

## Analyzing Teacher Learning in a Research Practice Partnership

Enisa Selimbegovic Akgul, Alison Castro Superfine  
eakgul2@uic.edu, amcastro@uic.edu  
University of Illinois at Chicago - Learning Sciences Research Institute

**Abstract:** Teachers are increasingly participating in RPPs with the goal of improving their schools and districts. This context provides teachers with unique learning opportunities as they directly take part in district-level instructional improvement work. However, we know little about what teachers learn from their involvement in RPPs. This study explores teacher learning over the course of the first year of a multiyear RPP which involves a group of elementary teachers and a team of researchers from a local university. Findings reveal shifts in three areas: teacher reasoning about relevant problems of practice, teacher contributions, and teacher roles. These findings not only shine a light on the nature of teacher RPP participation, but they also highlight how RPPs can be a context for teacher learning.

### Introduction

Research practice partnerships (RPPs) are long-term collaborations between practitioners and researchers in which the collective engages in school improvement work by investigating persistent problems of practice and solutions (Coburn & Penuel, 2016). RPPs are increasingly utilized for school improvement purposes because they address local problems of practice and enable greater use of research in decision making (Coburn & Penuel, 2016). Despite a growing body of literature related to RPPs, there is still a need for more detailed research, including the need to better understand conditions that foster or inhibit their success (Farrell et al., 2021) and the processes and outcomes of these partnerships (Klar et al., 2018). Increasing our understanding of how teachers participate in and what teachers learn from RPPs, may provide some insight into what helps these reform efforts either succeed or fail. Previous studies have focused on the learning of district leaders (e.g., Rigby et al, 2018), but few previous studies have focused on teacher learning within RPPs.

### Teachers and research practice partnerships

RPPs promote productive relationships between researchers and school district personnel, during which goals are collaboratively determined with the aim of achieving districtwide instructional improvement (Henrick, et al., 2016). Five key features of RPPs have been recently identified (Farrell et al., 2021): (1) they are long-term collaborations, (2) which often disrupt traditional power relationships, (3) whose goal is educational improvement, achieved through (4) the application of research (5) by its members who hold diverse expertise. Since addressing challenging educational issues is generally the goal of RPPs, these partnerships must therefore provide ample time for goals to be achieved. This means that RPPs in their first or second year are in the early stages of the work, and an RPP is only considered mature after 3 or more years (Farrell et al., 2021). While other change initiatives also rely on research, expertise, and shifts in power, the way RPPs leverage such resources is unique. RPPs both produce and promote the use of research in decision making. In terms of expertise, RPPs tap into the diverse knowledge and experiences the various participants bring with them. This commitment to engaging all participants meaningfully in the work of the RPP contributes to shifts in traditional power relationships, such as those between teachers and school administrators.

Given the previously listed features of RPPs, they can be considered as a community of practice. A community of practice is a group that collectively engages in a shared repertoire of routines as the group works towards a common goal (Wenger, 1998). RPPs can be considered a community of practice as they consist of a group of individuals who come together regularly to collectively investigate and solve persistent problems of practice. Previous studies have explored teacher learning as they engage in various types of communities of practice and Levine and Marcus (2010), in particular, found that different teacher collaboration structures provide different opportunities for teacher learning. However, we know little about what learning opportunities for teachers are provided by an RPP structure.

One of the defining characteristics of RPPs is that they require participants to take on roles that are unfamiliar or even oppose traditional norms (Farrell et al., 2019). This is especially true for teachers who often do not have opportunities to be directly involved in district-level instructional improvement efforts as districts' hierarchical leadership structures diminish the likelihood of such teacher participation (Leithwood et al., 2007). Unlike typical classroom-based instructional improvement efforts, RPPs have the potential to directly involve

teachers in the design stages of district-level improvement efforts because they intentionally employ flatter, less hierarchical, structures (Farrell et al., 2019) which encourage distributed leadership (Leithwood et al., 2007).

Given the nontraditional roles that teachers may take on in RPPs focused on districtwide improvement efforts, it raises the question of how teachers engage in and what teachers get out of such an experience. More specifically, what do teachers learn as they participate in RPPs? In this study, we investigate teacher learning in these partnerships by examining teacher reasoning of, contributions to, and roles in RPP work. Our three research questions are: As teachers engage in RPP work, (1) how does their reasoning about improvement work shift over time?, (2) how do teacher contributions shift over time?, and (3) how do the roles teachers take on change over time?

## Previous studies of teacher groups

To better understand the unique context that RPPs can provide for the study of teacher learning, an overview of more typical studies and contexts involving the study of teachers is necessary. Studies of teacher groups have become more popular in recent years (Lefstein et al., 2020) because teacher collaborative groups have been recognized as a potential structure to support school improvement (Horn & Little, 2010). For example, Kazemi and Loeff Franke (2004) examined how math teachers' participation in after-school workgroup meetings shifted over time as teachers came together to discuss students' work samples. Horn (2007) compared the conversations of two different teacher groups as they discussed the problems of practice they encountered in their classrooms. Bannister (2015) provided an empirical example of teacher learning within a community of practice by focusing on teachers' framing of various problems of practice. Although the studies differ in terms of methods and goals, they reveal how the study of teacher groups is typically tied to classroom-based problems of practice. RPPs however, have the potential to provide a context for teachers to engage in work that falls out of the realm of classroom. In this study, we explore teacher learning as teachers participate in conversations about problem identification and solution formulation that will not only impact their own classrooms, but all classrooms across the district.

## Conceptual framework

This study is grounded in a situated theory of learning which identifies learning as shifts in participation within a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this study, we explore how teachers' participation patterns shift over time as they engage in a routine of participating in district-level instructional improvement meetings. Through these regular meetings, a community of practice is formed between the participants.

We define the teachers' participation in this community of practice as their contributions to the collective reflective and planning discussions. More specifically, we conceptualize these contributions as episodes of improvement work reasoning (EIWRs), an adaptation of Horn's (2007) episodes of pedagogical reasoning (EPRs). Horn (2007) defined EPRs as detailed instances of teacher reasoning, focused on issues or questions about teaching practice. Horn used EPRs to identify conversational category systems, or the classification of things through everyday language. By building on Goodwin's (1994, as cited in Horn, 2007) work on category systems, this allowed Horn to identify teacher talk as one resource for professional learning in a teachers' community of practice. Following a similar line of thought, we too recognize teacher talk as a resource for professional learning. This reasoning aligns with Little's (2002) suggestion that all talk should be treated "as evidence of what is known and as a potential resource for learning" (p. 932).

We define EIWRs as episodes in which teachers exhibit reasoning through talk about the purposes, obstacles, and methods of instructional improvement work. This distinction is necessary because we are interested in what teachers learn about instructional improvement work and not teaching practice. Horn's examples of EPRs clearly illustrate how her definition of EPRs is tied to classroom practice: "I am not using that worksheet because it bores the kids," and "I have a handful of kids who are not successful. How is this going to impact our classes next semester?" (Horn, p. 46, 2007). EIWRs, unlike EPRs, focus on issues outside the classroom that are tied to districtwide instructional improvement efforts. For example, when reflecting on interview data, one of the teachers argues that team members having differing definitions of high-quality math tasks is problematic and should be addressed before further work is done: "...if we still have team members... that are still questioning high quality. Like what does it that look like, I think we definitely need to back up and like assess what we want to continue with because we want to make sure everyone's on the same page." By examining EIWRs, like Horn, we hope to explore professional teacher learning in relation to districtwide instructional improvement work.

## Methodology

This study draws on a case study approach (Yin, 2014) and employs an embedded multiple-case study design of four middle school teachers. The data for this study comes from a larger multiyear RPP project, Collaborating

Around Structures, Processes and Instructional Routines (CASPIR), in which a team of researchers from a large Midwestern university collaborates with several local K-8 school districts. The aim of these collaborative efforts is to investigate issues and solutions surrounding math teaching and learning within each district. Each district's RPP team is composed of district administrators, district teachers, university researchers, and university-affiliated math instructional coaches. A subgroup of members from each of these teams meets regularly to plan the work of the respective whole RPP team (see Table 1).

**Table 1**  
*Bay School District Subgroup Members*

Subgroup Team Member	Role
Frankie	Teacher
Kim	Teacher (Joined after 6th subgroup meeting)
Kristina	University-affiliated Math Coach
Leah	University Researcher
Lenny	Teacher
Mary	District Administrator
Nicole	Teacher

Subgroup meetings are the focus of this study because they prompt teachers to join in rich discussions as they engage in meaning making (Horn, 2007) surrounding problem identification and solution formulation. The four teachers on the Bay School District subgroup are the focus of this study. The district's subgroup also includes a district administrator, one university researcher, and one university-affiliated math coach, all of whom participate in the subgroup's discussions (all names are pseudonyms).

## Data sources and analysis

This study utilizes two data sources: video recordings of subgroup meetings and transcripts of subgroup meetings. The subgroup met 15 times over the course of the first academic year of the partnership, for a total of 26 hours. To answer the three research questions, two units of analysis were identified. The two units of analysis allowed us to investigate participation through two different lenses and they also made it possible to analyze the data at two different levels of analysis.

The first unit of analysis is individual EIWRs shared by teachers during subgroup meetings. First, EIWRs were identified in each meeting. Then, EIWRs were coded by topical content so that similar themes can be compared over time (Horn, 2007). We identified six major codes emerging out of the data (Charmaz, 2014): problem identification, norms, individual roles, subgroup role, data, whole group planning, and solution formulation (see Table 2). Some EIWRs fell into only one category, while others fell into multiple. EIWRs can be analyzed individually or collectively. When considered individually, an EIWR allows us to gain an understanding of an individual teacher's reasoning about a specific topic. For example, Table 2 includes an EIWR by Kim about problem identification. From this EIWR, we can see that Kim thinks that looking at the math curriculum is a good starting point for the team as they explore ways to improve the district's math program. When considered collectively, consecutive EIWRs allow us to gain an understanding of multiple teachers' reasoning about the same topic. Since EIWRs allow for the exploration of teacher reasoning and their spoken contributions to collective discussions, this unit of analysis was used to answer the first two research questions (i.e., How does teacher reasoning about improvement work shift over time? and How do teacher contributions shift over time?).

**Table 2**  
*Seven EIWR codes used for data analysis*

Code	Description	Example
Problem Identification	Talk about issues associated with the district's math program.	Kim: "Well, I think, first we want to look at what we're... our curriculum and what we're teaching day to day."
Norms	Talk about group customs and etiquette.	Frankie: "To kind of piggyback on what Nicole was saying. I was thinking honesty, but also being respectful for each other's ideas, and being trusting that we're all educators and we're all working toward what's best for our staff and our students..."

Solution Formulation	Talk related to formulation of solution(s) that will address issues with the district's math program.	Nicole: "...to me it just to have a conversation with somebody makes them feel like they're not in this by themselves, you know, they're in it together, so I would almost like to have that conversation with Owen (non-subgroup teacher), and then I can even ask additional follow up questions..."
Data	Talk about the use of any sort of data, such as student performance data or the feedback from a teacher survey.	Lenny: "...if they read it and digest it and then I think once they look at the tasks that they can then make those connections to the data, along with the tasks."
Whole Group Planning	Talk about whole group meeting agenda and activities.	Nicole: "We don't want them to make a mission statement."
Subgroup Role	Talk about the function or purpose of the subgroup.	Frankie: "I love that idea of us finding tasks already like pre-selecting them and bringing it to everybody, but I feel like we need to do something else before we do that, like we have to get everybody's brain in the zone..."
Individual Role	Talk about one's own role.	See example from the Solution Formulation row.

---

Ellipses indicate the removal of words without altering meaning due to space limitations.

Analyzing EIWRs sheds light on teacher reasoning and spoken contributions but they do not allow for the analysis of teacher roles, thus a second unit of analysis is necessary. To identify changes in teacher roles, the other unit of analysis, which we call major decision events (MDEs), were used and this allowed us to answer the third research question (How do the roles teachers take on change over time?). MDEs are important decisions made about RPP work. By important, we mean decisions that move the work forward but are not administrative decisions, like picking the time for the next meeting. An MDE is bound by the start and end of talk about that specific decision so MDEs are very lengthy. Due to space limitations, only excerpts from MDEs (see Table 5) have been included here. Many decisions were made during each meeting, such as what norms the team should use, or what sort of work should be done during the next whole group meeting to move the district's improvement efforts forward. Since we are interested in teacher roles, we only focused on MDEs that concerned what a specific teacher did or will do. To identify changes in teacher roles, MDEs which included teacher roles were identified in each meeting.

## Findings

Three major findings arise from our analysis. The first finding is that teachers' reasoning about relevant problems of practice shifted over time (see Table 3). In initial meetings, as the subgroup laid the foundation for districtwide instructional improvement work, they discussed problems associated with the district's math program. During this phase, each of the teachers pointed to a different issue they thought contributed to unsatisfactory outcomes of the math program. In the first meeting, Lenny brought up the lack of cross-grade level collaboration opportunities for teachers. During the third meeting, Nicole spoke about low test scores, while Frankie highlighted the lack of math interventionists and coaches. During subsequent meetings, as they continued to engage in discussion surrounding problem identification, all three teachers zeroed in on the fact that the district's teachers lacked a uniform understanding of high-quality math tasks. Thus, as the teachers engaged in RPP work, their reasoning about issues associated with the quality of their math program shifted, becoming more unified and clearly defined.

**Table 3**

*Teacher's reasoning about issues associated with the quality of the district's math program*

Teacher	Early EIWR	Later EIWR
Lenny	<b>Subgroup meeting #1</b>	<b>Subgroup meeting #4</b>

	“... I know that we've talked about before was talking across grade level teams, but then also, fifth grade being able to spend time [with] sixth grade and vice versa, some of those types of things.”	I think that that was the question that was asked in the interview is, what do you think a high-quality task is... Some people [are] like I don't know if I'm right or not... So then, having an opportunity to look at what other people are thinking to refine as a district what we think.”
Nicole	<b>Subgroup meeting #3</b> “...we just feel that there is a problem and we need to address that problem... the staff knows that there's some sort of... we are seeing them [MAP scores] flat line.”	<b>Subgroup meeting #6</b> “...teachers have to have a reason why they're picking, choosing something [a task]. Not just because they feel like it... There has to be a reason.”
Frankie	<b>Subgroup meeting #3</b> “Like what's going on? Why is this not progressing, not changing? Reading has tons of interventionists and coaches... Well, we've brought up a lot of times, well what about math?”	<b>Subgroup meeting #7</b> “...if we still have team members... that are still questioning high quality. Like what does it that look like, I think we definitely need to back up and like assess what we want to continue with because we want to make sure everyone's on the same page.”

Data for Kim is omitted because she did not participate in initial meetings.

We also found that the content of teachers' contributions changed throughout the course of the year. As time passed, teachers increasingly offered central input to the collective conversations. Table 4 includes two examples of teacher contributions that are noncentral. In the example from meeting #1, we see Mary, the administrator, share her thoughts about the vision the subgroup is crafting and then Lenny, one of the teachers, follows up by saying she agrees with Mary. In the second example from meeting #2, Leah, the university researcher, suggests how something the subgroup is working on should be worded and two teachers follow up by saying that they agree with Leah. Examples of central teacher contributions can also be seen in Table 4. In the first example from meeting #11, Nicole, a teacher, suggests that a tricky task should be included when the whole group engages in a task analysis activity because this may spark some good conversation. In the second example from meeting #13, Lenny, a teacher, suggests that it is important to remind teachers that tasks which are not considered to be high-quality are still necessary sometimes. When comparing the two earlier teacher contributions to the two latter contributions, it is easy to recognize the difference between the two. Central contributions are a teacher's input into the collective discussion that reveals the teacher's thinking about how things should be done. Noncentral contributions simply amount to teachers agreeing with the administrator's or researcher's ideas by saying something like “I agree,” “Yeah,” or “True.” Not all teacher contributions in the earlier meetings were noncentral, but there are more instances of such teacher contributions during earlier meetings than there are in later meetings. Likewise, there are fewer examples of central teacher contributions in earlier meetings than there are in later meetings. For example, there are five instances of noncentral teacher contributions in meeting #2, two instances in meeting #6, and zero in meeting #15.

**Table 4**  
*Noncentral versus central teacher contributions*

<i>Noncentral EIWRs</i>	<i>Central EIWRs</i>
<p><b>Subgroup meeting #1</b> Mary: “Yes. And it kind of goes together. The DLT, the BLT, and the vision. It's kind of like a cycle. That's the way I envision it.” Lenny: “<i>Yeah, I agree.</i>”</p>	<p><b>Subgroup meeting #11</b> Nicole: “And keep the ones that are a little tricky. Like even that eighth grade one that looked like a MARS task that everybody's going to jump in, kind of like what we did, jump in, and go ‘Oh, that looks like a MARS task, that should be high quality.’ Well just because it looks like it, it doesn't necessarily mean it is. That would lend itself to that conversation.”</p>
<p><b>Subgroup meeting #2</b> Leah: “So maybe this should say something like rigorous tasks invite multiple strategies?” Nicole: “<i>I agree.</i>”</p>	<p><b>Subgroup meeting #13</b> Lenny: “And one of the things that came up that I think it's important to remember is that just because it's not a high-quality task doesn't mean that it's not still</p>

Lenny: “Yeah.”

necessary. And so, I think that that's something that's important, so people don't think that they shouldn't be teaching, you know, that they're only teaching just these lessons...”

Like teacher contributions, the roles teachers took on also changed, becoming more teacher-directed over time. The MDE excerpts from meetings #1 and #2 (see Table 5), show how the early roles teachers took on were directed by others. During meeting #1, Leah, the university researcher, suggested roles for the teachers to take on by proposing that they introduce an activity during the next whole group meeting. The MDE excerpt from meeting #2 also shows Leah suggesting a role for a teacher. In both of those examples, a decision was made about what teachers should do, but the decision was made by someone other than the teachers themselves. The self-directed examples from meetings #14 and #15 show examples of teachers making decisions about the roles they take. In the MDE excerpt from meeting #14, we see Kim, one of the teachers, share how she made the decision to include something in the notes from a whole group meeting because she wanted one of the teachers to feel heard even though she did not agree with the teacher’s thinking. In the MDE excerpt from meeting #15, Frankie, a teacher, shares how she and Lenny picked some days for their group to meet over the summer so that it would be easier for them to invite other teachers to join their group. From these two examples, it is easy to see that as the year progressed, the teachers began to take on more self-directed roles as they began to increasingly make decisions about the work they do as part of the RPP initiative.

**Table 5**  
*MDE excerpts illustrating teacher roles*

Directed by Others	Self-directed
<p><b>Subgroup meeting #1</b> Leah: “So, I’m wondering if the three of you, Nicole, Frankie, and Mary, <i>if you would introduce this activity to the group</i> next Wednesday, in the way you think it should be. And what I would offer to do, if this is OK with everybody, and Kim can go back and forth a little bit, just to create the instructions on the first slide, send it to you guys to revise it. And if you guys want to, and if it's ok with you, if you could introduce it to your colleagues and kind of shape it the way you think it should be presented, that would be fabulous. As far as I'm concerned, and if you're willing.”</p>	<p><b>Subgroup meeting #14</b> Kim: “Yeah, and then the, the other part was the multiple choice. Selma (non-subgroup teacher) thought that that should be taken out but, I was trying to explain that we kind of wanted to have a start, it was like a pretest posttest. So, we wanted to have a starting point, so we knew where to go. But she was still very uncomfortable with having that multiple choice. She’s like, ‘The teachers are going to want to know,’ but I’m like, ‘That’s the whole point.’ So, we kind of, we’re at a deadlock there. But again, <i>I wanted to give her voice to be heard, so I typed it in the Google doc.</i>”</p>
<p><b>Subgroup meeting #2</b> Nicole: “Yeah, why start from scratch and start researching new images when we have all of these images already.” Leah: “Yeah, <i>you sound like somebody who might want to introduce this activity to your colleagues.</i>”</p>	<p><b>Subgroup meeting #15</b> Frankie: “About that too about trying to reach out and recruit. <i>We had, Lenny and I, had gone through our calendars to pick some weeks that worked for us to try to create a doodle poll, to send out to at least the people who have already committed. And we thought that maybe if we can narrow down some time, then we could approach somebody from K-3 and say these are the three or four dates that we're going to meet. And that might not sound so threatening, like ‘Oh, we're going to meet 10 to 20 hours this summer, can you do it?’ Maybe if we said we're going to meet this day for two hours and this day for three hours, then maybe they'd be willing to commit.</i>”</p>

## Discussion and implications

In this study, we set out to explore teacher learning in the context of an RPP through a situated theory of learning lens, in which learning is defined as shifts in participation within a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The clear changes in the contributions teachers offered during subgroup meetings and the changes in the roles teachers took on suggest that teacher learning did in fact occur during the first year of the partnership. The findings

show that by the end of the first year, teachers made more central contributions during planning meetings and they also began to increasingly take on self-directed roles. Therefore, we can say that the teachers learned how to become productive members of an RPP.

A closer examination of teachers' contributions and roles reveal that the teachers not only engaged in work that is outside their normal daily teaching practice, but we also see that teachers talked about issues not traditionally associated with teachers. Content and pedagogical knowledge are usually associated with teachers (Hill et al., 2018), yet in this study we see teachers engage with ideas that fall outside the realm of those two categories as they took part in districtwide instructional improvement efforts, discussing issues not directly tied to the issues of daily teaching practice. Teachers are not generally responsible for, nor trained in addressing issues at the district level. However, here we see teachers doing exactly that. The RPP context provides teachers an opportunity to engage in nontraditional roles (Farrell et al., 2021) which then creates an opportunity to explore teacher learning in this unique context. Further study of this teacher learning context and how it relates back to what we already know about structures for teacher learning or teacher collaboration is necessary.

Our findings not only offer insight into teacher learning, but they also provide insight into how RPPs function. Addressing major educational problems of practice takes time, thus, one of the things that we know about RPPs is that they are not considered mature partnerships until the third year (Farrell et al., 2021). In our findings, we see one example of the time requirement to do this sort of collaborative work. The teachers did not speak of the same issue, in this case, the lack of a unified understanding of what high-quality math tasks are amongst all district staff, until the seventh meeting. In our study, the subgroup teachers, who participated in planning and steering the work of the whole RPP team, did not come in with a unified understanding of the issue that they should address. Instead, it took several meetings of rich conversation for the teachers to develop a collective understanding of which problem to tackle. In fact, all the teachers did not reach a unified understanding of the main issue that needed to be addressed till the seventh subgroup meeting. This provides one example of how long it took an RPP group to agree upon which direction to take.

While looking for shifts in teacher contributions, the intentional moves the researcher and the administrator made to directly involve the teachers in the subgroup's work became evident. During the first meeting, Mary the district administrator said, "I am looking to build teacher capacity. And starting to, you know, in their buildings, be able to take on more of an integral leadership role." Mary's intention to empower teachers can be also seen in a comment she made later. After sharing her ideas, Mary said, "I feel like I am talking a lot, and I do not want to talk too much," as a way to invite more teacher input. Leah, the researcher, also made multiple moves throughout the year to encourage the teachers to take more of an active role in the work they are doing. For example, during the fourth meeting, Leah said, "Hey, I have done way too much talking so I am going to let you guys take the lead," as a way to encourage the teachers to take charge. One of the defining characteristics of RPPs is a shift of power to those who do not traditionally have it (Farrell et al., 2021). In our study, we see that the traditional power holders, the university researcher and the district administrator, made conscious efforts to empower and involve the subgroup teachers in the group's work. By the end of the first year, we see major changes in teachers' contributions and roles, however, to what extent the efforts of the university researcher and the district administrator facilitated the shifts in teacher participation is not clear. Future studies should explore characteristics of RPPs that successfully engage teachers in the partnership's work. The researcher's intentional moves to invite active teacher participation also provide insight into how researchers can create productive working relationships with teachers, which is something we know little about (Coburn & Penuel, 2016). From this example, it seems like continual reminders and encouragement by a university researcher can help teachers meaningfully engage in the partnership's work.

This revelation about the intentional moves the researcher and administrator made to fully engage the teachers also offers a design implication for RPPs that involve school administrators and teachers. Administrators and teachers typically fall into two very different spots on the hierarchy of power since administrators usually hold all the decision-making power. Furthermore, teachers are rarely positioned as peers to administrators when it comes to decision-making at the district or even school level. Thus, if researchers want to successfully simultaneously engage teachers and administrators, they have to account for this traditional power dynamic. In this case, the district administrator was interested in empowering teachers and creating a space where teachers could participate equally in the decision-making process, so the researcher did not have to take any further action to create such a space. However, even though the administrator was open to sharing decision-making power with the teachers, the researcher still needed to facilitate the transition through which teachers become more active participants. In this case, that transition happened through two specific actions. As mentioned previously, the researcher would pause speaking at times and would then invite teachers to provide input. The researcher also initially volunteered the teachers for roles they were to take on during whole group meetings. RPPs may have the potential to disrupt traditional power dynamics but this disruption may not come to fruition if researchers don't

actively work toward it. Therefore, researchers must first be aware of the traditional power dynamics that are present in the RPP context and then they have to be intentional about disrupting them.

This study explored changes in teacher contributions and roles only during the first year of an RPP, so future studies should explore such changes over longer periods of time and they should also investigate how such changes relate to the RPP's overall success.

## References

- Bannister, N. A. (2015). Reframing practice: Teacher learning through interactions in a collaborative group. *Journal of the learning sciences, 24*(3), 347-372.
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory*. United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.
- Coburn, C. E., & Penuel, W. R. (2016). Research–practice partnerships in education: Outcomes, dynamics, and open questions. *Educational researcher, 45*(1), 48-54.
- Farrell, C. C., Harrison, C., & Coburn, C. E. (2019). “What the hell is this, and who the hell are you?” Role and identity negotiation in research-practice partnerships. *AERA Open, 5*(2), 2332858419849595.
- Farrell, C. C., Penuel, W. R., Coburn, C. E., Daniel, J., & Steup, L. (2021). *Practice Partnerships in Education: The State of the Field*. William T. Grant Foundation.
- Henrick, E., Munoz, M. A., & Cobb, P. (2016). A better research-practice partnership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 98*(3), 23-27.
- Hill, H. C., Ball, D. L., & Schilling, S. G. (2008). Unpacking pedagogical content knowledge: Conceptualizing and measuring teachers' topic-specific knowledge of students. *Journal for research in mathematics education, 39*(4), 372-400.
- Horn, I. S. (2007). Fast kids, slow kids, lazy kids: Framing the mismatch problem in mathematics teachers' conversations. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 16*(1), 37-79.
- Horn, I. S., & Little, J. W. (2010). Attending to problems of practice: Routines and resources for professional learning in teachers' workplace interactions. *American educational research journal, 47*(1), 181-217.
- Kazemi, E., & Franke, M. L. (2004). Teacher learning in mathematics: Using student work to promote collective inquiry. *Journal of mathematics teacher education, 7*(3), 203-235.
- Klar, H. W., Huggins, K. S., Buskey, F. C., Desmangles, J. K., & Phelps-Ward, R. J. (2018). Developing social capital for collaboration in a research-practice partnership. *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lefstein, A., Louie, N., Segal, A., & Becher, A. (2020). Taking stock of research on teacher collaborative discourse: Theory and method in a nascent field. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 88*, 102954.
- Leithwood, K., Mascall, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N.A., & Yashkina, A. (2007). Distributing Leadership to Make Schools Smarter: Taking the Ego Out of the System. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 6*, 37 - 67.
- Levine, T. H., & Marcus, A. S. (2010). How the structure and focus of teachers' collaborative activities facilitate and constrain teacher learning. *Teaching and teacher education, 26*(3), 389-398.
- Little, J. W. (2002). Locating learning in teachers' communities of practice: Opening up problems of analysis in records of everyday work. *Teaching and teacher education, 18*(8), 917-946.
- Rigby, J. G., Forman, S., Fox, A., & Kazemi, E. (2018). Leadership development through design and experimentation: Learning in a research–practice partnership. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 13*(3), 316-339.
- Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems thinker, 9*(5), 2-3.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods*. (5th ed). Los Angeles: SAGE.

## Acknowledgments

Research reported for this paper is based upon work supported by the NSF under grant number 1907681. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed on this poster are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF.