

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJESS_111442</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Dynamics of University-School Partnerships in Teacher Education Practicum: A Comprehensive Analysis and Framework for Successful Implementation</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript adds to the research in the community highlighting existing issues between university and school district partnerships. This is a universal issue and one that has historically been noted by many notable researchers documented in the literature review.</p> <p>Yes the title is fine.</p> <p>Abstract is appropriate</p> <p>Subsections are appropriate. However, I wanted to know more specifics about what/why the principals found the model disturbing normal school activities, when in theory if the student teacher is working within the adopted curriculum (there is no mention of this) there should not be a significant disturbance. Moreover, I do not see where the curriculum models are discussed, and this is significant. What practices are being supported by the university which are not in line with the delivery of the adopted curriculum? How culturally relevant is what is being used in school in line with the theoretic position of the university? I am really left wondering what universal practices were adopted from this. I simply do not know how the partnership improved the student teachers understanding and delivery of instruction. I do not know the evaluation framework that student teacher and master teacher quality was being evaluated with, so I do not know if the expectations and outcomes aligned.</p> <p>The references are fine.</p> <p>The point of the university/school district partnership is to improve the teaching/learning process. I am not getting how this was accomplished in curricular improvements. The focus is purely administrative, which is only one level. I want to know what happened to improve mentor teacher and student teacher relationships and how the university field supervisors used this knowledge to improve university level curriculum changes to make universal improvements in the teaching and learning process, because this is where the change impacts the students. Were the student teachers effective in improving student outcomes as observed by mentor teachers? Do principals actually evaluate the actual teaching of student teachers? What attributes/evaluation system is used to evaluate quality teachers? How does this contribute to student outcomes? What assessments are being used and are they culturally relevant to the student population? What is being done in the classroom to differentiate instruction for the students that sit before them? I simply do not know how the teaching/learning process was improved and how principals were involved here. This would impact my view of whether the proposed model is in fact effective. The authors state that this is an effective model, but I do not have enough information to take back and want to use it with my university and New York City Department of Education for instance. That I cannot do after reading this and that is what you want the reader to do – take it and use it. I do not feel that has been accomplished here.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The English is fine.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>As I mentioned earlier, I am still left wondering specifics. I feel the discussion about the model does not provide the specific actions which were taken to improve teaching and how this impacted university curriculum and district level student outcomes. If the goal of this is to provide other university and district partnerships a framework that they can replicate/use in their own practice, I could not successfully get that take away from this research. I do not feel I could duplicate what Sri Lanka is doing in New York, in other words and that is what I want to take away from this work.</p> <p>I want to know more about the school district curricular goals and how this drove the relationship to create change. Was a co-vision for instruction created because of the university/school district partnership? I want to know more about the effectiveness of the instruction provided to students and how student achievement is measured. I want to know how effective teaching is determined. Were there any norming exercises? Were the mentor teachers provided professional development in how to coach a student teacher? What model is being used to measure the teaching/learning process? In other words, in NY we use Charlotte Danielson's model for effective teaching and that same model is used in our student teaching evaluation rubric. Were the evaluation instruments aligned and are they appropriately measuring student achievement and how? From this, what specific universal changes were made at the school level and at the university? The discussion does not provide steps for another university to adapt with their school district partners and that is what I wanted to glean from this research and do not feel like I know that in the end.</p>	
---	--	--

**PART 2:**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Sharon Sullivan-Rubin</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Touro University, USA</b></p>