the workforce and introducing novice teachers into urban settings that are well-versed in CRP and other best practices to reduce inequities often found in the urban school setting. As described, well-implemented UTRs have the potential to weave practical and contextual experience with traditional theory-based teacher education while focusing on residents learning from experienced mentors in a specific context (Berry et al., 2008). UTRs support both the new teacher workforce and the veteran teacher workforce and have shown promise positively impacting students in high-needs urban areas (Podolsky & Sutcher, 2016). While some critics may argue that the UTR model fails to prepare teachers for non-urban settings, this has not yet been evaluated with significant evidence for further consideration (Berry et al., 2008). For now, the benefits of this model far overstep any potential risks: the literature clearly suggests that new teachers trained in the UTR model are stronger teachers in the inclusive instructional setting because they are more prepared to address learning barriers in the general education classroom and less likely to misidentify historically marginalized students as needing special education (Berry et al., 2008; Chou & Tozer, 2008; Hammerness & Craig, 2016; Hammerness et al., 2016; Klein et al., 2013; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Ricci et al., 2019). The lasting impact of using the UTR model to train teachers to work in high-needs and culturally diverse urban school so far shows serious promise.

References

Bates, L. A., Glick, J. E. (2013). Does it matter if teachers and schools match the students? Racial and ethnic disparities in problem behaviors. *Social Science Research*, *42*(5), 1180-1190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2013.04.005

Berry, B., Montgomery, D., Curtis, R., Hernandez, M., Wurtzel, J., & Snyder, J. (2008). *Urban teacher residencies: A new way to recruit, prepare, and retain effective teachers in high needs districts*. Aspen Institute. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED512419.pdf

Boveda, M., Reyes, G., & Aronson, B. A. (2019). Disciplined to access the general education curriculum: Girls of color, disabilities, and specialized education programming. *Curriculum Inquiry, 4*(4), 405-425. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2019.1652543

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners.* SAGE.

Burgess, S., & Greaves, E. (2013). Test scores, subjective assessment, and stereotyping of ethnic minorities. *Journal of Labor Economics, 31*(3), 535-576. https://doi.org/10.1086/669340

California Department of Education. (2022). *Fingertip Facts on Education in California* [Data Set]. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/ad/ceffingertipfacts.asp

Carothers, D., Hasan, A., & Houdyshell, M. (2019). Teacher shortages and cultural mismatch: District and university collaboration for recruiting. *Journal of Social Studies Education Resarch, 10*(3), 39-63. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1229410.pdf

Carver-Thomas, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teacher turnover: Why it matters and what we can do about it*. Learning Policy Institute. https://doi.org/10.54300/454.278.

Carver-Thomas, D., Kini, T., & Burns, D. (2020). *Sharpening the divide: How California's teacher shortages expand inequality*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/sharp-divide-california-teacher-shortages-report

Chou, V., & Tozer, S. (2008). What's urban got to do with it? Meanings of "urban" in urban teacher preparation and development. In F. P. Peterman (Ed.), *Partnering to prepare urban teachers: A call to activism* (pp. 1-20). Peter Lang Publishing.

Cormier, C. J. (2022). It's not easy being green: Addressing overrepresentation in special education through culturally responsive pedagogy. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2022.2132326

Cornwell, C., Mustard, D. B., & Van Parys, J. (2013). Noncognitive skills and the gender disparities in test scores and teacher assessments: Evidence from primary school. *Journal of Human Resources, 48*(1), 236-264. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23799113

Connor, D. J. (2017). Who is responsible for the racialized practices evident within (special) education and what can be done to change them? *Theory Into Practice*, *56*(3), 226–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1336034

Darling-Hammond, L., Furger, R., Shields, P., & Sutcher, L. (2016). *Addressing California's emerging teacher shortage: An analysis of sources and solutions*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/LPI-Report-AddressingCA_TeacherShortage.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L., Sutcher, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2018). *Teacher shortages in California: Status, sources, and potential solutions*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-shortages-ca-solutions-brief

Dee, T.S. (2015). Social identity and achievement gaps: Evidence from an affirmation intervention. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 8*, 149-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2014.906009

DiNapoli, M. Jr. (2022). *Federal role in tackling teacher shortages*. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/blog/federal-role-tackling-teacher-shortages

Egalite, A. J., Kisida, B., & Winters, M. A., (2015). Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, *45*, 44-52. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.01.007

Ford, B.A., Stuart, D. H., &Vakil, S. (2014). Culturally responsive teaching in the 21st century inclusive classroom. *Journal of the International Association of Special Education, 15*(2), 56-62.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice.* Teachers College Press.

Gershenson, S., Hansen, M., & Lindsay, C. A. (2021). *Teacher diversity and student success: Why racial representation matters in the classroom*. Harvard Education Press.

Gough, D., Oliver, S., Thomas J. (2012) *An introduction to systematic reviews.* SAGE.

Haberman, M. (1996). Selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 747-760). MacMillan Reference Books.

Hammerness, K., & Craig, E. (2016). "Context-specific" teacher preparation for New York City: An exploration of the content of context in Bard College's urban teacher residency program. *Urban Education, 51*(10), 1226-1258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085615618722

Hammerness, K., Williamson, P., & Kosnick, C. (2016). Introduction to the special issue on urban teacher residencies: The trouble with "generic" teacher education. *Urban Education, 51*(10), 1155-1169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915618723

Hanna, R. N. & Linden, L. L. (2012). Discrimination in grading. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 4*(4), 146-168. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23358248

Hines, D. E., Boveda, M., & Lindo, E. J. (Eds.). (2021). *Racism by another name: Black students, overrepresentation, and the carceral state of special education.* Information Age Publishing.

Ingersoll, R., May, H., & Collins, G. (2019). Recruitment, employment, retention and the minority teacher shortage. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 27*(37), 1-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.27.3714

Klein, E. J., Taylor, M., Onore, C., Strom, K., & Abrams, L. (2013). Finding a third space in teacher education: Creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education, 24*, 27-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.711305

Knoblauch, D., & Hoy, A. W. (2008). "Maybe I can teach those kids." The influence of contextual factors on student teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 166-179. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.05.005

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: A.K.A the remix. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 74-84. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice, 34(*3), 159-175. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1476635

Lavy, V. (2008). Do gender stereotypes reduce girls' or boys' human capital outcomes? Evidence from a natural experiment. *Journal of Public Economics, 92*(10), 2083-2105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2008.02.009

Leavell, K. B. (2009). *Cultural mismatch or opportunities for mutual growth*. In P. Dam & Coward, M. (Eds), Understanding the English language learner (pp. 228-242). Denton, TX: Texas Woman's University Press.

Matsko, K. K., & Hammerness, K. (2014). Unpacking the "urban" in urban teacher education: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *65*(2), 128–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487113511645

Mechtenberg, L. (2009) Cheap talk in the classroom: How biased grading at school explains gender differences in achievements, career choices and wages. *The Review of Economic Studies, 76*(4), 1431-1459. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40247647

Miles, A. (2016). Overrepresentation in special education: Does the IDEA violate the equal protection clause? *Rutgers Race & The Law Review, 17*(1), 245–265.

Milner, H. R. (2007). Race, culture, and researcher positionality: Working through dangers seen, unseen, and unforeseen. *Educational Researcher, 36*(7), 388-400. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X07309471

National Center for Education Statistics's Urban-Centric Locale Categories. (2006). *Urban Education in America: Definitions.* https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/urbaned/definitions.asp

Partelow, L., Brown, C., & Johnson, S. (2014). America needs more teachers of color and a more selective teaching profession. https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k12/reports/2017/09/14/437667/america-needs-teachers-color-selective-teachingprofession/

Podolsky, A., & Sutcher, L. (2016). *California teacher shortages: A persistent*

problem. Learning Policy Institute. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/ca-teacher-shortage-persistent-problem-brief

Powell, R., Chambers-Cantrell, S., Malo-Juvera, V., & Correll, P. (2016): Operationalizing culturally responsive instruction: Preliminary findings of CRIOP research. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, *118*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811611800107

Pugach, M., Blanton, L., Mickelson, A., & Boveda, M. (2020). Curriculum theory: The missing perspective in teacher education for inclusion. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 43*(1), 85-103. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406419883665

Ricci, L., Persiani, K., & Williams, A. (2019). From 'training wheels for teaching' to 'cooking in your mother-in-law's kitchen': Highlights and challenges of co-teaching among math, science, and special education teacher candidates and mentors in an urban teacher residency program. *International Journal of Whole Schooling, 15*(2), 24-52.

Ross, J. A, & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 179-199. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09243450600565795

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23,* 1086-1101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.07.011

Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston teacher residency: District based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*(5), 478-488. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109349915

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

U.S. Census Bureau. (2022, October 3). *Urban and rural*. Census.gov. https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/geography/guidance/geo-areas/urban-rural.html

Voulgarides, C. K., Fergus, E., & Thorius, K. A. (2017). Pursuing equity: Disproportionality in special education and the reframing of technical solutions to address systemic inequities. *Review of Research in Education*, *41*, 61–87. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16686947