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Problem

The development of school/university partnerships is not a simple process. It requires collaboration between two groups of professionals who come from different cultures, have developed different forms of expertise, and operate under different organizational conditions and reward structures (Goodlad, 1990; Stoddart, Winitzky & O'Keefe, 1992). Throughout much of the last century, collaboration between schools and universities have often been unsuccessful. In order for Professional Development Schools to be successful in educational reform, it is necessary to focus on defining and delineating the essential characteristics of Professional Development Schools and the process of their establishment.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to (1) define Professional Development School and delineate its component parts; (2) describe its history, and chronicle the establishment of a Professional Development School; and (3) explore the implications of Professional Development Schools for local school change, school/university relationships, and national standards.

Methodology

This study used a descriptive, qualitative case study method based on interviews, observations, documents, and artifacts, to describe the Professional Development School (PDS).

Data were collected from five primary informants, including two deans of schools of education, two national PDS specialists, and one local elementary school with its partnering. These data were used to define and describe the process of establishing a Professional Development School.

Findings and Conclusions

The study highlighted some of the challenges involved in developing and establishing a Professional Development School. It documented the need to (1) provide a clear operational definition of a PDS; (2) provide a substantial opportunity for developing relationships; and (3) use research to identify developmental stages of the PDS.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem or Building the Plane

Her eyes were quite large as she serendipitously said, "Creating a Professional Development School is like building an airplane . . ." and her smile became explosive as she finished her statement, "while you’re flying it!" (Volume 2, p. 2). Throughout the next several hours of interviews, this Dean of Education discussed how she and other educational professionals had established their Professional Development School (PDS).

I kept thinking about her descriptive statement as I further studied how various universities, elementary, and secondary schools were also building their ‘airplanes’ while flying them. The ‘builders’ had been given a general sketch through the Holmes Group trilogy on the reform of education in the United States—Tomorrow’s Teachers (1986), Tomorrow’s Schools (1990), and Tomorrow’s Schools of Education (1995). The trilogy proposed a type of institution called the Professional Development School and defined it as “a school for the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching professions” (Holmes Group, 1990, p. 16). Additionally, the Task Force on Education

1 Throughout this document reference to direct quotes of participants is found in two volumes of raw data.
and Economy (Carnegie Corporation, 1986), John Goodlad (1990), Marsha Levine (1992), and Linda Darling-Hammond (1994) described what they called clinical schools, professional practice schools, or professional development schools—schools that supported novice and experienced teachers learning in the course of teaching, schools in which teachers grounded their work in a professional knowledge base, and schools in which teachers worked and collectively sought ways to meet their students’ learning needs (Levine, 1998a).

This general sketch continues to be modified and developed, as ‘builders’ have redesigned the original ‘prop job’ and are developing ‘blue prints’ for the future ‘aerospace industry’ of education. Lee Teitel (1998b) describes many of those ‘blue prints’ in an article entitled Professional Development Schools, A Literature Review.

Teitel (1998b) states that by the summer of 1995, the ERIC database listed almost 200 references to Professional Development Schools (PDSs), including journal articles, reports, conference papers, and a few edited books. To provide an overview of the literature available on PDSs, Teitel (1998b) credits Lisa Christie of the PDS Standards Project for categorizing almost 200 references drawn from an ERIC search and other sources, on the basis of reviews of the abstracts. He states that she found 86 descriptive studies or documentation works, 41 works classified as policy or opinion, 18 surveys or evaluations, 18 case studies, 5 reports based on focus groups or interviews, 15 books, and 19 references and other resources, such as handbooks. Teitel (1998b) asserts that the volume of publications about professional development schools is proliferating. In the 1998 search he conducted, Teitel (1998b) found that more than 125 additions have been
placed into ERIC, and several books on professional development schools have been published (Abdal-Haqq, 1997; Hoffman, Reed, & Rosenbluth, 1997; Levine & Trachtman, 1997.)

An overview of the PDS literature, Teitel (1998b) continues, would not be complete without an acknowledgment of a problem that underlies any broad analysis of its scope: With no clear criteria established, it is hard to know which of these hundreds of articles pertain to more developed PDSs, which to less, and which to institutions that, in truth, are PDSs in name only. In her review of the literature for the Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (1996), C. Book identifies this problem:

The operationalization of what is meant by a professional development school continues to plague researchers’ ability to clearly explain what impact the activities of a PDS are having on teaching, learning, school organizations, and teacher education. As researchers and teacher educators, we are often at a loss to define when a school is actually a professional development school. Is it when the university and school district label it a PDS or make a commitment to create one? Is it when the criteria specified by the Holmes Group or other organizations are met? Is it when there is evidence of the interacting effects of new forms of teaching on higher levels of learning? How sophisticated or developed must the relations between goals and outcomes be to acknowledge a school as a PDS? (p. 204)

The lack of clear criteria does not affect just researchers who study professional development schools, but anyone who works in, or advocates for, a PDS. Although there is a growing clarity and consensus on the definition of a PDS (Teitel, 1998b), there is still a great need to provide a systematic definition. One of the purposes of this dissertation is to contribute to the literature and to help establish an operational definition of PDS that can be agreed upon by educational experts in the field.
Richard Clark, in his 1999 book, *Effective Professional Development Schools*, states that major organizations—including Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), the Holmes Partnership, the National Center for Restructuring Education and Schools Teaching (NCREST), and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)—agree that professional development schools must accomplish four basic goals. Although the wording used by each organization varies, Clark states, they concur that such schools provide a clinical setting for preservice education, engage in professional development for practitioners, promote and conduct inquiry that advances knowledge of schooling, and provide an exemplary education for a segment of P-12 students (preschools through 12th grade).

However, when he discusses the question of how many PDSs are in existence, his response is as follows:

No one really knows. Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) includes more than five hundred such schools in its 1997-1998 directory, and it does not include many that are part of other important reform initiatives. The PDSs reported are substantially different from one another. The agreement or purpose that is apparent in the national statements is not as clear when actual practices in the schools are examined. (p. 9)

Given this gap between asserted purpose and common practice, how else can we define a PDS? Examples are another means of doing so (p. 11). Another purpose of this dissertation is to describe through interviews, observation, and participation, the establishment of a professional development school. The participants in the school and university have been promised anonymity; therefore pseudonyms for them are used throughout this dissertation.
It seems that although there are opportunities for success when you 'build the plane as you fly it', there is a higher probability of a 'crash and burn' ending to the story. I believe there is something to be said for taking time to be sure you have the right 'blue prints' in hand before building the plane, for knowing the direction and how far you want the plane to travel, for obtaining the proper tools and creating appropriate building timelines, for designing continued maintenance plans, and for being sure everyone has on a safety belt (and has a parachute) for those unforeseen circumstances. I believe any pilot of any aircraft would say that to do any less would be suicide, if not murder.

PDSs and Student/Teacher Learning or What About Pilot Training?

As students begin to study to become pilots, they have a great deal of reading to do. They first need to understand the aircraft and the process of preparing the plane to be flown. At times there is also opportunity to 'fly' in a simulator—to practice. Once they have passed ground school and flight simulator tests, and have complete understanding of the machine, they begin actual lessons, in the plane, with a professional at their side at all times to guide them, or, if necessary, save them in the most dire situation. Learning to fly, ultimately, occurs in the sky, the environment where flying happens.

Sykes (1997) observed it is a truism that learning to teach must occur in the environment where teaching happens—the school. He suggests that one can only study about education at the university. And yet, Sykes continues, for almost all of the 20th century the clinical portion of a teacher's preparation has been one of its weakest links. Touted by almost all teachers as being the most important part of their preparation, the
prevailing model tacks two 7 to 10 week practicums onto the end of a 4-year undergraduate program. One-on-one relationships between a teacher candidate and his or her mentor limit the learning opportunities, and the basic approach is that of apprenticeship. Sykes stipulates that the teacher candidate is, at best, a good guest in the school setting.

Zeichner and Miller (1997) summarized years of studies of traditional school-based training programs. Among the more common findings were clinical programs that often had no design or curriculum, no criteria for evaluation, little or no quality control of supervisors, inadequate mentoring because of structural limitations, and inadequate resources. Levine and Churins (1999) address this issue when they state that researchers have identified poor articulation between the campus-based and school-based components of the teacher preparation program. They believe that PDSs promise to address these widespread weaknesses in current clinical programs.

The need to strengthen teacher preparation programs and to ensure that teachers emerge from their novice years as knowledgeable, committed educators is a nationwide challenge that has attracted considerable attention from the public and leaders in education (Harriman, 1998). Recommendations have been outlined in Draft Standards for Identifying and Supporting Quality Professional Development Schools, by the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF, 1997), and include:

- Implement teaching standards to guide the professional development of teachers that are congruent with learning standards for students.

- Make licensure decisions based on ‘demonstrated ability to teach’ to the new standards and other professional proficiencies.

- Support the establishment and sustenance of schools organized for student and teacher success.
Restructure teacher education to include yearlong internships in professional development schools. (p. 4)

Other professional organizations such as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) have recommended professional standards and assessments of pedagogical, content knowledge, and proficiency as requirements for entering the profession (INTASC, 1992). In 1998, 40 states had established testing requirements (Educational Placement Consortium, 1998) as a means of addressing the concerns about teacher preparation programs (Harriman, 1998).

Although paper and pencil tests are somewhat useful, they evaluate only a limited range of the proficiencies and abilities that are necessary for the complex responsibilities of teaching. While they may provide a degree of public accountability, they do little to prepare candidates to share their accomplishments in the classroom once they become teachers (Glenn, 1998).

In the past decade, university-school partnerships have created Professional Development Schools (PDSs) in over 250 locations around the world (Abdal-Haaq, 1995). They bring together university and school based faculty to share responsibility for the clinical preparation of new teachers, the professional development of experienced faculty, the support of research directed at improving practice, and enhanced student learning.

PDSs are one way to embed extended practice in the real tasks of teaching and assessment of teaching into teacher education programs. PDSs can serve "as inclusive site(s) where multiple professional standards may be combined in service to the development of new professionals and new knowledge" (Sykes, 1997, p. 160).
The development of new knowledge is stimulated by the exchange of ideas among preservice teachers, experienced schoolteachers, university faculty, and other professionals working in the site. Through multilayered interactions, mentoring of preservice teachers can serve as a merging point for implementation of standards and other reform initiatives underway in schools. Most important, the PDS offers a rich context to nurture and assess teacher development (Harriman, 1998).

PDSs are characterized as having a unique objective in that they seek to prepare preservice and in-service schoolteachers and university faculty to enhance learning and development of all members of the academically diverse learning community. In addition, they have been described as a special type of school restructuring, with the primary goal of creating learner-centered schools and a teacher corps that is empowered with knowledge and skill to effect positive change in the school setting (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster, & Cobb, 1995).

Although much research is being conducted in regard to the implications of PDSs (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995), little has been written about the effects on students in public schools who are recipients of the educational change that results from PDS partnerships. Still less has been revealed on what students perceive to be the impact of having such a program in their school (King, 1996). Fullan (1991) suggests that students are more often thought of as beneficiaries of change rather than active participants in the change process.
The Wright brothers became interested in flying in 1896 and by 1899 they began serious reading on the subject. Soon they obtained all the scientific knowledge of aeronautics that was then available. In 1890 they tested their first glider that could carry a person. In 1901 they tested a larger glider. Neither the 1900 nor the 1901 glider had the lifting power they counted on. After going “back to the drawing board” several times, they built and successfully flew a third glider in 1902. On December 17, 1903, the Wright brothers built and successfully flew the world’s first power-driven, heavier-than-air machine near Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. The plane flew 120 feet and was in the air 12 seconds.

Throughout years of struggle, the Wrights believed that airplanes would eventually be used to transport passengers and mail. Even through the years of public doubt, they had reason to be sure of their eventual success because their gliders had proven their airplane’s design and control system to be sound. The brothers had also become skilled pilots. Their understanding of aerodynamics and ability as pilots set them apart from most others who tried and failed to fly powered airplanes.

Like the Wright brothers, school reformers will only be successful if there is a sound design and control system for the schools, and if the teachers become skilled pilots.

Lyons, Stroble, and Fischetti (1997) suggest that in the late 1980s, when school reformers at last shifted their attention to teachers and suggested that they needed to be at the center of school change, effectively reaching all students, it became clear that the
restructuring of education had to go hand in hand with the renewal and reform of teacher education (Carnegie Forum, 1986; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes Group, 1986; Wise, Darling-Hammond, & Berry, 1987). Good schools would need a steady supply of excellent teachers, with new habits of mind and new habits of work (Meier, 1992). At that moment, by extension, the school reform movement reached the university, especially the colleges of education and their teacher education programs. If students in schools were to be constructors of their own knowledge and understandings, teachers too would need to be in new kinds of knowledge relationships with students (Elmore, 1996). There had to be two features to school renewal: changing practices for teachers and students in new relationships around knowledge and learning, and changing practices for learning to teach.

The research of Lyons et al (1997) reveals that after 10 years of school reform, renewal, and restructuring, and the proliferation of Professional Development Schools across North America, several characteristic features of change have emerged (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Elmore, 1996; Goodlad, 1994; Levine, 1992; Meier, 1992; Osguthorpe, Harris, Fox-Harris, & Black, 1995; Robinson & Darling-Hammond, 1994; Clark, 1995; Grossman, 1994; Lieberman, 1995; Lieberman & Miller, 1992; Muncey & McQuillan, 1991). The characteristics identified by Lyons et al. (1997) from the cited literature are:

The process of renewal, restructuring, and creating partnerships for teacher education is a long-term undertaking—some would argue a 10 year process at least.

School reform may be more possible by designing a new school culture than by changing an existing one; PDSs may be considered a new kind of culture.
Reform depends on the strength of intense, shared commitments to students and their teachers, to learn about learning, and to the ongoing assessment of these efforts. Without a shared vision of what students could be, especially intellectually, and what teachers need to do, reform will not be sustained within either institution. Nor will the creative work of developing the necessary skills and competencies and programs take place. National dialogues can help the process, facilitate local action, and serve as catalysts to sustain the enterprise, but the hard work at the grassroots is sustained by a common vision and commitment.

Renewal and change are highly context-dependent, perhaps even context-driven, depending on the history, practices, and regularities of the institutions (Sarason, 1982, 1990), as well as the people involved, their relationships to one another, and the continuity of these relationships. The commitment to changing environments is crucial.

Reform and change are complex and multidimensional. This may be especially so in the new partnerships between schools and universities needed to create Professional Development Schools. As they engage in a common enterprise, to support the learning of their students and the transformation of teacher education, each institution has its own agenda, history, and way of operating. The two organizations are separate yet joined by intertwining visions and goals, engaged in creating a new entity. No map or blueprint is readily available to chart a direction. Invention and ongoing inquiry are what partnership must be about.

Not surprisingly, partnership relationships are not without dilemmas, tension, and critical questions. At heart is the question of how they can be sustained.

To date, the university, unlike partner schools, shows the least overt institutional change. Yet radical change is occurring in the roles university faculty take on in Professional Development Schools. This change, once in motion, is taking its direction from what has gone before, altering colleges and universities in apparently simple, almost invisible, yet ultimately far-reaching ways. (pp. 89-90)

The cases presented in my dissertation will illuminate through their detail some of the above issues. Lyons et al. (1997) discovered that university changes generated by Professional Development School activities are incremental with the ripple effects of a quiet revolution. Professional Development Schools, a new, jointly defined school culture, are subtly altering the traditional tasks of the university, raising compelling questions such as: What counts as knowledge? Who constructs it? How? Who is its
faculty? Lyons et al. (1997) came to the conclusion that these changes may foreshadow the university of the future, addressing the idea of the university not simply as an institution of learning but as an institution of learners, a learning organization, carrying out its mission primarily through partnerships whether with schools, engaged in a simultaneous and ongoing process of renewal demanded by the dynamics of a changing worldview.

The Study of an Innovation or Is It a Kite, a Biplane, or a Concord Jet?

In his book Change Forces (1993), Michael Fullan proposes that longstanding concerns about the inadequacy of teacher education (from initial preparation to the end of the career) and the isolationist culture of schools have led to various attempts to improve both components, but rarely in conjunction. Put positively, Fullan believes that new emphasis on teacher-as-learner and on collaborative work cultures have converged in the concept of Professional Development Schools (PDS). Stoddart, Winitsky, and O’Keefe (1992) summarize the Holmes Group’s (1990) definition:

A Professional Development School (PDS) is a school in which university faculty work collaboratively with practitioners over time with the goal of improving teaching and learning through (1) upgrading the education of pre-service teachers, (2) providing professional development for experienced teachers, and (3) field-based research. Inherent in the PDS model is the notion of school sites evolving as models of excellence and centers of inquiry through collaboration between school and university faculties over time. (p. 2)

Fullan (1993) contends that, in principle, the PDS is a model that is on the right track in promising to produce learning educators and learning organizations through school/university partnerships. According to Fullan (1993) three main observations can
be made at this early stage of PDS development: The concept is ambitious and vague, little research data are available as yet, and the university side of the partnership is underdeveloped.

Teitel (1998a) states that although wording differs, and the emphasis and focus differ among PDS advocates, there is a strong convergence around four goals: the improvement of student learning, the preparation of educators, the professional development of educators, and research and inquiry into improving practice.

Additionally, Marsha Levine (1998a), writing for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), states that demands for public and professional accountability have moved Professional Development Schools (PDSs) from being just a good idea to an imperative. Levine (1998b) defines NCATE as a coalition of over 30 education organizations concerned with the quality of teacher education. It is the national professional organization recognized by the U.S. Department of Education to grant professional accreditation to institutions preparing teachers. In 1995, NCATE initiated the PDS Standards Project and established three goals:

To establish a consensus about quality and good practice in PDSs.

To design standards that reflect the fact that the PDS is still evolving as a new institution.

To use standards as part of the development of an infrastructure to support and sustain PDSs. (Levine, 1998b, p. 1)

Levine (1998a), as Director of the PDS Standards Field Test Project at NCATE, believes that standards for PDSs can help ensure that this new institution will have the impact it promises. NCATE recognized that PDSs might be one of the most important
innovations, among many in recent years, in teacher education and school reform (Levine, 1998b). Such recognition of this innovation makes it worth studying.

In reviewing the PDS literature, Teitel (1998b) identifies two issues that stand out in relation to goals and purposes. First, because of the lack of a standardized definition, those writing about their own PDSs try to use other published definitions of PDSs to justify that their partnership is indeed a PDS.

A second broad issue Teitel (1998b) identifies concerns the 'all or none' debate. Throughout the literature is a strong sense of the interrelatedness of the different goals of a PDS. Murray (1993), of the Holmes Group, develops in more detail the Holmes criteria for a PDS and argues that the "goals are interconnected and none can be achieved without the others" (pp. 70-71). Yet in the real world, the Holmes Group (1990) notes that probably not one partnership with all features exists. Brainard (1989) constructed a list of 14 criteria and after reviewing the extant PDSs (both Holmes Group and others) concluded that "none of the projects included in this study appears to meet all or even most of the fourteen criteria" (p. 49). More recently, Osguthorpe and his colleagues (1995) report that in the National Network for Educational Renewal, no partner school can claim to excel in all four basic areas.

The Problem or Is a Plane by Any Other Name Still a Plane?

In my study of Professional Development Schools, it is important to focus on what the innovation is like even as it is being established—before implementation. This will facilitate an "evaluability assessment," a term used by Patton (1987, p. 37). An
evaluability assessment, according to Patton, involves identifying the program "treatment," making sure it is consistent, and establishing that the outcomes are clear, specific, and measurable. Such a study ensures that the PDS is well described in operational terms and the definition becomes comprehensive enough for studies of effectiveness and systematic evaluation. Although this study does not deal with the effectiveness or evaluation of PDSs, future studies of its effectiveness and evaluation may be more easily conducted, based on the findings of this study.

So, what type of plane is being flown? Are we sure we are flying a plane? Some seem to be flying a kite, and call it a biplane. Others are flying a biplane and consider themselves to be flying a Concord Jet. And still others believe none of these can get off the ground because none have met all the specifications in the blueprint when, in actuality, there is no blueprint. As the dean described her PDS, "We're building the plane as we fly it!" My question becomes: Is a plane, by any other name, still a plane?

My study deals with the designing of the blueprint, creating the specifications, and the building of the plane before it is flown.

Marsha Levine (1998b) acknowledges that there are several interested communities advocating for PDSs. Advocates for PDSs have grown up within the major sectors that are involved-teacher educators, P-12 school reformers, teacher union leaders, school district policy makers, and administrators. However, little unanimity exists, either within each of these groups or among them, about many issues except with respect to PDSs. Levine continues by suggesting that the problem extends to such fundamental questions as "What is a PDS?" and "What are its distinguishing characteristics?" Each
group sees in the PDS a different promise. Levine explains the problem from various points of view: Some teacher educators view PDSs as a critical component of the professionalization of teacher preparation with strong emphasis on content and professional and clinical preparation; others are threatened by the major changes inherent in making a commitment to PDSs. School reformers look to PDSs as the places where new teachers will learn the skills, dispositions, and orientation to practice that are associated with school reform; They see PDSs as models or exemplars of schools that support such professional practice. Some school district leaders view PDSs as good front-end investments because they prepare new teachers to be successful, reduce teacher turnover, improve teacher retention, and reduce professional development costs; others do not yet connect their district’s needs with the potential of the PDS.

A description of the establishment of a PDS, its definition, and its characteristics are imperative before questions of its impact on students or teacher education can be addressed. Otherwise, it may be an assessment of a ‘non-event’ (Charters & Jones, 1973). In other words, the PDS partnership may be no different from any other school partnership. It is assumed, then, that there is much to be learned by everyone involved.

The problem, metaphorically speaking, is that one school is a kite, one school is a biplane, and one school is a Concord Jet—however, each calls itself a plane. Without an agreed-upon set of characteristics or blueprints, we may be building something that is not a plane at all. If we do not have blueprints, how do we know what we have built? Or perhaps even worse, we may just continue to build the kite, as we have always done, and change the name of component parts without changing our behavior, and call our kite a
Concord! Without the essential characteristics identified, a plane by any other name may
or may not still be a plane.

**The Purpose or Exactly What Is It That**
**Makes a Plane a Plane?**

This study focused on three aspects of a PDS namely, (1) identification and
definition of the components of a PDS, (2) description of the establishment of a PDS, and
(3) exploration of the implications of PDSs on school change, school/university
relationships, and national standards. The purpose of the study was threefold: (1) the
study will define and describe a local PDS, (2) the study will describe the context of the
establishment of a local PDS, and (3) the study will examine and analyze the process of
school/university relationships within the context of PDS partnerships.

Having studied Professional Development Schools, Clark (1988) made this
generalization about interinstitutional relationships, “When studying the writing of others
about these relationships, it is necessary to be alert to the fact that simply because the
terms are the same, it does not necessarily follow that the relationship is the same.” In
short, terminology needs to be operationally redefined with each study. While it may (or
may not) be possible to say a plane is a plane is a plane, one cannot conclude that a
partnership is a partnership is a partnership. As different interinstitutional relationships
are examined, it will be necessary to consider each in terms of its operating concepts and
practices, not its label.
Research Questions or How to Make a Blueprint

When developing a blueprint for a plane the developer asks questions about how the plane will look and fly when it is completed. The same concept holds for the development of a PDS.

This study attempts to address the following research questions:

1. What is a PDS?
   a. What are the essential components of a PDS?
   b. What is the relationship between the school and the university in a PDS?
   c. How do school and university personnel participate in a PDS?

2. What does the establishment of a PDS look like?
   a. How are relationships between university and school(s) cultivated?
   b. What are the accountability issues of the PDS and how are they solved?

3. What are the implications of a PDS on local school/university relationships, and national standards?

Rationale for the Study or If It Flies Is It Really a Plane?

If it flies, does it necessarily mean it is a plane? Birds fly. Helicopters fly. Hot air balloons fly. Without defining the essential components of the ‘flying machine’—airplane—one does not know what it is that is flying.

After completing a literature review, I discovered that there is a need to define the essential components of a PDS, and to continue to document how this partnership happens. The literature has numerous documented examples that compare and analyze
PDS start-ups and implementations, e.g., how well a PDS takes hold in one school versus another (Campbell, Strawderman, & Reavis, 1996; Rakow & Robinson, 1997). The analyses provide opportunities for authors to report what works in one setting and how well it translates to another (Cambone, Zambone, & Suarez, 1996). Although much of the early PDS literature was filled with success stories (while, presumably, failed or aborted PDSs were not reported), these comparative analyses acknowledge the tough tasks in starting and sustaining a PDS. Along with articles like Teitel’s (1998a) account of Divorces, Separation and Open Marriages in a PDS network, they represent a maturation of the literature, allowing for a deeper discussion of what works and what does not work in these partnerships.

At the heart of the PDS idea is the goal to substantially improve the preparation and continuing education of educators. Sykes (1997) cautions that few people learn to teach in a university: Typically, one studies education at a university and learns to teach in a school. This point may seem obvious, Sykes continues, but the institutional arrangements to prepare teachers have never reflected it. The prevailing model tacks 14 to 20 weeks of practice teaching onto a slender collection of university courses, with these two strands only loosely connected to one another. Sykes believes that, by creating long-term, deep relationships between schools and universities, as exemplified by PDS programs, the historic breach may be healed and a much stronger form of professional education may emerge. What a wonderful opportunity for educators and students alike!

A description of the components that are needed to establish this long-term relationship...
between schools and universities will contribute valuable information to the knowledge base in education.

I am interested in how a university establishes a deep relationship with an elementary school—something that was not available to read about in the literature review. It is important to describe the process of the development of a partnership between two institutions where there is such a difference in orientation. "The oft-noted hiatus between educational theory and educational practice," wrote Schlechty (1990) "exists in part because theory tends to be generated in a culture where it does not apply (the university), and efforts to apply theory are made in a culture where few theoreticians practice (the schools)" (pp. 44-45). The contribution of this research will be toward the building of a description of the effort to establish a partnership between a school and a university.

Levine (1998b) noted that while support for PDSs has grown over the last several years, it had become clear by 1995 that the PDS "movement" was in some danger. Viewed as an important innovation, Levine continued that PDSs had proliferated rapidly, with little attention to definition and quality. She acknowledged that under such circumstances, there was concern that PDSs could rapidly become an empty promise and a lost opportunity. The horizon of education reform is littered with such unfulfilled promises. Further, Levine asserted, as interest from national, state, and local policy makers increased, it became clear that definition and a way to identify quality were imperative.
In order to define a PDS, and identify its qualities, an Innovation Configuration (IC) would be useful. The concept of IC grew from efforts to conceptualize, define, and measure innovations as individuals in an organization use them (Heck, 1981).

My work became clear. By using an innovation configuration to define a PDS, the configuration will also provide a way to identify the quality of a PDS by listing component variations that define the attributes of an ideal, acceptable, and unacceptable Professional Development School. In addition to defining the components of a PDS and describing the establishment of PDSs, this study attempts to bring together relevant research findings of areas related to educational change and endeavor to draw connections between them.
CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

This case study on Professional Development Schools took place in the Central County School District at Kitty Hawk Elementary School (KHES) and Wright University (WU), both private Christian schools. (The names of these institutions and individuals are pseudonyms). I selected this school district and university partnership because it was in the beginning stages of developing a partnership, and I wanted to observe how the PDS was established as it emerged into a full partnership.

To find out what this innovation looks like in actual practice, I used the Innovation Configuration (IC) (Hall & Loucks, 1978) process. A qualitative case study method is used to describe and define a Professional Development School and answer research questions. The qualitative approach is designed to study the process and the context of a particular situation. “If qualitative inquiry in education is about anything, it is about trying to understand what teachers and children do in the settings in which they work” (Eisner, 1991, p. 11). Too often what is suggested to teachers and administrators is said independently of context and often a detailed description of the practices being used is essential to improve schools and practices (Eisner, 1991, p. 11).

Gay and Airasian (2000) suggest that key features of qualitative research include defining the problem or question to be studied, but not necessarily at the start of the
study; taking into account contextual factors in the settings the research participants inhabit; collecting data from a small number of purposefully selected participants; and using nonnumerical, interpretive approaches to provide narrative descriptions of the participants, their actions, and their contexts. They advocate that it is important to understand that the belief underlying qualitative research in the world is neither stable, coherent, nor uniform, and therefore ‘truth’ as sought by quantitative researchers cannot be obtained because perspectives and understandings differ from group to group. Additionally, one of the primary instruments used by quantitative researchers is very different from those used by qualitative researchers; self:

Self as Instrument

Merriam (1988) states:

The importance of the researcher in qualitative case study cannot be overemphasized. The researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Data are mediated through this human instrument, the researcher, rather than through some inanimate inventory, questionnaire, or machine. Certain characteristics differentiate the human researcher from other data collection instruments: The researcher as instrument is responsive to the context; he or she can adapt techniques to the circumstances; the total context can be considered; what is known about the situation can be expanded through sensitivity to nonverbal aspects; the human instrument can process data immediately, can clarify and summarize as the study evolves, and can explore anomalous responses. (p. 19)

Because the primary instrument in case study research is human, all observations and analyses are filtered through one’s worldview, one’s values, one’s perspective. As Goetz and LeCompte (1984) observe, “Case study research is one of the few modes of scientific study that admit the subjective perception and biases of both participants and researcher into the research frame” (p. 95).
“Related to the self as instrument is the positive exploitation of our own subjectivity” (Peshkin, 1986). Eisner (1991) extends this thought:

Each person’s history, and hence world, is unlike anyone else’s. This means that the way in which we see and respond to a situation and how we interpret what we see, will bear our own signature. This unique signature is not a liability but a way of providing individual insight into a situation. (p. 34)

How do we know this insight is valid and reliable?

Reliability and Validity

Relative to case studies, Chiba and Lincoln (1981) make a case for side stepping reliability in favor of internal validity: “Since it is impossible to have internal validity without reliability, a demonstration of internal validity amounts to a simultaneous demonstration of reliability” (p. 120).

Merriam (1988) suggests, “Findings will be considered more valid by some if repeated observations in the same study or replications of the entire study have produced the same results. This logic relies on repetition for the establishment of truth; but, as everyone knows, measurements, observations, and people can be repeatedly wrong” (p. 171).

Scriven (1972) points out that simply because a number of people have experienced the same phenomenon does not make the observations more reliable. All reports of personal experience are not necessarily unreliable any more than all reports of events witnessed by a large number of people are reliable.
In a case study, Walker (1980) points out, "The emphasis is towards 'collecting definitions of situations' (multiple representations) and the presentation of material in forms where it is open to multiple interpretations" (p. 44).

Since the term reliability in the traditional sense seems to be something of a misfit when applied to qualitative research, Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 288) recommend thinking about the "dependability" or "consistency" of the results obtained from the data. That is, rather than demanding that outsiders get the same results, one wishes outsiders to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense—they are consistent and dependable.

Merriam (1988, p. 172) offers several techniques an investigator can use to ensure that his or her results are dependable:

1. The investigator's position: The investigator should explain the assumptions and theory behind the study, his or her position vis-à-vis the group being studied, the basis for selecting informants and description of them, and the social context from which data were collected.

2. Triangulation: Especially in terms of using multiple methods of data collection and analysis, triangulation strengthens reliability as well as internal validity.

3. Audit trail: The investigator must describe in detail how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the inquiry.

I have applied each of these techniques throughout this dissertation. The assumptions, theory and social context are discussed in chapter 3: Historical, Philosophical, and Current Context of Professional Development Schools. Triangulation
included use of observations, structured and unstructured interviews, field notes, comments in journals, and surveys. I have two volumes of transcription and field notes that have been used to describe in detail how data were collected, how categories were derived, and how decisions were made throughout the dissertation.

One of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured. Such research addresses questions like, what is being observed in qualitative research and how does one assess the validity of those observations? What is being observed are people's constructions of reality, how they understand the world: "The case study worker constantly attempts to capture and portray the world as it appears to the people in it. In a sense for the case study worker what seems true is more important than what is true. For the case study worker the internal judgments made by those he studies, or who are close to the situation, are often more significant than the judgments of outsiders" (Walker, 1980, p. 45). How does one evaluate a "holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing reality?"
property of interacting selves, and the meanings people live by are malleable as a basic feature of social life, then concern over reliability—in the postpositivist sense—is fanciful” (p. 303).

Additionally, Eisner (1991) establishes that,

Unlike the experiment that demonstrates relations of cause and effect or correlations that statistically describe the strength of association, qualitative studies typically employ multiple forms of evidence and they persuade by reason . . . . In qualitative research there is no statistical test of significance to determine if results “count”; in the end, what counts is a matter of judgment. (p. 39)

Qualitative research and evaluation can serve as a map, but they are more likely to function as a guide. Unlike maps, qualitative studies are general, they are not mathematically scaled to match the territory, and they are more interpretive and narrative. Their function is to highlight, to explain, to provide directions the reader can take into account. Guides call to our attention aspects of the situation or place we might otherwise miss. They are typically prepared by people who have visited a place before and know a great deal about it. If the guide is useful, we are likely to experience what we otherwise might have missed, and we may understand more than we would have without benefit of the guide. The good guide deepens and broadens our experience and helps us understand what we are looking at. (Eisner, 1991, p. 59)

Ratcliffe (1983) offers an interesting perspective on assessing validity in every kind of research. It should be remembered, he suggests, that (1) “data do not speak for themselves; there is always an interpreter, or translator” (p. 149); (2) that “one cannot observe or measure a phenomenon/event without changing it, even in physics where reality is no longer considered to be single-faceted”; and (3) that numbers, equations, and words “are all abstract, symbolic representations of reality, but not reality itself” (p. 150). Ratcliffe concludes that there is no universal way of guaranteeing validity; there are only “notions of validity” (p. 158). In a supportive response Merriam declares (1988) “Validity, then, must be assessed in terms of interpreting the investigator’s experience,
rather than in terms of reality itself (which can never be grasped)” (p. 167). It seems then that interpretation is a determining factor of validity. What is interpretation in qualitative inquiry?

Interpretation

Eisner (1991) suggests two types of interpretation:

First, it means that inquirers try to account for what they have given an account of . . . In short, one meaning of interpretation pertains to the ability to explain why something is taking place. This requires, at times, the use of constructs from the social sciences. At other times it requires the creation of new theory.

A second meaning of interpretation pertains to what experience holds for those in the situation studied. Qualitative research is concerned with matters of meaning. Meaning is an elusive term, and one way to treat such elusive matters it to neglect them entirely. Behaviorism took this road. What matters most in behaviorism is what people or animals do, not what the doing means to them. For qualitative researchers and evaluators meaning, though elusive, still counts. In this sense qualitative researchers are interested in matters of motive and in the quality of experience undergone by those in the situation studied. (p. 35)

Peshkin (1985) supports meaningful interpretation as he speaks to subjectivity;

“If, somehow, all researchers were alike, we would all tell the same story about the same phenomenon. By virtue of subjectivity, I tell the story I am moved to tell. Reserve my subjectivity and I do not become a value-free participant observer, merely an empty-headed one” (p. 280).

I expect that this dissertation will, as Patton (1980) describes, “provide perspective rather than truth, empirical assessment of local decision makers’ theories of action rather than generation and verification of universal theories, and context-bound information rather than generalizations” (p. 283).
Case Study Design

For this study I have selected to use the case study as the primary research method. A case study is an examination of specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group (Merriam, 1988, p. 9). I have selected this design because I am interested in the process of collaboration between schools and universities. My decision to focus on a qualitative case study design stems from the fact that I find the analysis of insight, discovery, and interpretation more relevant for studying a process than hypothesis testing. Case study has been differentiated from other research designs by what Cronbach (1975, p. 123) calls "interpretation in context." By concentrating on a single phenomenon (PDS), in a specific context, this approach aims to uncover the interactions of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon (PDS).

I chose this methodology because it fits my research questions best. My questions are process oriented and by looking at the context holistically, through case study, I can ask people to translate their thoughts, actions, and ideas into meaningful narratives which can then be analyzed to draw conclusions.

Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) define case study as the in-depth study of instances of things of interest to the researcher. They explain that a case study is a particular instance of the phenomenon.

Wilson (1979) conceptualizes the case study as a process "which tries to describe and analyze some entity in qualitative, complex and comprehensive terms not infrequently as it unfolds over a period of time" (p. 448). MacDonald and Walker’s
(1977) definition of a case study as “the examination of an instance in action” (p. 181) is congruent with Guba and Lincoln’s (1981) statement that the purpose of a case study is “to reveal the properties of the class to which the instance being studied belongs” (p. 371). Becker (1968) defines the purposes of a case study as twofold: “to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the groups under study” and “to develop general theoretical statements about regularities in social structure and process” (p. 33).

In summary, case studies can be defined as an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit. Case studies are particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic and rely heavily on inductive reasoning in handling multiple data sources (Merriam, 1988, p. 16).

Selection Process

At the onset it is necessary to delineate the scope of this study. In order for me to keep the scope of this study achievable I purposefully selected two university/elementary school partnerships in neighboring states because: (1) I wanted to be able to quickly access them, (2) the deans were actively involved in PDS presentations I attended, and (3) the deans came highly recommended.

Purposive sampling was used to select the universities for the research study. Purposive sampling refers to hand-picking the sample needed in order to learn from those who best exemplify what is being studied. Chien (1981) compares it to expert consultants being called to a difficult medical case. “These consultants—also purposive sample—are not called in to get an average opinion of the entire medical profession. They
are called in precisely because of their special experience and competence” (Chien, 1981, p. 440).

Purposive sampling requires that one establish the criteria for units to be included in the investigation and then select the sampling according to these criteria.

I selected the following criteria to identify experts in the field:

1. University Dean of the School of Education had established and participated in a PDS for 3-5 years.

2. PDS with partnership members who have participated in the PDS from the beginning of the innovation.

3. PDS experts were willing to and capable of participating in the study.

Using the above criteria, two university partnership deans were identified based on purposive sampling or what Goetz and LeCompte (1984) call reputational case selection. They were chosen partially on the recommendation of the regional executive secretary of the Association of College Teacher Educators (ACTE). Throughout his work as regional executive secretary with ACTE he had the opportunity to work with many deans. The two deans he recommended communicated with him regularly about state and local PDS standards while developing PDSs at each university site. I selected these two experienced deans because I wanted to compare and contrast the concept of PDS from several perspectives. Additionally, I selected to interview another expert from the field, based on her expertise with PDSs. Marsha Levine has been the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Director of the PDS Standards Project since 1995, and has studied, written, and edited several books on the subject of
PDS. My goal is to identify the common characteristics of PDSs and their establishment, and to explore the implications of PDSs on school change, school-university relationships, and national standards.

The effectiveness of a PDS in terms of student or student teacher outcomes, or outcomes of the school or university faculty, was not directly studied.

**Data Collecting Techniques**

Data collection techniques included the following tools/techniques: (1) the Innovation Configuration (IC) interviews, (2) observations and field notes, (3) structured and unstructured interviews, (4) surveys—the Gregorc Style Delineator (Gregorc, 1985), and (5) artifacts.

**Interviews**

While discussing the advantages of the interview, Borg and Gall (1989, pp. 446-447) suggest that the interview as a research method in survey research is unique in that it involves the collection of data through direct verbal interaction between individuals, and that perhaps its principal advantage is its adaptability. They maintain that the interview situation usually permits much greater depth than the other methods of collecting research data.

The purpose of interviewing is to understand how program staff and participants view the program, to learn their terminology and judgments, and to capture the complexities of their individual perceptions and experiences. The fundamental principle
of qualitative interviewing is to provide a framework within which respondents can express their own understanding in their own terms (Patton, 1980, pp. 204).

In order to be able to describe the components of a PDS and to define PDS, it was important that I provide an opportunity for people to respond in their own terms. Eisner (1991) made reference to the issue of understanding what is or has happened in a particular setting by saying “we need to listen to what people have to say about their activities, their feelings, their lives” (p. 183). When writing about how to describe an innovation, Gene Hall (1974) states that “what we are attempting to study and describe is the highly personal, dynamic, interactive process and events that occur when educational institutions adopt complex educational innovations” (p. 1). I purposely studied innovation adoption in educational institutions using the process of Innovation Configuration (IC)(Heck, 1981). Adoption is not an event at a point in time; rather it is a developmental process that individuals and institutions move through as they select, adapt, and institutionalize use of an innovation configuration.

To identify the components of a PDS and define a PDS, the use of IC interviews was completed. The concept of IC emerged from the research on the process of educational change. It represents the patterns of use that result when an innovation is applied. The patterns of use help to develop the IC checklist (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & Loucks, 1981), which identifies the component parts of the innovation and variations in the use of each part. The IC process is facilitated by semi-structured interviews.

All interviews were tape recorded, transcribed, and included as raw data in Volumes 1 and 2.
Observations and Field Notes

Wright University (WU) and Kitty Hawk Elementary School (KHES) (pseudonyms) administration decided to form a PDS. In order to begin the process of the establishment of a PDS, there were several meetings where, as research has indicated, cooperative learning (between faculty and administration of both schools) and sharing of knowledge to define the components of a PDS was necessary. By means of participant observation I observed the activities of people, the physical characteristics of the social situation, and what it feels like to be part of the scene (Spradley, 1980, p. 33). As an active participant, I sought to do what other people are doing, not merely to gain acceptance, but to more fully learn the cultural rules for behavior (Spradley, 1980, p. 60).

Due to the nature of the interviews in this study, I did not expect to experience significant influences that can often distort results in experimental research. The Hawthorne Effect and the John Henry Effect have somewhat opposite effects on an experiment. The Hawthorne Effect reflects the impact of being part of an experiment upon the experimental group's performance, and the John Henry Effect reflects the impact upon the control group in experiments where the experimental group is perceived as competing with or threatening to surpass the control group. Since there are no experimental groups, and since this study does include my participating in the observational groups at times, these effects do not threaten my research findings. Additionally, because I did not have specific expectations for the people I interviewed, there were no issues with the Pygmalion Effect. No changes occurred in the subjects' behavior that are brought about by the experimenter's expectations (Borg & Gall, 1989).
I simply studied a phenomenon: Professional Development Schools. Borg and Gall (1989) state that qualitative methods are especially appropriate for the study of new ideas, theoretical constructs, or behavioral syndromes, particularly when they emerge as they are often poorly defined and not well understood. Borg and Gall (1989) continue explaining that qualitative research methods such as case studies are probably the best means available to describe the new phenomenon and help develop an understanding of it. Often an in-depth study of one individual using observation and interview will give a better understanding than will a shallow survey of 100 subjects.

All handwritten and tape-recorded observation and field notes are included as raw data in Volumes 1 and 2.

**Surveys**

The Gregorc Style Delineator is a self-analysis inventory developed by Anthony Gregorc (1982) and is helpful in understanding 'mind styles'. Gregorc (1985) states that, "Generally, style consists of outer behavior, characteristics, and mannerisms which are symptomatic of the psyche and of particular mental qualities. Specifically, an individual’s outer, visible style characteristics provide clues as to the inner invisible nature and capacity of his psychological and mental makeup" (p. 7). Basically the inventory provides vital information about how people think and learn. Gregorc believes that a person’s thinking and learning capabilities are revealed by two abilities: perception and ordering.

Perceptual abilities indicate how information is grasped or understood. Gregorc proposes that perception can be displayed on a continuum with two qualities, abstraction
and concreteness. Ordering abilities describe the ways in which information is systematized, arranged, and referenced. These abilities can also be placed on a continuum, which shows sequentialness to randomness. The Gregorc Style Delineator is a self-reporting instrument that allows a person to map his or her own abilities. One can score high or low in: concrete/sequential (CS), abstract/sequential (AS), abstract/random (AR), and concrete/random (CR).

People who score high in one or more of the abilities listed above tend to utilize those abilities in their learning and processing. Characteristics in each category can be compared to those in other categories (Gregorc, 1982).

These characteristics can be used to describe the ways adults think and learn in a particular environment. In this study, the Gregorc Style Delineator was administered to the elementary school vice principal/school liaison, the university dean of the school of education, the university liaison, and myself. This information helps in describing the context within which the innovation was initiated and nurtured.

The instrument consists of 10 different sets of descriptive words that are scored by the participant, with 4 being most descriptive of himself/herself, to 1 being least descriptive of himself/herself. The recommended time for word ranking is 4 minutes. Gregorc (1985) describes the style delineator as a "psychological association test that requires an individual to actively connect its words with personal thoughts and feelings. It prompts to life, or to light, something that has been seen, heard, felt, or experienced. The intensity of this association is measured by ranking words in descending order -- 4, 3, 2, 1" (p. 154). Once the individual has ranked the words on the instrument, there are
directions to follow for scoring and graphing a style profile. Additionally, the instrument includes a brief style comparison that represents dominant style characteristics of each: concrete/sequential (CS), abstract/sequential (AS), abstract/random (AR), and concrete/random (CR). A description of the construct validity and reliability for the instrument can be found in the administrative manual (Gregorc, 1985).

The rationale for using this inventory is that it will provide one way of understanding how the administration and the liaisons at both the elementary school and university relate to the development process, and helps to describe the context of the establishment of the PDS. The instruments that I used helped me to describe the context in which the PDS planning process happened. This type of information is included for providing data about the context within which things operate. It is not for me to predict. It is not for me to generalize. It is for me to describe what the people are like and the context in which they operate.

All surveys are included as raw data in Volumes 1 and 2.

**Documents and Records**

The artifacts of this study include documents collected from novice, practicing, and expert sources. Additionally, documents in the form of journal responses collected after meetings are included.

All documents and records are included as raw data in Volumes 1 and 2.
Data Analysis Techniques

Mirriam (1988) describes data analysis as “the process of making sense out of one’s data” (p. 127). In order for me to make sense of the data that I collected, I organized it topically and chronologically. As I read and reread, I jotted down notes, comments, observations, and questions in the margin. I expect the notes to “serve to isolate the initially most striking, if not ultimately most important, aspects of the data” (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 191). I also kept a separate running list of major ideas that cut across much of the data.

I also identified “units of information” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 344) from interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents. These units consist of a phrase, a sentence, or a paragraph. I then put each unit of information on a separate index card and coded it according to the category it represents. The resulting categories later emerged as themes and concepts.

All notes, comments, observations, and coded index cards are included as raw data in Volumes 1 and 2.

The Role of the Researcher

At times my role in this research project was one of participant observer. As a participant observer I had a dual purpose: (1) to engage in activities appropriate to the situation, and (2) to observe the activities, people, and physical aspects of the situation (Spradley, 1980). It was necessary for me to participate with other school and university faculty in the establishment of the PDS. At other times my role was as observer and/or interviewer.
Organization of the Study

Chapter 3 is devoted to a discussion of the historical and philosophical reform of PDSs. Chapter 4 gives an account of the findings of the IC and its use in defining PDS. Chapter 5 includes a description of the settings, informants and relationships, and reveals details regarding the establishment of a partnership between one elementary school and one university. Chapter 6 discusses expert and participant PDSs and stages of PDS development. Chapter 7, the final chapter, provides a summary with conclusions and recommendations from the research findings, as well as suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER THREE

HISTORICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL AND CURRENT CONTEXT
OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

Introduction

"Traditional teacher education programs tend to reinforce the division between theory and practice," so says Susan Walters (1998, p. 3). Although teacher education course work is based on research and theory, practice in schools is influenced by less-formal, context-based knowledge (Darling-Hammond, 1994). The separation of these two types of knowledge in traditional teacher education programs is exemplified by the advice often given to new teachers to forget everything they learned at the university (Sockett, 1993). However, theory and practice have joined forces in the Professional Development School (Walters, 1998).

PDS developers recognize that knowledge is also created by the practitioner. Involving teachers as equal partners in program design and delivery allows utilization of the expertise of both school and university faculty, although the resulting "rub between theory and practice" (Miller & Silvernail, 1994) creates new tensions. It also opens conversations about the best practices between the two groups (Sockett, 1993).

Historical and Philosophical Background

The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in
Education, 1983) prompted a national interest in educational reform and led to an onslaught of state legislation primarily designed to tightly control teachers and local schools through graduation standards, statewide student testing, teacher testing, and new procedures for teacher licensure (Futrell, 1989). As this wave of legislation increased bureaucratic regulation, concern grew that reform efforts would fail unless teachers and administrators were involved (Walters, 1998). Without teacher enthusiasm, commitment, and effort, needed changes in schools would not take place (Carnegie Corporation, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Holmes Group, 1986, 1990; Lieberman & Miller, 1991).

These concerns led to a second wave of reform, illustrated by The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (Carnegie Corporation, 1986), which advocated the professionalization of teaching. To grant teachers the discretion and autonomy characteristic of a profession, site-based decision-making and deregulation of schools was recommended. Because authority for decision-making is grounded in professional competence, working conditions in schools must support intellectual work. The report published by the Carnegie Corporation also suggests the need to improve professional development opportunities for experienced teachers as well as preservice training through the creation of clinical schools (Walters, 1998).

The Holmes Group (1986, 1990) first suggested PDSs as a vehicle for connecting school reform to teacher development under an agenda for preservice teacher education. Based on long-term partnerships between schools and universities, these schools educate both novice and experienced teachers while university and school faculty collaborate on educational research and development (Walters, 1998). Through partnerships based on
mutual trust, respect, and parity, the PDS serves as a catalyst for systemic reform (National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teacher Education [NCREST], 1993).

Walters (1998) believes that PDSs redefine the relationship between schools and universities. She states that most traditional teacher education programs require only minimal involvement by teachers, generally limited to service as supervising teachers. In PDSs, teacher-preparation curriculum is developed jointly by university and school faculty. Walters (1998) asserts that reorganizing teacher education to take place in schools that are restructuring as centers of inquiry results in new roles for teachers.

Levine (1998a) agrees that the idea of clinical schools, or PDSs, was invented to respond to the identified need for stronger clinical education provided in a collaborative relationship between university and school—places in which university and school would each contribute to the development of the new practitioner. She suggests also that the Holmes Group (1986, 1990, 1995), and before them the Task Force on Education and Economy (Carnegie Corporation, 1986) and John Goodlad (1986), called for such innovation—schools that support novice and experienced teachers learning in the course of teaching, schools in which teachers grounded their work in a professional knowledge base, and schools in which teachers worked and collectively sought ways to meet their students’ learning needs.

Levine (1998a) believes that part of the power of these ideas came from the strong philosophical basis on which they were building. Both professionalization of teaching and the school as a center of inquiry have philosophical roots in the progressive
movement. John Dewey, when developing his Laboratory School, thought of teachers as students of learning who could and should reflect on their own practice and learn from one another (Levine, 1992, p. 8). The notion of teacher as learner was further developed by Lucy Sprague Mitchell (1950), in Schaefer's "schools of inquiry" (1967), and by Eleanor Duckworth (1986, 1987).

Another basis for confidence in the idea of clinical education came from how well it had worked in reforming medical practice and professionalizing medicine (Levine, 1998a). Many analogies have been drawn between the role played by teaching hospitals in the reform of medicine and the potential of PDSs in the reform of education (Levine, 1992, p. 9). In fact, says Levine (1998a), Abraham Flexner (1910), credited with being the father of the American teaching hospital, was directly influenced by John Dewey's philosophy. Histories of modern medicine (e.g., see Ludmerer, 1985) describe Dewey's influence on Flexner's conceptualization of the teaching hospital. Dewey placed enormous importance on the role of knowledge, experience, and practice in the development of the thinking individual (Dewey, 1904/1974). Levine (1998a) asserts that Flexner designed teaching hospitals to support the development of thinking practitioners in medicine. She maintains that he stressed the importance of teaching and learning in clinical settings and the relationship between research and practice. Levine (1998a) concludes that it is no wonder that educators who believe that we need thinking practitioners to teach in America's restructured schools would find a soul mate in Abraham Flexner and a model in the institution of the teaching hospital.
The Current Challenge: The Context of Teacher Quality and Education Reform

Over the last dozen years, recognizing the potential of the PDS model, a significant number of educators have invested themselves and the resources of their institutions in implementing PDSs. There are more than 600 partnerships today that are committed to the goals of PDSs: preparation of new teachers, professional development inquiry to improve practice, and student learning (Abdal-Haqq, 1997).

Linda Darling-Hammond (2000) described the following in her foreword for *Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education*,

> While there is increasing consensus on what teachers and their students need to know and be able to do in order to meet the more ambitious goals of the 21st century schools, there is not yet a well developed knowledge base about how to prepare teachers to do these things. Although teacher education has been much critiqued, little research has been done to examine the kinds of learning experiences that help beginning teachers acquire the knowledge and skills that underlie learner-centered and learning-centered practice. (p. v)

In addition to problems inherent in the lack of a well-developed knowledge base, Arturo Pacheco (2000), dean of the College of Education at the University of Texas at El Paso, believes that the attack on those whose job it is to prepare teachers has increased. Most of the focus of the criticism, he claims, has been on colleges of education, the presumed responsible party. During his lecture entitled *Meeting the Challenge of High-Quality Teacher Education*, he cited that in 1999 Congress mandated that a national ‘report card’ on teacher training institutions be put in place. He suggested that much of the criticism is politically motivated, or comes from a base of ignorance. On the one hand, the attention to teacher-preparation programs is good in calling for self-renewal and improvement of often neglected and underfunded programs in universities. On the other
hand, if no improvement is forthcoming, programs in teacher preparation will continue to be blamed for many things, some of which are beyond their control. Even John Goodlad (1999), one of the staunchest supporters of teacher education over the past 40 years, has provided us with a surprisingly negative assessment of the current state of teacher preparation. In short, Goodlad states, "As the decades of the 20th century passed by, the status of teacher education in institutional priorities dropped" (p. 325).

In his book *Effective Professional Development Schools*, Richard Clark (1999) echoes that the nation’s educational system is at a critical juncture, with a rare opportunity at hand. During this decade, he attests, many teachers will retire or switch careers. Schools will hire 2 million new teachers to fill these vacancies. He believes that how they are prepared, selected, and inducted into teaching will be crucial to the success of school improvements. Likewise, he adds, many professors in education will retire.

Clark (1999) emphasizes that renewing schools and renewing teacher education must proceed simultaneously. Many people offer many solutions to the problems they see with America’s schools. But they must realize that the schools will not change until teacher-preparation programs change. Clark (1999) warns that despite the achievements of the school reform movement, schooling in America is still in serious trouble. Linking school reform with reform of the education of teachers in partner schools or PDSs substantially increases the chances for lasting improvements in schooling, according to Clark (1999).

Levine and Churins (1999) are satisfied that PDSs are particularly well aligned with the prevailing vision of teaching and learning and with education policy, as we
move into the 21st century. At the heart of the PDS model, they believe, is a vision of teaching as professional—grounded in a knowledge base, collegial, and inquiry oriented (and a reciprocal view of learning that stresses deep understanding). PDSs attempt to provide clinical education that is appropriate for developing professional teaching practice. Professional practice requires teachers who have strong content knowledge as well as professional knowledge and skills, working collegially, solving problems, seeking solutions, and making decisions in the interests of their students, utilizing best practices.

That same vision of professional practitioners is at the core of contemporaneous efforts to create professional teaching standards for teacher candidate performances (Levine & Churins, 1999). Three separate national organizations have initiatives underway to create standards that will address quality practices for teachers from novice through expert. NCATE, through its NCATE 2000 initiative, is currently redesigning its standards for evaluating teacher education programs, which are to be performance-based (Wise, 1998). PDSs offer a model for clinical experience that emphasizes the characteristics that have been identified as important in NCATE 2000. Sophisticated and authentic assessment of new teachers exists through the efforts of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC, 1992). This is a consortium of more than 30 states working together on licensing standards and assessment strategies to be used with beginning teachers. Finally, there are the efforts to develop standards and assessments for advanced practitioners. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was established in 1987 to create an advanced certification process for teachers (NBPTS, 1999). Darling-Hammond (1996) noted that the three initiatives...
have important features in common: "The standards explicitly view teaching as collegial work, informed by collective planning and problem solving and by continual reflection on practice with colleagues" (p. 23). PDSs, state Levine and Churins (1999), are uniquely situated to be responsive and responsible for achieving the NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS common standards.

When the NCATE PDS standards project was initiated, it was somewhat controversial, according to Levine and Churins (1999). They state that some practitioners and researchers argued that such efforts were premature. PDSs were developing institutions, and there was concern that the articulation of standards might curtail the creative development process. Other practitioners and researchers argued that the concept needed rigor and accountability, or this innovative institution would disappear.

Levine and Churins (1999) report that there are at least four important purposes for developing PDS standards. First, PDSs are viewed as an important innovation. They have proliferated rapidly with little attention to definition and quality. Under such circumstances they can easily become an empty promise and a lost opportunity. On close scrutiny, one finds that many so-called PDSs are really traditional student-teaching programs, perhaps with a cohort placement. Others are pursuing only the teacher preparation part of a PDS agenda. Second, many PDSs struggle with issues related to supporting adequate time and financing for their work. Standards could provide the kind of leverage these new institutions need to garner necessary support from their partnering institutions. Third, standards can ensure that PDSs can play the powerful role designed for them in assuring teacher quality and restructuring teacher education and school
reform. Finally, standards can provide a framework to permit the collection of data across PDS sites, which would substantiate the anecdotal evidence that PDSs are better at preparing new teachers and supporting student learning than other clinical programs (Abdal-Haqq, 1997; Teitel, 1998b).

With these purposes in mind, NCATE initiated a project in 1995 to develop standards for PDSs. The first question they addressed was one of definition: What is a PDS? Levine and Churins (1999) admit that this presented a formidable challenge to the design task. They discovered that little agreement existed when the project began about what a PDS was, much less what standards for it would be appropriate. They found that some so-called PDSs were such in name only; some continued to offer traditional student-teaching experiences under a new title. Others, they found, represented major shifts in teacher and student learning and the nature of collaboration between school and university.

The second challenge for Levine and Churins (1999) to defining PDSs arose out of the considerable diversity in the organizational arrangements and configurations that were associated with PDSs. Their questions became: Is the PDS a partnership—sometimes with multiple school sites—or is it the school site in which the partnership does its work? Do all faculty members in a PDS site have to be PDS participants, or can a PDS exist with only a few faculty involved?

The working definition for PDS as described by Levine and Churins (1999) became:

Professional Development School. Collaboration between schools, colleges or departments of education, P-12 schools, school districts, and union/professional...
associations. The partnering institutions share responsibility for (1) the clinical preparation of new teachers; (2) the continuing development of school and university faculty; (3) the support of children's learning; and (4) the support of research directed at the improvement of teaching and learning. (NCATE, 1997, p. 4)

Although the wording used by each organization varies, major organizations—including Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER); the Holmes Partnership; and the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST)—concur that Professional Development Schools must accomplish those four basic goals (Clark, 1999).

Levine and Churins (1999) did cross-group analyses of definitions and principles provided by the Holmes Group (1990), NNER (Clark, 1995), NCREST (1993), the American Federation of Teachers Professional Practice Schools Project (Levine, 1992), and the National Education Association Teacher Education Initiative (Seidel, 1997). Not surprisingly, they found overlapping definitions and shared principles. But such statements of vision and principles, they insisted, lacked the specificity needed to provide guidance to the field and thus have limited potential in terms of how useful they may be to the practitioners doing the hard work of creating these collaborative institutions. For this reason, I believe, it was necessary to go to the field and do an innovation configuration—to discover the essential elements—to determine exactly what it is that makes a PDS necessarily a PDS.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE INNOVATION CONFIGURATION

Over the past several years, innovation has been the subject of much research in the world of education as well as business. When describing innovation in the world of business, Nord and Tucker (1987) wrote that innovation in modern organizations is a complex and little-understood process. Creating something new and useful is difficult and unpredictable, requiring special conditions that foster both imagination and the synergistic use of ideas. As a practical matter, they continued, the newness or innovativeness of something is not absolute. Something that is new to members of one system or subsystem often is not new to others. The metal axe, for example, could still be new to some primitive cultures (Nord & Tucker, 1987, p. 5). Borrowing and changing the statement a bit, I suggest that the Professional Development School, for example, is new to some school cultures.

Continuing to borrow theory from the business world, and applying it to the world of education, it seems there is a lack of agreement about what innovation is; however, two (business organizational) definitions are common. According to one definition, innovation is the first or very early use of an idea by any organization (Becker & Whisler, 1967, p. 463). The second definition is more frequently used in research on organizational innovation. It views innovation as the first use of an idea within an
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organization (Aiken & Hage, 1970), whether or not the idea has been adopted by other organizations already.

Nord and Tucker continue to describe two types of organizational innovation. Routine innovation is the introduction of something that, while new to the organization, is very similar to something the organization has done before. A radical innovation, in addition to being new to the organization, is very different from what the organization has done previously, and is therefore apt to require significant changes in the behavior of employees and often the structure of the organization itself (Nord & Tucker, 1987, p. 11).

When applying these structured definitions of innovation to the PDS process, I expect that for some schools and universities it will be a routine innovation; for others it will be a radical innovation, depending upon previous experience of the relationship between the school and the university.

Nord and Tucker (1987) define innovation as the process of introducing a technology, product, or service that is perceived by members of a particular organization to be new to their organization (p. 41).

Researchers in the field of education also made an effort to define the term as it is used in education. In their important review of knowledge-utilization studies, Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) offered the following definition of the term innovation:

An innovation is an idea, practice, or object perceived as new by an individual. It matters little, so far as human behavior is concerned, whether or not an idea is "objectively" new as measured by the lapse of time since its first use or discovery. It is the perceived or subjective newness of the idea for the individual that determines his reaction to it. If the idea seems new to the individual, it is an innovation. (p. 19)
The concept of Innovation Configuration (IC), as described by Susan Heck (1981), grew from efforts to conceptualize, define, and measure innovations as individuals in an organizational setting use them. Innovation Configurations (ICs) represent the operational patterns of the innovation that result from implementation by different individuals in different contexts. In the course of early research they conducted with different innovations, they noted that individuals used parts of an innovation in different ways (Heck et al., 1981). When these parts were put together, a number of different patterns emerged, each characterizing a different use of the innovation. They called these patterns Innovation Configurations (ICs). The means of representing the parts of the innovation and variations in the use of these parts, such that patterns may be derived, is called an Innovation Configuration Checklist (Heck et al., 1981).

Hall and Loucks (1978) maintain that the developer of an innovation usually has a "model" form or forms of the innovation in mind. Whether specified as such or not, this model will contain certain key characteristics or components that are essential to the innovation.

They continue by stating that as the innovation is disseminated and the developer's model is translated into practice in different classrooms, it may be unrecognizable. At the very least, one or more components may be "adjusted" to fit local needs. At different sites, different components may be adapted in different ways. Thus, any one innovation can be said to have several different operational forms or innovation configurations. Hall and Loucks (1978) define IC as the operational patterns of the
innovation that result from selection and use of different innovation component variations.

The key to identifying ICs is to first determine the components and the component variations that describe the innovation in use. The degree of specificity and the complexity needed is best determined by considering the use to be made of the information. An innovation developer may emphasize 10 components while a practitioner may consolidate these to 3 or 4. Further, the innovation developer may, and often does, tolerate less variation within each component than the practitioner (Hall & Loucks, 1978).

Hall and Loucks (1978) also observed that persons who claimed not to be using an innovation were actually practicing many of the same things that persons who claimed to be users were doing. In addition, many different people who claimed to be users were not. These findings led to the IC concept of the identification of "minimum criteria" necessary for being a user.

An innovation configuration focuses on the behavioral and structural characteristics of that innovation. It breaks down the innovation into discrete parts and identifies critical components that can be operationally described. The focus is on what people actually do, as well as the materials, behaviors, and processes essential for implementing the innovation (Hall & Loucks, 1978).

The idea for creating an IC for PDSs emerged from a meeting of Wright University (WU) faculty who were to be involved in developing a new PDS. Since this was a new program between WU and Kitty Hawk Elementary School (KHES)
(pseudonyms), the IC would identify the behaviors of users, the implementation processes, the materials, and attributes essential for implementation. The IC would provide operational descriptions that would serve as guidelines for the development of the PDS.

Additionally, as I searched for information about the establishment of PDSs, there was a lack of consistent, concrete descriptions of what users do when establishing a PDS. In fact, the descriptions were so varied I could not even identify a consistent definition of a PDS. Heck et al. (1981) identified the lack of concrete descriptions as one of the reasons why implementation and long-term changes are so difficult.

After Hall and Loucks (1978) defined the characteristics of several innovations through the use of the IC, they concluded that a lack of success in implementation could be due to the participants not using the minimum criteria necessary for success. The concept of IC allows the emphasis to be placed on the concrete and more tangible operational form of the innovation.

Using an IC will help to identify the critical components of a PDS, providing a picture of fidelity to the model. It will be helpful in providing a record of how a PDS is defined and established. In order to identify the components, or parts, of an innovation and to answer the question, “What is it?” Heck et al. (1981) developed a tool: the IC component checklist.

Before describing the procedure for developing a checklist to identify the configuration of an innovation, it is important to explain some of the basic terms
frequently associated with the IC. These definitions are those used by Gaikwad (1991), Heck et al. (1981), Heck (1981), Henriquez-Roark (1995), and Jones (1999).

**Basic IC Terminology**

**Innovation Configuration**: The operational patterns of an innovation that result when it is implemented by individuals in different contexts.

**Components**: The major features or operational parts of any innovation.

**Critical components**: Components that have been determined essential to innovation use.

**Related components**: Components that are not considered essential but are recommended by the developers.

**Variations**: The different ways to put a component in operation in the setting in which the innovation is being used.

**Fidelity**: How consistently and completely the critical components are implemented by users.

**Checklist**: A tool for identifying specific components or parts of an innovation and the variations that might be expected as the innovation is implemented in an educational setting.

**The Procedure**

The basic procedure used to develop an IC involves forming a checklist of components and variations. Descriptions of the procedures can be found in several sources: Gaikwad, 1991; Heck et al., 1981; Henriquez-Roark, 1995; Hord, 1986a; Hord
and Hall, 1986; and Jones, 1999. Hord (1986a) created general procedures for developing an IC checklist. For this study, I modified that flow chart to illustrate the development created by the school-university collaborators for the PDS Innovation Configuration. The result of this modification is shown in Figure 1.

Step 1: Identifying Innovation Components

I started by reading as much descriptive material about PDSs as I could find. Books and articles that I read included Effective Professional Development Schools (Clark, 1999), Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education: Preparation in the Undergraduate Years (Darling-Hammond, 2000), Change Forces (Fullan, 1993), Change Forces: The Sequel (Fullan, 1999), School-University Partnerships and Partner Schools (Goodlad, 1993), From Cooperation to Collaboration: The Changing Culture of a School/University Partnership (Kirschner, Dickinson, & Blosser, 1996); Professional Practice Schools: Linking Teacher Education and School Reform (Levine, 1992); Designing Standards That Empower Professional Development Schools (Levine & Churins, 1999); School University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988); When PDS Stakeholders Work Together: Reflections on Collaboration and Serendipitous Discoveries in a Preservice Field Experience (Smith, 1996); and Professional Development Schools (Walters, 1998).

Next I interviewed the practitioners of PDSs at the university level and two deans of education; I also interviewed experts, the Director and Associate Director of the PDS
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Figure 1. Modified Innovation Configuration flowchart.
standards project for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The following questions were included in the interviews to identify PDS components:

1. Would you describe a PDS to me?

2. What do PDSs look like when implemented? What will I see professors, teachers, and students doing? What would I see if I were to visit a PDS?

3. What are the essential components of a PDS?

Step 2: Identifying Additional Components and Variations

Observing and participating in the process of establishing a PDS at a local elementary school helped me to identify additional components and variations. During five half-day meetings, the elementary school teachers, and the university teachers worked together, in small teacher-groups, to develop our own PDS. We studied the literature, and I shared interview information which I gathered while interviewing PDS University deans, teachers, professors, and Marsha Levine, Director of NCATE PDS standards.

After studying how others defined PDS, we wanted to define what a PDS was in our terms. We defined what the critical or essential characteristics would be for our PDS. We did this by categorizing several different statements (from the literature we read and the interviews I conducted) into several characteristics we agreed could define our PDS. Additionally, we looked at the Kitty Hawk Elementary School’s philosophy, mission, and vision statements and aligned them with our current findings for the PDS we were
developing. We spent the majority of our time defining and sharing what we decided could be the critical characteristics of our PDS. Table 1 is a compilation of that effort analyzed by frequency for each attribute and its corresponding description.

**Step 3: Enlarge Pool of Components and Variations**

During this step I continued to collect data through interviews. Additional observation and participation in collaborative meetings with the local schoolteachers establishing the PDS also allowed me to collect supplementary data. This produced a database for use in the analysis of components and the delineation of the innovation configuration. Through this process I was able to identify a number of component similarities, and variations began to emerge. The checklist that emerged, identifying PDS components as a result of completing Steps 1, 2, and 3, is shown in Table 2. This list represents an initial list of components designated by the teacher groups on inductive thinking record sheets.

**Step 4: Checklist Construction**

A checklist (Table 2) with major components of the innovation was developed and shared with the faculty of both the elementary school and the university. They were asked to evaluate the checklist and to write down beside each component any changes they made in the components. They discussed the checklist, and agreed that it accurately depicted the work they had completed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Frequency of Group Choice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sharing, working together, open communication, encouraging, promotes and monitors the PDS collaboration, identify/delineates responsibility, emphasizes mutual interactions between PDS partners, promotes inquiry and self reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Delineates purpose, role. Describes practice, sets boundaries for PDS collaboration, governance operates under and shapes it decisions with the influence of PDS definitions, philosophy, shared vision, culture. Research, continuous learning, partnerships, community, shows results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time, communication, collaboration, shared philosophy, shared vision, change, integrative collaboration, synergy, bond creating, building positive relationships, work hard together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/Planning/Funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Establishes the standards that influence the development of the PDS culture, shapes decisions, encourages, promotes and monitors, resolves logistical problems, allocation and adequate time for development and implementation, building culture, space, funding, responsibilities, organizes, provides for material needs and time, creates environment conducive to learning and teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conversations, relationships, collaboration, trust, open communication with everyone, multi-level communication, takes place over time, involves both areas, and provides links to other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describes positive relationships, trust, describes climate, emphasizes positive communication, the definitions of PDS will influence the culture that develops within it, culture provides the climate that encourages PDS collaboration, the culture is influenced by the established governance standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Change, integrative, collaboration, time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All deal with basic requirements, specific approaches, continuous learning, shared vision, common philosophy, and common training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Commitment of all involved, change, cohesiveness, building a culture, takes time to make change, some types of changes occur over time, visible results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time, trust, and building a culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Time, space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Classroom Practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Innovation, university students practicing, inquiry, reflection, research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Professional Roles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professors, researchers, experts, share expertise, define role of professor, explain how to get involved, visibility/involvement/commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Activity, inquiry, analysis, reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Building a Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Environment, responsibilities, the glue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Education/In-Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learning, teaching, time, collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shared Vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communication, integrative collaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2
INITIALLY IDENTIFIED CHECKLIST OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL – APRIL 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment</td>
<td>All constituencies are committed to the partnership—the school, the conference, the union, and the university. The commitment includes four areas of teaching and learning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The preparation of new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Practice-based inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shared Decision Making</td>
<td>There is agreement among partners to shared decision-making in areas which directly and indirectly affect the mission and vision of the PDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time</td>
<td>Planning typically takes 1-3 years. The complexity of the process takes at least a year to plan and 2-5 years to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relationships</td>
<td>Building complex relationships takes time and trust. Real and sustained university presence at the school is essential. Consistent time is provided for shared talk about problems of teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration</td>
<td>A PDS is characterized by joint work between and among school and university faculty directed at implementing the mission. Responsibility for learning is shared; research is jointly defined and implemented; all participants share expertise in the interests of children’s and adults’ learning. Participants move across institutional boundaries to engage in collaborative activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shared Language &amp; Practice</td>
<td>It is essential that shared language be heard among participants. Participants can demonstrate ways, in which they believe and practice a common (shared) theory of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning Community</td>
<td>The learning-centered community is characterized by norms and practices which support adult and children’s learning. School faculty is engaged in the study and improvement of their own practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources</td>
<td>Resources need to be dedicated to supporting the vision and mission of the PDS partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Accountability</td>
<td>Multiple and diverse assessment and evaluation practices are embedded throughout the PDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Governance</td>
<td>The PDS should be able to document that working agreements are in place regarding decision-making about the PDS and participation in the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 5: Mark Users’ Checklist

Normally, after receiving the checklist from Step 4, changes are made and the checklist is given to all study participants for corrections, additions, and other feedback. Since they did this verbally during Step 4, this step was not necessary.

Step 6: Analyze Data

Though there are many ways to analyze the data collected on a component checklist, the most common type of analysis involves the use of a computer or manual computation of component frequencies. I used raw tallies of the components that were identified most frequently by teacher groups from the collaborative meetings. The checklist shown in Table 3 includes the component variations that are ideal, variations that are acceptable, and variations that are unacceptable. The component variations above the double lines are ideal. Those variations between the single and double lines are acceptable. The component variations below the single lines are unacceptable.

I repeated Step 5, sending the checklist with variations to the practitioners: the two Deans of education, and the experts, NCATE PDS director and associate director. Their feedback was not included in Table 3 for two reasons: (1) by the time I received their feedback the teachers, who had been developing the PDS Innovation Configuration, went on summer break so I could not review the suggestions with them, and (2) I am continuing dialogue with the practitioners and experts to refine and develop their suggestions and give feedback to the teachers for possible addition to their PDS IC, in the fall.
### TABLE 3
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL INNOVATION CONFIGURATION CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1 – Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ a. All constituencies including the school, district, county, and university are committed to the partnership including the preparation of new teachers, continuing professional development, practice-based inquiry, and student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ b. Some of the constituencies including the school and the university are committed to the preparation of new teachers, continuing professional development, and student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ c. None of the constituencies are committed to the PDS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 2 – Shared Decision Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ a. There is agreement among all constituencies including the school district, county, and university to shared decision-making in areas which directly and indirectly affect the mission and vision of the PDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ b. There is agreement among some of the constituencies including the school district and the university to shared decision-making in areas which directly and indirectly affect the mission of the PDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ c. There is no agreement among the constituencies to shared decision-making in areas which directly and indirectly affect the mission of the PDS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 3 – Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ a. There is a long-term (2-5 years) common focus and common purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ b. There is a short-term (1-2 years) common focus and common purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ c. There is no long-term or short-term commitment to a common focus or common purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 4 – Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ a. Sustained daily university presence at the school where consistent time is provided for shared talk about problems of teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ b. Sustained weekly university presence at the school where some time is provided for shared talk about problems of teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ c. There is less than weekly university presence at the school and no time is provided for shared talk about problems of teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component 5 – Collaboration

- a. All teaching participants move across institutional boundaries to engage in collaborative activities. Responsibility for learning is shared; research is jointly defined and implemented; all participants share expertise in the interests of children’s and adult’s learning.

- b. Some teaching participants move across institutional boundaries to engage in some collaborative activities. Some participants share responsibility for learning; research may be defined, but is not implemented; expertise in the interests of children’s and adult’s learning is shared by some participants.

- c. Collaboration is not practiced.

### Component 6 – Shared Language and Practice

- a. Shared language is heard among all participants. All participants demonstrate ways in which they believe and practice a shared theory of learning.

- b. Some participants discuss and practice a common theory of learning using a shared language.

- c. There is neither shared language nor shared theory of learning.

### Component 7 – Learning Community

- a. All participants are collaboratively engaged in the study and improvement of their own practice as well as the norms and practices which support children’s learning.

- b. Some participants are collaboratively engaged in the study and improvement of their practice as well as the norms and practices which support children’s learning.

- c. There is no learning centered community as characterized by norms and practices which support adult and children’s learning. Participants are not engaged in the study and improvement of their own practice.

### Component 8 – Resources

- a. All constituencies share in dedicating financial resources, physical space, and training to support the vision and mission of the PDS.

- b. Some of the constituencies dedicate financial resources, physical space, and training to supporting the vision and mission of the PDS.

- c. There are no financial resources, physical space, or training dedicated to the vision and mission of the PDS.

### Component 9 – Accountability

- a. Multiple and diverse assessment and evaluation practices are embedded throughout the PDS.

- b. Standard assessment and evaluation practices are present in the PDS.

- c. Neither assessment nor evaluation is practiced in the PDS.
### Table 3—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 10 — Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ a. All constituencies document that working agreements are in place regarding decision-making about the PDS and participation in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ b. Some of the constituencies document that working agreements are in place regarding decision-making about the PDS and participation in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ c. There is no document in place regarding decision-making about the PDS and participation in the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 11 — Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ a. All draft NCATE PDS standards are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ b. There is a written document, including a time line, describing how and when all draft NCATE PDS standards will be in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ c. There is no attempt to meet the draft NCATE PDS standards and no documentation to develop a plan/process to meet the draft NCATE PDS standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Component variations “a” (above the double line) are ideal. Component variations “b” (between the double and single line) are acceptable. Component variations “c” (below the single line) are unacceptable. See Tables 6 to 8 in the Appendix for overlap of (1) threshold conditions, (2) PDS functions, and (3) critical attributes identified in the PDS draft standards with principals, commitments, and purposes of national PDS groups and networks.

### Results of the IC Procedure

The implementation of the IC process resulted in a definition and delineation of the key characteristics of the development of a local PDS. Specifically, the IC in this study represents the essential attributes and component variations of the development of a PDS as described locally. The practitioners, including two deans of schools of education, and expert Eleanor Churins, NCATE associate project director for PDS standards, responded to the final Innovation Configuration, which included component variations. Their responses will be further refined and suggestions will be distributed to the local PDS IC developers in the fall. For a further discussion of their responses, see chapter 6.
Through the IC process, I was able to distinguish 11 particular components of an ideal Professional Development School with its variations, as shown in Table 3.

Summary

This chapter presented (1) the concept of innovation and innovation configuration, (2) the procedures for developing an innovation configuration; and finally, (3) identified an innovation configuration checklist for Professional Development Schools as described by the local school and university.

Through this study I was able to provide answers to the first question:

1. What is a PDS?
   a. What are the essential components of a PDS?
   b. What is the relationship between the school and the university in a PDS?
   c. How do school and university personnel participate in a PDS?

After diligent reading of the literature, and the incorporation of reported developer and expert interviews, the faculty participants focused on the identification of the behavioral and structural characteristics of the PDS (innovation). They created the Innovation Configuration checklist (Heck et al., 1981). Finally, the participants broke down the innovation into discrete parts and identified critical components that they operationally described (Hall & Loucks, 1978).

The following definition was used as a general guide to the development of the Innovation Configuration:
Professional Development School: Collaboration between schools, colleges or departments of education, P-12 schools, school districts, and union/professional associations. The partnering institutions share responsibility for (1) the clinical preparations of new teachers; (2) the continuing development of school and university faculty; (3) the support of children’s learning; and (4) the support of research directed at the improvement of teaching and learning. (NCATE, 1997, p. 4)

According to Nord and Tucker (1987, p. 11), Kitty Hawk Elementary and Wright University are in the process of experiencing a radical innovation; in addition to being new to the schools, the PDS is very different from what the schools have done previously, and it does require significant changes in the behavior of all the faculty involved and in the structure of both schools’ schema.

It is important to understand the context in which this radical innovation configuration was developed. Fullan (1999) states, “Successful reforms are partly a function of good ideas, and largely a function of the conditions under which the ideas flourish” (p. 64). The context of developing relationships frames chapter 5, and provides a sketch of the environment in which the ideas were shaped.
CHAPTER FIVE

DEVELOPING RELATIONSHIPS

The first concern for those seeking to build a PDS should be to clarify how the former relationships among schools and universities in general and prospective partners in particular may affect their success. During their more than 360-year history, America’s colleges and universities have had mixed relationships with their communities. Although some communities are dependent on the local college for their existence, there are also numerous instances of failed consulting and partnership arrangements. Nevertheless, school-university partnerships are being encouraged more strongly than ever as complex problems seem to demand collaboration (Clark, 1999, p. 32).

One confounding situation is that prospective partners often do not have a common understanding of what a partnership is. Two approaches may help build the necessary understanding: constructing a useful definition of such partnerships, and looking at the major stages of development that partnerships go through (Clark, 1999, p. 32).

A Definition of Partnerships

Although a wide range of practices are being called partnerships, the term is best used to describe a relationship in which different entities serve each other’s needs in a manner similar to what biologists refer to as mutualism. In other words, a true school/
university partnership is beneficially symbiotic. In such a partnership there should be channels of communication between the university and school districts, including a governance group consisting of the district superintendents and the dean of the school, college, or department of education as well as key leaders from arts and sciences, a coordinating group of university faculty and school district administrators, and interpersonal relationships that support open and frank exchanges of ideas involving teachers at both the university and school level (Clark, 1999, p. 33).

The story that follows does not intend to represent all PDS sites, nor is it necessarily an exemplar of good practice. Instead, I ask the reader to think about this story in two ways. As Walton (1992) suggested in his discussion of case studies, this story is an ‘instance’: It is a situationally grounded, limited view of social life. At the same time, as Wasley (1994) described, this school-change story is also a “tale of contemporary pilgrims set out on a shared journey toward better schooling” (p. xvii). Although I hope this story will reflect the perspectives and values of participants, I did bind the chroniclers to a predetermined set of questions—about the establishment and definition of a PDS. I expect that this story will somehow reflect the PDS and its context, however complicated it is for me to move between my role as participant and author/researcher.

I soon discovered that not all participant voices would be represented equally in the story. Some members had little to say when they were asked to contribute their perspectives. Some even chose not to participate or be present throughout the story. Others worried about ‘coming clean’ about their experiences, given their anticipated
continued employment in these schools. Some, in fact, insisted that I keep their
individual and site identities hidden. I have honored their requests, but acknowledge that
not all participants preferred anonymity (Shulman, 1990).

In their work on narratives, Tappan and Brown (1989) wrote, “The telling of a
story is not the rendering of facts, but rather the putting together of a plot that imposes
meaning on the events reported” (as cited in Gitlin, 1990, p. 46). I will propose some
ideas that may help the reader examine the meaning suggested by the PDS storytellers.
They should not be confused with law-like generalizations. Instead, as Carter (1993, p.
10) suggested in her discussion of the place of story in teaching and teacher education,
these organizers are “explanatory propositions.” These ideas may help make sense of the
dilemmas and problematics inherent in the creation of PDSs.

The theoretical literature describing the creation of new settings offers some
important lenses through which to examine the school invention story that follows. First,
it is important to acknowledge that the creation of new settings challenges the sacred
beliefs and taken-for-granted behaviors of organizational members (Sarason, 1972).
Further, since new organizations take resources away form existing initiatives, they are
watched closely; their visibility and high-profile status raise the stakes by which
nonparticipants measure their wins and losses. Second, because people and places have
long histories, participants in new organizations need to pay close attention to the time
before the beginning (Sarason, 1972). For the PDS, this refers to the time during which
participants at the school or university site may have developed problematic or supportive
beliefs about themselves, their work, and their prospective cross-institutional partner.
Third, as Stinchcombe (1965) suggested, inventing new roles, developing new relationships, and creating an organizational culture have high costs in time, worry, conflict, and temporary inefficiency. This is because the new organization must go from having no beliefs to new beliefs, from no rules to new rules, and from no culture to new culture (Pettigrew, 1979). Fourth, especially in the beginning, new organizations rely heavily on social relations among near or complete strangers. In new settings, the actions and attitudes of each member are particularly visible, since people have yet to develop routinized roles and responsibilities. Fifth, as Schein (1985) wrote, each new organization faces problems related to external adaptations and internal integration. Consequently, the new institution must struggle simultaneously with its own growth and its effects on the rest of the ecosystem to which it belongs. Finally, according to Selznick (1957), how the organization evolves depends largely on its early decision regarding where its resources are and upon whom it is dependent.

Planning for the PDS

During the planning year, participants in the PDS learned the importance of continuously examining their intellectual and conceptual understanding. While participants articulated a shared mission and considerable agreement regarding project objectives, their activities and processes in the planning year revealed 'conceptual blips' on the Professional Development School screen. As they worked to define new roles for teachers, they discovered an array of dilemmas (including sacred norms) that discouraged collegiality and connectedness. They discovered that earlier experiences had not prepared them for working in new ways with other school and university members.
Further, they learned that current institutional resources did not provide for teacher activity outside the classroom and across traditional role boundaries. School and university participants were not excused from fulfilling their regular role obligations during the planning year. Their work lives were complicated further by their efforts to connect the PDS to the rest of the school and university community; consequently, many spent countless hours sharing their plans with colleagues, hoping to gain support for the concepts and assumptions undergirding their work. Most significantly, they learned that the redesign of teachers' work would require forging new bonds with building administrators. As they worked toward redefining teacher and administrator influence, they discovered that not all school and university administrators wanted (or knew how) to play a role in the creation of this new organization.

The Context of Leadership in Planning

In his book *Inside Styles Beyond the Basics*, Anthony F. Gregorc (1985) defines administrative style as one “consisting of the behaviors, characteristics and mannerisms, and underlying mental qualities used to manipulate the physical environment in permitting an organizational vision or goal to be fulfilled” (p. 215).

The Gregorc Style Delineator was completed by the Dean of the School of Education, the elementary school liaison, the university liaison, and myself. The dominant results for each are included in Table 4, along with brief descriptors of thinking processes, negative characteristics and workshop/meeting expectations. This information is designed to provide a deeper understanding of the leadership context of the collaboration process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Roles</th>
<th>Dominant Style</th>
<th>Thinking Processes</th>
<th>Negative Characteristics</th>
<th>Workshop/Meeting Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean, School of Education</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Intellectual Logical</td>
<td>Belief that Aristotelian logic will eliminate all problems. The arrogance of intellect discounts and devalues all other ways of knowing.</td>
<td>Considers meetings a waste of time or a necessary evil... “This could have been put in a memo.” They will attend meetings that deal with their perception of substance. Want a meeting over as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>Analytical Correlative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Liaison</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Intuitive Instinctive</td>
<td>Impatient. Can be ruthless in attempts to get at the root of problems. Runs roughshod over traditional individuals or those with conflicting views.</td>
<td>Likes problem solving, participatory meetings; dislike rubber-stamping. Prefers agendas with flexibility. Want to meet and share ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>Impulsive Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Liaison</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Emotional Psychic</td>
<td>Unwillingness to see evil in the world. Wants peace-sometimes at any cost. Interprets aggressive behavior as transformable by the extension of a warm hand of friendship.</td>
<td>Opportunity to socialize and share common concerns. Anticipates group discussion. Likes format variety. No problem with meetings that run overtime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random</td>
<td>Perceptive Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher (myself)</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Instinctive Methodical</td>
<td>Short-sightedness, fails to see long-term effects of immediate political moves.</td>
<td>Meeting should be run by the person “in charge”: should have clear-cut objectives, agenda handed out well in advance and knows what the behavioral expectations are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>Deliberate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This data on the administrative body in place during the development of the PDS IC may assist the reader in better understanding the disappointing outcomes of university presence at the collaborative meetings. One interpretation may be that the leadership for the school of education only attended part of the first and last collaborative meetings held at the elementary school. The dean did attend the steering committee meetings where she helped create and run the agenda for the meetings. Although faculty from the school of education were encouraged by the liaisons to attend all meetings, the dean did not make it a priority; therefore, perhaps the faculty did not see it as such.

**Other Issues in the Planning Process**

At times during the innovation process, school-based participants were distracted by exogenous shocks in the form of school calendar realignments. In other instances, local site, conference, and university support for the project appeared to wane, leaving participants unsure about the short-term and long-term future of their efforts. During the innovation process, the university participants struggled to convince their under-resourced department to support a more expensive field-based model of teacher education. Further, bound by traditional university schedules, some university-based faculty felt considerable tension, as they could not spend more time at school sites, collaborating with practitioners, because that time did not necessarily lead to fulfilling class load schedules.

The PDS’s local context affected the planning process in important ways. For some, the new initiative posed unacceptable opportunity costs in terms of time, space, money, and staff. By the end of the planning year, several participants had lost their
jobs—including the site principal, the collaboration specialist, and the university liaison. Unlike other school and university improvement efforts, the development of the PDS required approval, support, and cooperation from the larger school community. Participants learned that the creation of new settings with new norms required lengthy meetings, ongoing discussion, and new kinds of intra- and inter-organizational connections. They learned that they needed more time than they had budgeted for planning the creation of a new organization.

The Establishment of a Professional Development School

This is a case study of planning for collaboration between a private Christian elementary school, Kitty Hawk Elementary School (KHES) in a suburban county school system, and a local private Christian university, Wright University (WU), establishing a Professional Development School. (In honoring the request of the school and university participants to remain anonymous, pseudonyms have been applied.) (See Table 5) As with any relationship, the parties entered with differing perspectives, interests, histories, and goals. In relationships that survive over time, the differences become respected and, to some degree, understood. In some relationships, however, the differences do not complement each other, the communication systems do not work, or the essential continuous tension of power and its uses within the relationship are destructive. In this case, there seems to be sufficient energy to push through the inevitable collisions and conflicts, and the choice is made to continue the relationship during the beginning collaborative stages.
# Table 5

**Comparison of KHES Professional Development School and the WU School of Education**

**Demographic Profiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Profile of Kitty Hawk Elementary School PDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students:</strong></td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Race/ethnicity:** | 95% Caucasian  
5% Other (Black, Hispanic, Asian) |
| **Instructional Program:** | Kindergarten to eighth grade  
August to May schedule for faculty, staff, and students |
| **Faculty:** | 98% credentialed  
2% provisional certification  
P.E. teachers (1 part-time)  
1 Librarian  
1 Resource teacher  
1 Computer teacher  
3 part-time Music teachers  
1 Spanish teacher  
92% completed Master’s degrees  
18 classroom teachers  
5 teachers employed 10 years or longer  
10 teachers employed 5-10 years  
3 teachers employed 3 years or less |
| **Administrators and Staff:** | 9 changes of principals since 1990  
6 changes of principals since 1995  
2 changes of vice principals since 1990 |
| **Community:** | Predominantly Caucasian  
Middle/upper-middle socioeconomic community  
High percentage of literacy among adult population |

**Wright University School of Education**

| Program: | Prepares fewer than 40 elementary teacher candidates each year  
Four-year undergraduate program  
Very few students of color  
4 changes in deans in the last 10 years  
2 Education faculty employed up to 5 years ago  
5 Education faculty employed 5 years ago to present |
The WU dean of the school of education became familiar with the PDS movement in 1997, during an NCATE evaluation at the university. At that time, she began discussing PDS possibilities with the KHES principal. In the fall of 1998, the KHES Visioning Committee decided to add PDS to its initiative list, as an “umbrella under which we could hang major change in our school environment” (Volume 2, p. 38).

In January 1999, the WU dean called a meeting, including the WU professors of education and the administration of KHES, to discuss beginning a PDS as soon as possible. By July 1999, the dean and the principal had appointed one elementary liaison and one university liaison to coordinate the establishment of a PDS between the schools. In August 1999, at a WU faculty luncheon, I decided to chronicle the establishment of a PDS between these two schools.

In September 1999, a PDS steering committee was organized and developed a plan of action for the school year. The steering committee consisted of the dean, the principal, the elementary and university liaisons, three faculty members from the elementary school, and three faculty members and a collaboration specialist from the university. The agenda items included reading scholarly literature and reporting back to the committee, a visit to at least one local PDS, and a presentation by another neighboring university professor about their PDS. Initially these meetings were filled with agenda items that led to diverse conversations about how to develop, and when to implement, a PDS. The dean suggested starting the PDS immediately, first or second semester. Having read several articles about successes and failures while establishing a PDS (Volume 1, pp. 116-226), the university and elementary school members of the
committee shared concerns they had about lack of collaboration and a history of poor relations between the two entities. After lengthy debate and discussion, all agreed that it was important to first develop a definition of ‘our’ PDS collaboratively before its actual implementation (Volume 1, p. 115).

A great deal of time was spent in the preparation of an agenda for a meeting to be held at the university to introduce the PDS concept to faculty from both the elementary school and WU School of Education. That meeting took place at the end of September 1999.

At the invitation of WU, all of KHES teachers and several professors from the School of Education were present at that September meeting. Additionally, the KHES superintendent and associate superintendent for schools, and the WU academic dean were in attendance to show support for the development of the PDS. The School of Education dean welcomed everyone and described how the PDS could benefit both KHES and WU. The principal then expressed the desire he had for “KHES to help WU produce excellent teachers!” and, “to work with WU to develop a plan to transform KHES into a Professional Development School. WU cannot set this up without our help. We will lend them our professional input” (Volume 2, p. 47). The next person to speak was the WU liaison. She updated the group on what had been accomplished up to that point, and then explained, “The next step is to get everyone involved. What exactly is a PDS? We will learn about a neighboring PDS today, and then together, throughout this year, we will define our own PDS together” (Volume 2, p. 47). At this point there was a break for
lunch, which was provided by WU. Conversations at the tables seemed hopeful for a new opportunity to work together in the creation of a PDS.

A neighboring university provided a presentation of its PDS programs. Included in the presentation were two university professors, two principals, two teachers, and two student teachers who were involved in their PDS. The professor was encouraging in his presentation, and confirmed that the PDS process is in continual change as he declared, “We are using a model that is still emerging. It changes every single semester” (Volume 2, p. 47). One of the principals stated that there were two things that make the PDS successful, “One is being sure there is a part-time PDS professor on site, and two is making sure of teacher buy-in” (Volume 2, p. 47). A PDS student-teacher reported, “The bonding is the biggest plus . . . bonding with students and bonding with teachers” (Volume 2, p. 48). During a question-and-answer time, a PDS professor responded to a question about the downside of PDS work, “The cognitive disequilibrium you feel when you begin any new program is the only negative I’ve experienced” (Volume 2, p. 48). The other PDS professor discussed the process of program design-change issues, stating, “In this program, you design the plane while you fly it” (Volume 2, p. 49). This statement intrigued me, and after the meeting I spoke to her about its origins. I would soon be meeting with the dean of the School of Education, whom she had quoted.

The KHES vice principal/liaison presented a draft schedule of the monthly PDS collaboration meetings stating, “October, November, and February will be half-day sessions (noon to 5:00 p.m.), and perhaps brief meetings at our faculty meetings if we
need follow-up after that.” She also suggested that the “critical point to be garnered from the presenters was clearly faculty buy in” (Volume 2, p. 50).

Finally, the collaboration specialist (employed by the university) closed the meeting by describing the process of the future monthly meetings. “We will define what the PDS is operationally, and how it is adapted to our site. We will be doing this in a very orderly and systematic way... discovering and defining the PDS, identifying 8-14 different components, and writing a plan to operationalize the PDS” (Volume 2, p. 51).

The Process

On October 12, 1999, I attended a meeting of the Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (ACTE), along with the WU School of Education dean, liaison, and collaboration specialist. We were interested in a presentation titled, Building Partnerships, and Characteristics of Effective Partnerships and the Perspective, from NCATE. The presenters, a PDS principal and university professor, represented a PDS located in a different state (Volume 1, p. 56). The demographics of this PDS include the distinction of existing in the fifth largest county school system in the country, where there is a high focus on accountability (Volume 1, p. 53). After a brief historical description of the development of partnerships, with the constant reminder that the PDS is a commitment/relationship process, the presenters declared what they believe are the three principles of partnerships/collaboration:

1. Money/Time
2. Top leadership must value and give support to collaboration
3. Faculty commitment/Institutional commitment (Volume 1, pp. 52-53).
Their presentation was interesting to us, as they gave suggestions that were new to us. For instance, in order for a school to become part of the PDS, it must apply to the university for acceptance, and must reapply every 2 years if it wants to maintain PDS status with the university (Volume 1, pp. 54-55). We also discovered that the school they represented was participating in the NCATE Pilot PDS Standards Project Field Test (Volume 1, p. 57). The university professor said that the “PDS standards and application process evolved through relationships” and that it was a “district-wide process.” She also announced that “NCATE asks us to do more than put our students on a site and call it a PDS. There is a selection process for each site” (Volume 1, p. 54).

While we spoke to them after the presentation, we were invited to their PDS to observe the program they presented. Within the next 2 months, we would do exactly that. The presenters were very informative and had had several years of experience with collaboration.

Excited conversation between the dean, liaison, collaboration specialist, and myself took place on the drive back to WU. The discussion encompassed an idea of doing a 1-month teacher-intensive workshop at KHES in the summer, which would include professors from WU in the learning and teaching process. This would present an opportunity to continue the collaborative and bridge-building efforts through the following summer and into the new PDS school year. Feeling excited and encouraged, we returned to our site, and began to plan for our first collaborative meeting with KHES.
KHES and WU Collaborative Meeting Number 1

October 26, 1999, found the WU dean and four faculty members, as well as the KHES principal, vice principal, and all elementary teachers, in attendance at the first WU/KHES collaborative meeting in a KHES classroom. The university and elementary school liaisons and the collaboration specialist were charged by the PDS steering committee with developing and implementing a plan for guiding the participants through the defining process. The ultimate goal was “To operationally define what a PDS is in our environment” (Volume 1, p. 62).

After a lunch provided by KHES was completed, the meeting was opened with singing, prayer, and a game of introduction. The goal for this meeting was to become familiar with each other and the PDS concept. The plan was for seven WU faculty, and 25 elementary faculty to be divided into seven groups, with one WU faculty assigned to each group. However, only three WU faculty were present. Therefore, several groups did not have a WU person in their group. Additionally, the WU dean of education came in late and left early. Each group was given two to three journal articles to read and discuss regarding a specific topic. Each group would also reveal their findings to the other participants in a 5-to-10-minute presentation. Members of the PDS steering committee selected the topics that were represented as follows:

1. Governance and Accreditation
2. Development (time, money, planning)
3. Outcomes (student, teachers, community)
4. Scholarly Literature/Research
5. Vision and Successful Implementation Practices

6. Professional Roles (teachers, professors, administration)

7. Leadership (Volume 1, pp. 57-62).

Each group displayed special talent as they presented what they considered the most important information from the articles they read about PDSs. Of some 94 comments made (then transcribed) during the seven presentations, the following comments were reflected in various forms more than once: “Makes a community of learners”; “Reinvents learning environments”; “Collaborative decision making at the grassroots level-partnership-equal decision-making”; “Redefining the role of the teacher”; “Renewing schools”; “In a modification of the teaching hospital model, the PDS weaves together student learning, student teacher education, professional development (or teacher learning), and research into an integrated environment for deeper level learning”; “Partners need not be exemplary, but need to be committed to continuous improvement”; “Open communication between college teachers, college students, and classroom teachers”; “Talking across boundaries”; “Innovative, non-traditional teaching and learning strategies” (Volume 1, pp. 6-8).

The theme that clearly emerged throughout the afternoon of productions was one of collaboration and the future partnership between the school and the university.

Fifteen minutes prior to the end of this meeting, each participant was asked to respond in writing, anonymously, to the following set of questions:

1. What went well?

2. What could be improved?
3. Any additional comments?

Of the 20 responses to "What went well?" the following types of statements emerged as typical: "It was exciting to see how creatively some groups reported their findings"; "I appreciate being involved in this process"; "Today's session and the one in September helped me to know and understand what a PDS might look like-I enjoyed our group and the discussion and sharing"; "I appreciated the abundance of reading material"; "It brought to mind many questions about PDS that in turn helped me process what it is we are trying to do"; "The articles we read began to give me a better view of the 'big picture' behind the PDS concept-before this I wasn't too sure"; "I felt this was a very appropriate meeting. I'm excited about the prospect of becoming a PDS. I think it will make me a better teacher"; "Thanks for having a worthwhile meeting and not wasting my time"; "Talking and sharing with other teachers about what their concerns were gave some new insights for me"; "Sharing with university professors and seeing their commitment to this program gave me encouragement that our time is not being wasted"; "It was exciting to read some of the literature on PDS and see the success it is having"; "I really liked having small working groups"; "You empowered us to find answers in our questions rather than expecting us to absorb information from a presenter that would allegedly answer our questions or create a clear picture"; "This was a collaborative experience"; "The KHES mission and vision are perfectly matched for coordinating a PDS school" (Volume 1, pp. 1-5).

The theme of the joy of practicing collaboration surfaced as what the participants seemed to value most about this meeting. Most of the above comments have an
enthusiastic tone about working together in small groups and sharing ideas. There was a sense of camaraderie and building relationships present in the room that day (Volume 1, p. 5).

Six of the 18 written responses to "What could be improved?" described a statement that was made more than once: "Starting time-our sessions need to start on time"; "Invite board members"; "Visit a local PDS site"; "The university professors and all teachers and administration need to be here during the entire meeting"; "All stakeholders should be present" (Volume 1, pp. 1-5).

The themes addressed in these comments share a view of concern that not everyone who should be represented is represented. Responses to this question that appeared only once were: "Concise definitions of some terminology—What do you mean by some of the things you say (I wish I could think of a good example)?; "We need smaller class size and multi-grade (ungraded) classrooms—we need to have a model school based on God's model in the book Education"; "Advance assignment for reading"; "Three hours straight was a little difficult at times to stay focused, even though we were well focused" (Volume 1, pp. 1-5). These comments suggest a few of the individual needs that were not met, which would be addressed at the next meeting.

The 15 written responses to "Any additional comments?" included several questions as well as comments. The recurring issues appear to be concern about lack of university presence, schoolteacher focus, and acceptance of the PDS in the educational community. The following statements were made at least twice, in various ways: "Will this community be open to making these changes that are necessary? I don't see these
changes occurring without a great deal of dialogue and education”; “At this school, the whole idea, while wonderful, is somewhat idealistic-this school seems notorious for trying new things but not sticking with them-this concerns me”; “People seem to be well focused today, but what can be done with the several who continue to work on classroom related tasks during the time”; “There should be WU faculty at our table, and the principal and the dean of the School of Education left early”; “I’m glad to see university people sitting at our table and collaborating with us” (Volume 1, pp. 1-5).

As I read and reread this data, a picture emerged of teachers, who although typically practice independently of each other, seemed delighted to work together in teams. Reading PDS literature and sharing ideas were a highlight for them. The tone of those teachers who were able to collaborate with university faculty or school administration was clearly more enthusiastic in their comments than those teachers who did not have university faculty or school administration present within their team. There seemed to be a sense of great frustration (almost anger) at one point as one teacher put pen to paper and scrawled, “This is a joke. Why do we work on this when ‘big’ people will, in the end, have a meeting behind closed doors and decide everything and so nothing changes in the end? We trust a little less and change a little less and eventually a school symbol is a pillar of salt” (Volume 1, p. 3). Upon further analysis of the next several meetings, it becomes painfully clear that as fewer and fewer university representatives were in attendance, more and more frustrated comments began to appear in journals.
The Quest for Successful Practitioner Methodology

Throughout the next few weeks, I interviewed two deans of education who were operating what they considered to be successful PDSs (see chapter 6). The collaboration specialist joined me during the local university dean interviews. This dean was from the university, whose professors, with some of their PDS partners, presented at our September meeting. The two November interviews with this dean, when transcribed, were 26 pages in length. She detailed her 5-year history of deanship, noting at the onset,

What I thought needed to be done was to remove the disconnect between this very dynamic troubled, obviously troubled public school setting and the rather calm waters that are higher education. I mean, we come in here and we teach our classes, and we go about our business, and our public school partners were experiencing enormous change, enormous conflict, enormous demands for accountability and we were untouched by that. So I thought that the interesting thing to do would be to somehow put those two worlds together. To see whether or not there is a way that higher education could get on board in this business of public school improvement. What I was really after was a mechanism that would put teacher educators in public schools on more than a visiting basis, but as a regular part of their work. (Volume 2, p. 2)

These two ideas, collaboration and university professors working within the public schools for a good part of their workweek, eventually emerged as two of the themes described by this dean as essential components for her PDSs.

Also, as detailed in chapter 6, I traveled to another state, with the university liaison and the collaboration specialist, to meet another dean, whose professor and a PDS partner presented at the ACTE meeting I attended in October. The two interviews with this dean of education, when transcribed, were 40 pages in length. This interview also included a trip to a PDS site, and a visit with a PDS university site professor, principal,
teachers, and 5th-year student-teachers. This dean began the interview with a brief professional and institutional history:

I've been a faculty member here for 19 years and so I've been a part of the program prior to the revision to a graduate program. I may talk in sort of wandering ways because, like any change effort, this was not a nice, neat linear experience. There were multiple factors at work and many different initiatives beginning and interacting. This is an institution that has had a long history of a strong field-based program in teacher preparation. We've been very fortunate here that the faculty who established this as a School of Education had a real commitment to strong and extensive field experiences and good relationships with public school people. So that was real important foundation upon which we've always been able to build. Because we had consistently built on our relationships, we didn't have to do the 'Can we trust one another, do we like one another?' kind of work that a lot of places have to do. (Volume 1, p. 40)

Throughout the lengthy interviews, the dean, the PDS university professor, school principal, teachers, and 5th-year student-teachers revealed the theme of supporting school/university relationships as one of the essential components for their PDS.

After transcribing the above-mentioned interviews, the October 26th collaborative meeting presentations, observation notes, and documents, "units of information" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 344) were identified. These units consisted of a word, a phrase, or a sentence. Each unit of information was put on separate index cards and coded according to the category represented. These units of information were used during our November meeting. The units of information from the dean's interviews are summarized in Appendix B.

KHES and WU Collaborative Meeting Number 2

On November 30, 1999, the same group (KHES and WU faculty) was invited to assemble once again, after lunch provided by WU, at KHES. The meeting began with
singing, prayer, and a class-building activity. Our collaboration expert defined our goal for this meeting: “To define PDS in WU and KHES terms by delineating the essential attributes” (Volume 1, p. 65). The groups then used an inductive process (Joyce & Weil, 1996; Taba, 1967) to categorize data from research articles and interviews, and reported back to the whole group (Volume 1, pp. 14-22, 65, 68-73). Each of the groups recorded categories on an Inductive Thinking Record Sheet (Volume 1, pp. 74-82). The categories were then presented to the whole group as follows:

Group 1: Definitions, Governance, Culture, and Collaboration
Group 2: Definitions, Collaboration, Outcomes, Logistics and Classroom Practices
Group 3: Communication, Development, Definition, and Professional Roles
Group 4: Relationships, Planning, Philosophy and Education
Group 5: Collaboration, Commitment, Research, Time, Building a Foundation, Relationships, and Transformation

In addition to the categories, the groups also were given time to define the critical attributes they considered essential for a successful PDS (see Table 2). There was a “mixed bag” of presentation techniques, ranging from one group member reading two sentences, to all group members presenting several paragraphs, to the use of selected songs to identify the categories.
Spirits seemed high as participating members began again to respond in writing, anonymously, to the following set of questions:

1. What went well?
2. What could be improved?
3. Any additional comments?

Of the 23 written responses to “What went well?” the following 14 exemplify the spirit that was present during this meeting. These responses were indicative of all 23 responses: “The class/climate building exercise was fun—also, I felt everyone entered into the process and worked hard—that is gratifying”; “I enjoyed the socializing and developing good relationships—the groups had good reports”; “Very efficient and effective way to identify the attributes of a PDS—this activity gave everyone a sense of collaboration”; “It appears that the faculty as a whole are moving closer to a shared vision of PDS—I’m in the ‘hyper’ mode of anticipation of starting—it feels like my accelerator is stuck”; “I enjoyed working in a group”; “The group gets along well—I was pleased to have completed the tasks”; “Categorizing the statements increased my knowledge and understanding of a PDS—I feel like we are almost ready to start developing our own PDS”; “I can handle the concentrated portion much better than the ‘games’”; “I enjoyed the interaction, laughter, and working together”; “We did pull some good concepts and generalizations from the material—seeing the interpretations of the other groups also helped to bring it all into better focus”; “Good thinking and reporting back”; “I really enjoy working with my group—since we are doing something new and different, it’s nice to be able to step into the unknown with friends—they think of things I...
don’t think of and send me in a new direction”; “Our group worked more easily and comfortably together—I can see how time working in the same group with familiar material in new ways brings increasing dimensions of understanding” (Volume 1, pp. 9-13). These statements begin to describe the maturation of group work, and the joy found in cooperation and collaboration among teachers.

Considering the 23 responses to “What could be improved?” I selected the following, which typify (two or more variations) the written remarks: “Shorten the fringe activities”; “Water on the tables would help”; “I feel myself fighting discouragement and skepticism—due to the lack of involvement from the university—what is their level of interest—of true willingness to develop a PDS and work with us?”; “I feel ready to move beyond general theory and get more specific regarding our situation at KHES—I still know ‘mountains’ of communication and collaboration will be necessary to make PDS work successfully”; “I am looking forward to seeing the results of the synthesis of all the work that has been done”; “For a few of us who need the directions written because we do not work auditorially as efficient, it would be appreciated to have directions on overhead or one sheet per table”; “It’s hard to do such ‘high level’ thinking after teaching part of the day—however, it did help to have it early in the week” (Volume 1, pp. 9-13). The pervasive theme to these responses seems to be personal needs and comforts which must be met, and a concern for the future communication and collaboration with the university.

Two outlier statements were of great import in that these two statements seemed to describe an undercurrent experienced throughout the meeting:
You two [the collaboration specialist and the university liaison] are super! Committed, consistent, hardworking, dedicated but the lack of involvement of most of the others [university faculty] creates a big question of their interest and willingness to be a part of the big team. What is their (each one’s) level of interest? Of true willingness to develop a PDS and work with us? ‘Actions speak louder than words’ and their lack of actions is shouting out a discouraging message. Can anything be done to convince us that there is hope honestly? Not fluff words and hopefulness, but proof that they are on board with the rest of us? (Volume 1, pp. 9-13)

And, from another journal, the following concern:

It concerns me that we will be losing the leadership of the collaboration specialist and the university liaison [as they were not rehired by the university the following year]. It seems to me that the entire idea of PDS is focused on relationships and to have developed a great working relationship with specific people and then not to have this continue seems like inviting disaster. I don’t believe this work can be successfully transferred to new leadership. Is the university really committed to continuing? (Volume 1, pp. 9-13)

The discomfort of working ‘collaboratively’ alone was becoming more and more prevalent as fewer and fewer university faculty attended meetings.

“Any additional comments?” was the final reflective response for the day. Of the 23 responses, the following 6 provide for a theme of concern and uncertainty that each response reflected: “When will we be a PDS—how will what we’re doing now change?”; “It is difficult to stay and write in this journal when there are so many things pressuring me out of this space”; “I appreciate the atmosphere of these meetings”; “When will all the WU staff and all the KHES staff get together to share and discuss this?”; This is going to take considerable amount of time and commitment by KHES and WU faculty”; “I think we all have a fairly clear idea now of what a PDS is, but the question is: What can we do to pull it all together and collaborate with everyone who needs to be
involved?"; "Is the university committed to continuing—where are they?" (Volume 1, pp. 9-13)

And, again there were two outlier statements of great interest: "I'm having a hard time now being excited about it with you guys [the collaboration specialist and the university liaison] going." Then, as if trying to discover a silver lining in the dark cloud of contract nonrenewal, another person wrote, "We did a ton of learning and realizations. Now we have formed our own opinions and no one is gonna take that away from us!" (Volume 1, pp. 11-12). The concerns regarding lack of university presence were heightened when the university did not rehire the collaboration specialist and the university liaison for the upcoming school year (the first year of PDS implementation). There seemed to be a sense of betrayal for the elementary school teachers because they had developed strong ties to the university liaison and the collaboration specialist, having worked closely with them throughout the last 4 months. The strong statements above speak to this sense of concern and loss.

**The Quest for Expert Guidance**

On January 10 and 11, 2000, the collaboration expert, university liaison, and I flew to Washington, D.C., to interview the Director of PDS Standards Project for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Dr. Marsha Levine, and her associate, Eleanor Churins (see chapter 6). (Permission was granted to use the true names and institutional name.) Dr. Levine was a very interesting individual to interview. She was very thoughtful in answering all of my questions, and generously gave me a great deal of NCATE written documentation of the PDS studies NCATE has
conducted. She suggested I read the Draft NCATE PDS Standards, and proceeded to hand me a copy that had not yet been released to the public, saying,

> When you examine this document, I hope you will find in there at least some of the answers to the questions that you are looking for in terms of the view of the field at the time when those standards were being put together. And all of the work that Ellie and I have been doing for the last 3 years on it is based on trying to use those standards in the field for the purposes of designing them, and revising them and giving them more creditability. They were developed by folks over a period of time who were actively engaged in this type of work and all of the different constituencies of professional development schools and alternate process. But at some point we decided that sitting around a table and deciding what should be the definition of criteria had reached its limits and that in order for the standards to be really authentic they needed to be lived in the field and that the next generation of standards will reflect what went on at those PDS sites. And, so we have 17 partnerships all around the country that have been working with us in using the standards and several groups of participants who helped us develop the project, visiting the PDS sights and looking at the work that goes on in the PDS partnership through the PDS Draft Standards. And we are in fact learning a great deal about standards, how to revise them, how to build rubrics around them so that they reflect the development like the work we alluded to on going back at least to what we call the 'time before the beginning'. (Volume 2, p. 86)

After transcribing the interviews and observation notes, and reviewing NCATE PDS Standards Draft documents, additional “units of information” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 344) were identified. These units of information were used during our February meeting. (See Appendix A, NCATE Draft Standards.)

**KHES and WU Final Collaborative Meeting**

The KHES and WU faculty gathered together once again at KHES on February 29, 2000, after lunch provided by KHES. The meeting began with an icebreaker game. Next we enjoyed singing and prayer. Our collaboration expert defined our goal for this meeting; “To compare NCATE PDS Standards to KHES/WU draft definition and the
KHES mission and vision statement” (Volume 1, p. 83). There were five questions designed to structure group reports. They were:

1. What is a Professional Development School? What is the definition?

2. What are the essential or critical characteristics? What would a PDS look like in operational terms? (We will provide samples of what we mean by operational terms.)

3. How do our philosophy, mission, and vision statements align with the ideas and practices of the PDS?

4. How can the topic we, as a small group, are becoming ‘expert’ about contribute to the whole group’s understanding of the PDS concept?

5. What topics, ideas, or practices need further investigation? What do we need more information about?

The groups then compared the NCATE PDS Standards Draft to the categories and attributes they previously identified (see Table 1) and were asked to present their findings and write comments, ask questions, and suggest implications (Volume 1, pp. 34-40, and 85-102). The result was a table representing the initially identified components of the PDS (see Table 2).

There was a great deal of discussion about the NCATE Draft Standards and the implications of those standards on this educational community. As the groups had ample opportunity to collaborate, the following are results of the presentations.

Group 1: Systematic practices in classroom teaching are consistent with our goals and our focuses.
Group 2: Advice to administration: (a) the university needs to be more involved in collaboration, (b) search for mutual time for us to work collaboratively, and (c) shared vision and definition needs to be created by both schools.

Group 3: We need to identify roles and talk a lot. We talked about doing some self-reflection. We thought it was really important to be using the same language and teaching practices in both the university and our school.

Group 4: Must be fully collaborative in all attributes. We feel there is a need to study to find out what a successful PDS is and to work together in making this model.

Group 5: Positive working relationship and a basis for trust between partners. And, we have a couple of questions: Who is the university PDS faculty, and whom are we collaborating with?

Group 6: Quality assurance. This gave us concern because this should definitely happen with the university teachers involved in decision-making about the quality of student teachers and master teachers.

Group 7: We had the critical attributes. We have a lot of questions about the implications of the critical attributes as an overlay on our PDS. What is the next step? We know we are at the threshold. How do we keep from reaching a plateau? Where do we go now? How do we know we are not spinning our wheels right now? We tend to think of this in future terms; at what point does PDS actually become a reality? How do we get this to be more university driven? And what if we don’t want to be involved? What if there are people who are not gung ho for PDS? (Volume 1, pp. 34-39).
The meeting was then closed with a few parting statements from the collaboration expert:

Sounds like we still have some discussion to do, particularly with our partnership if we are going to partner and so discussion still needs to continue. However, what we had said was that we would meet with you four times. This is the fourth time that we have met. So we could give you the report back, which would be a rough draft of what we had said here. And so that’s what our expectations were and that’s where we are right now and now it’s time for journaling. (Volume 1, p. 40)

There was certainly a sense of unfinished business in this last meeting, which was reflected in the journal writing. As had become our practice, 15 minutes prior to the end of this meeting, each participant was asked to respond in writing, anonymously, to the following set of questions:

1. What went well?
2. What could be improved?
3. Any additional comments?

Written responses to “What went well?” were indicative of a sense of success and of thankfulness. The following 10 reflections were stated in various ways more than once: “A great learning experience today—to see the NCATE Draft Standards was encouraging in the fact that there are standards for a PDS partnership—I hope that WU will take a critical look at this document and that this will be an excellent starting point for this important initiative”; “Seeing specific examples as defined by NCATE was helpful—it starts to put the ‘concrete’ behind the ‘abstract’”; “Wonderful to have agenda all laid out so beautifully”; “Thanks for the H2O and fruit”; “I appreciate your exemplifying professional perseverance in continuing this study and development of a
PDS for us even when you’ve/we’ve encountered some serious obstacles now [the dismissal of KHES principal, and the non-rehiring of the collaboration specialist and the university liaison]; “Supportive of PDS—stressed hearing/seeing lack of action from WU”; “I enjoyed seeing all our work put together by the doctoral student—it was helpful to see it in this form”; “It was helpful to see NCATE looking at the PDS and know that a lot of our ideas agree with theirs”; “Was interesting reading over the NCATE standards for PDS—each activity makes it clearer”; “Good discussions and presentations. I appreciate the doctoral student continuing work with us”; “Excellent meeting” (Volume 1, pp. 41-44).

Written responses to “What could be improved?” included 18 reflections. The following 8 ideas were suggested in more than one way: “We seemed to visit the same questions today—what is next?”; “Pre-portion is still too long for me”; “We always seem short on time for the activities”; “Would like to see an organized closure—executive summary”; “I still struggle with reading complex material in such a short period of time, yet making a critical evaluation”; “It is discouraging to see the lack of participation by the university and the great opportunity they are missing”; “Timing for the meeting today was difficult”; “The concerns are very real and do need to be addressed. I think we could easily have another meeting”; “It is amazing to me the lack of commitment the college is showing” (Volume 1, pp. 41-44). The theme continued to be one of apprehension about unanswered questions, and lack of university presence.

Of the 18 responses to “Any additional comments?” the following 6 typify the comments: “Now is when we either get busy or let everything fall by the wayside—and
the unsettling truth is that we can’t do it alone—if even one component or partner is not pulling their weight, the whole process falls apart”; “I understand the PDS process better now—I hope it comes to fruition”; “We need time for university and KHES to work collaboratively, we need awareness training for stakeholders such as governing branches from both partners, parents, staff, students”; “Many questions were brought to light that previously we wouldn’t have known to ask . . .”; “I feel that the KHES teachers should be educated in the ’new’ strategies and teaching styles that the WU students are learning”; “I am very afraid that this is it. This is the last methodical and decisive examination and stop we will take. It’s disheartening and shameful in a way. I’m way grateful for knowing the information and processes that we learned. It was great” (Volume 1, pp. 41-44).

Two outlier statements were identified as follows, and seem again to reflect the concern about lack of university participation: “Perhaps I am idealistic, but it tends to bug me that so much discussion is needed and yet with all the discussion not much happens. Perhaps the most frustrating thing about PDS is the seeming disinterest from WU, but maybe I am interpreting it as such.” And, an entrepreneurial teacher suggested, “Maybe we should invite other universities to partnership. In a capitalist society competition has value” (Volume 1, pp. 41-44). Interesting suggestions from seemingly frustrated faculty.
On March 14, 2000, the university liaison, elementary school liaison, collaboration specialist, and myself presented a Professional Development School Report, including the Innovation Configuration Draft, to the faculty of the WU School of Education. At this time the School of Education university dean suggested creating PDS sub-committees, to begin in the fall, and include members from KHES and WU faculties. She suggested four sub-committees comprised of Curriculum, Evaluation, Research, and Social. There was also a brief discussion regarding the selection of a class or classes to begin implementing the PDS in the fall. With very little input from faculty members, the WU dean and liaison agreed that Introduction to Education class would be a good starting point for the PDS (Volume 1, pp. 103-104, 108, 109, 110).

On March 23, 2000, all members of the PDS Steering Committee (with the exception of the two WU faculty members) were present to discuss the March 14 report given to WU. The report detailed: (1) the Introduction to Education class that WU professors considered implementing in the Fall, (2) the PDS sub-committees, and (3) the agenda for the last PDS all-partner meeting, April 17, 2000, as part of a KHES faculty meeting (Volume 1, p. 105). This was a brief meeting and discussion was minimal.

On April 17, 2000, KHES and WU faculty had the last joint meeting for the school year. This meeting included a brief presentation and minimal discussion about the final draft of the IC, the PDS sub-committees, and the scheduling of the fall PDS Introduction to Education class (Volume 1, p. 111). This report was sandwiched in between several other important topics during an after-school KHES faculty meeting. A
decision was made to meet again in the late summer to continue our discussion of the implementation of the PDS IC.

Many hours were spent during the school year to develop productive relationships with perspective PDS partners. In addition to creating positive relationships, the partners who were present at all the meetings discovered, discussed, and developed the defining elements for their PDS. As cited numerous times in chapter 5, there was a significant lack of university presence at all four collaborative meetings. The only constant university presences at the four collaborative meetings were the university liaison, the collaboration expert, and myself. The WU School of Education faculty, including the dean, numbers seven. Out of seven, only two faculty members consistently represented the university school of education. Consequently, only two WU School of Education faculty members collaborated with KHES, and one of those members was not rehired for the fall. The original WU liaison, who worked so diligently to develop a relationship between KHES and WU, will not be available in the fall to implement the PDS IC she collaborated to develop—not unlike the conscientious work of the collaboration specialist who guided the collaborators through the hard work of developing the Innovation Configuration. He too was not rehired, and will not be available in the fall for the PDS IC implementation.

School/university partnerships are necessary preconditions to the establishment of effective PDSs. However, they will reach this goal only if the partnerships are well governed, develop clear communication, and through this communication gain common understanding among all participants regarding school renewal and the fundamentals of teaching and learning (Clark, 1999, p. 55). With the discouraging lack of university
presence, and the non-rehiring of two key collaborators, it will be difficult at best to implement an effective PDS in the coming year as planned. Additional governance issues include a new principal at KHES who was not involved in the development of the PDS IC. I am seriously concerned about the likelihood of a successful implementation of the PDS IC in the fall.

Summary

The *Thorndike Barnhart World Book Dictionary* (Barnhart & Barnhart, 1989) defines relationship as (1) A connection; (2) The condition of belonging to the same family, and; (3) The state or condition that exists between people or groups that deal with one another. There is a condition that exists between KHES and WU; however, it is possible that a connection has not been formed, due to the lack of WU presence at the collaborative meetings.

This chapter presented (1) the concept of relationship/partnership, and (2) the process of establishing a PDS, as described by the local school and university.

Through this study I was able to provide answers to the second question:

2. What does the establishment of a PDS look like?

   a. What is the process of establishing a PDS on a local site?
   
   b. How are relationships between university and school(s) cultivated?
   
   c. What are the accountability issues of the PDS and how are they solved?

The literature, practitioners, and experts lent descriptions of how a PDS might be established. KHES and WU developed what they considered to be their definition of a PDS including its component parts. The literature also describes the possible stages these
partnerships may go through. In chapter 6, the experts and the literature will help to identify the attributes of the stage of our PDS, and define next steps, while we ascend the platform for partnership.
CHAPTER SIX

A PLATFORM FOR PARTNERSHIP

"The history of failure and disappointment in educational innovation starts with confusion of purpose" (Ellis & Fouts, 1993, p. 5). The purpose of this dissertation is (1) to define the essential elements of a PDS, and (2) to record the process of the establishment of a local PDS. The platform for partnership can be identified in five developmental stages.

Carol Wilson, Richard Clark, and Paul Heckman (1989) generated a five-stage developmental sequence based on their examination of 14 school/university partnerships from across the country that had been in existence for 3 to 5 years. I found this developmental sequence useful when trying to understand and create clarity of purpose in the KHES/WU setting. A modified version of the original description of the stages follows. The changes from the original description reflect continued observations of partnerships since the original formulation of the stages (Clark, 1999, pp. 48-50).

Stage 1: Getting Organized. During this first stage, founders seek to determine who will be involved, ask why the partnership is being formed, draw up rules for operation and governance, and determine what resources will be invested. The tendency to stay at this stage for a long time—permanently, in some cases—seems to be inversely related to the willingness of partnership participants to commit to a common goal based
on shared discomfort with existing conditions. If one member of the partnership (school or university) remains dissatisfied, the dialogue about structure persists. The length of time spent at this stage and the degree of conflict present also depend strongly on the context in which the partnership is formed, including past partnership efforts in which participants have been involved.

Stage 2: Early Success. Excitement spreads as participants join in conferences and seminars, discover that there are common interests, meet with outsiders who reinforce that they are on the right track, and recognize the really significant challenges that face them. This excitement is often recognizable in the glow that new acquaintances share at the end of a conference after they have discovered common concerns and had extended conversations about these concerns. Conference participants are often heard to say, “We need to do this more often” or “I didn’t realize school (university) people were really worrying about the same thing I was” or “This is so much more stimulating than attending a conference or a class where someone lectures to me.”

Stage 3: Waiting for Results. As this first blush of success and satisfaction fades, there is a lull while participants struggle to achieve some real results from their labors. Impatient participants bail out. There are doubters. Frequently during this stage, partnership leaders retreat to discuss structure, convene meetings to ask what the real goals are, and assign different people to formal leadership roles.

Stage 4: Major Success and Expansions. Next, when results significant to participants are achieved, the base of participation expands to include participants from multiple areas of interest.
Stage 5: Mature Partnership. Few of the many extant partnerships have reached this stage. During Stage 5, participants provide leadership to other major partnership efforts designed to accomplish similar purposes. They also accomplish their own stated purposes with great skill. Conversation is dominated by critical inquiry into the progress of their partnership. Community members and individuals from schools and colleges or universities involved are visibly engaged in substantive changes that go beyond tinkering.

Although Stages 1-4 were identified in 1989, 10 years later Clark (1999, p. 50) suggests there is “clearly another stage for many partnerships.”

Stage 6: The Death of the Partnership. Given the nature of partnerships, it has become increasingly apparent that there is a sixth stage, which is neither a reversion to earlier discussions of structure and purpose, nor Trubowitz’s (1986) “regression stage” but rather a stage of decline, decay, and death. Frequently, this stage corresponds to the cessation of external funding or the departure of a key player. In other instances, personal agendas of individual members may take the partnership in a different direction.

Current Partnership Stages

According to the above stages, WU and KHES have successfully completed Stages 1 and 2 as follows.

Stage 1: Getting Organized. “During this first stage, founders seek to determine who will be involved, ask why the partnership is being formed, draw up rules for operation and governance, and determine what resources will be invested.” As discussed in chapter 5, because administration from WU learned about the NCATE Draft PDS Standards at a recent NCATE university review, she invited open discussion with
administration of KHES about the possibility of a collaborating PDS (Volume 1, p. 38). Additionally, the KHES Visioning Committee was considering the use of a PDS as an ‘umbrella’ under which they could drape major school change (Volume 1, p. 38).

Concurrently, the KHES Board was suggesting the exploration of a partnership with WU (Volume 1, p. 28). Once the decision was made to have PDS programs, the elementary school and university liaisons set up the PDS Steering Committee, which began to meet immediately to plan for the first collaborative meeting. After the first meeting/presentation at WU in October, the chairperson of the KHES board decided to take the lead in developing the administrative policies. In early November, he typed out the first draft of administrative policies, and called a meeting with the WU dean of education, and the KHES principal to discuss the policy (Volume 1, pp. 28-29). The outcome of that meeting is as follows:

1. Financial Arrangements: WU will provide the following PDS Program Resources:
   a. Materials, supplies and xeroxing for teacher training and student experiences
   b. Secretarial services for teacher training and student experiences
   c. Expenses, honorariums, etc., of guest presenters, trainers, etc.

2. Space Arrangements: Schools will provide:
   a. Classroom space for students during the hours they meet for WU classes.

3. Space Arrangements: Schools will NOT provide:
   a. Office space for WU professor(s)
   b. Building keys to WU professors or students

4. Administration:
The Vice-Principal is the PDS building coordinator. Any decisions affecting facilities, personnel, programs, students or parents must be approved by the appropriate on-site committee and/or principal. (Volume 1, p. 114)
Stage 2: Early Success.

"Excitement spreads as participants join in conferences and seminars, discover that there are common interests, meet with outsiders who reinforce that they are on the right track, and recognize the really significant challenges that face them" (Clark, 1999, p. 48). This excitement was recognized in the glow that new acquaintances shared at the end of each collaborative meeting, after they had discovered common concerns and had extended conversations about these concerns. Journal comments which were cited at least five to six times after each meeting describing this 'glow' were reflected in variations of the following: "I appreciate being involved in this process" or "It appears that the faculty as a whole is moving closer to a shared vision of PDS" or "I enjoyed socializing and developing good relationships" or "A great learning experience today. Seeing specific examples as defined by NCATE was helpful" (Volume 1, pp. 1, 9, 12, 41).

Practitioner and Expert Responses to the Final Innovation Configuration

According to Stage 2, part of the successful development of a PDS includes opportunity to meet with ‘outsiders’ who reinforce that the participants are on the right track. Volume 2 is a transcription of the interviews and observations I had with experts and practitioners in the field. After each interview, I was able to share current application and information during the WU/KHES collaboration meetings, which was ‘reinforcing’ to the participants.
The culmination of those interviews is cited in Volume 2, pages 114-124, and in chapter 4, Table 3. After reviewing the work that was completed during Stages 1 and 2, I E-mailed a copy of the final Innovation Configuration, including ideal, acceptable, and not acceptable definitions, to each of the experts and practitioners I had interviewed. Each of the three interviewees replied via E-mail. As stated in chapter 4, the following comments are being refined/revised and will be presented to the PDS collaborative at our first fall meeting. For this reason, these comments have not been added to the Innovation Configuration. The purpose for including these interactions is to demonstrate how our PDS model may be affected by practitioners and experts.

The comment from the neighboring university dean of education stated simply, “I think it looks great. I have shared your list with our PDS people and they like your approach” (Volume 2, p. 122). I had hoped for more of a critique, and responded to her by requesting that if any of her ‘PDS people’ would like to take the opportunity, I would be glad to receive more input. I have not received a reply.

The comments from the dean of education from the out-of-state university had some concerns with the word ‘ideal’. When writing to me about Component 4, this dean stated,

I’m not sure it makes sense to have as an ideal something that (at least from my perspective) is unrealistic. I just do not see how you could have daily university presence for consistent time for shared talk... I don’t know how any faculty member could have that much time to devote and still meet other requirements and commitments. (Volume 2, p. 119)

I found her comments interesting, and responded to her by explaining to her that although it would be difficult to always have an ‘ideal’ PDS in every component, the idea
of the IC is to define what an ideal PDS would look like. And, I asked her, "Why strive for anything less than ideal? Perhaps there are PDSs that strive for acceptable; however, once they can demonstrate that they have acceptable critical elements in place, it would be imperative to strive for ideal. If the acceptable critical elements are not in place, then they do not have a PDS." I await her response.

Interestingly enough, the associate director for NCATE PDS Standards also took issue with the word 'ideal', however, with a different slant, declaring, "When looking at Component 2a, we have found that a written agreement is critical not idyllic." When comparing her comments with the out-of-state dean’s comments, there is an interesting paradox. The out-of-state dean suggests that ideal in many cases is unrealistic and should not be defined as such. Yet, Ms. Churins thinks that in many cases the elements are ‘critical’ not just idyllic. I responded to Ms. Churins that,

"Ideal describes the critical elements that must be present in order to be ideal. The acceptable elements are just those, acceptable critical elements. One can have no less than ideal critical elements to present an ideal definition of a PDS, and one can have no less than acceptable critical elements to define an acceptable PDS. If the acceptable critical elements are not present, then the PDS is, without a doubt, not a PDS." (Volume 2, pp. 114-118)

Additionally, she was concerned about Component 2b as well, stating, "The notion of decision making shared by only some is not really acceptable to the long-term survival of partnership." She continued, "In Component 6, I raise the question again about having it acceptable for some participants not sharing a common theory of learning and language. It matters a great deal who is not participating." This was an interesting comment, and I responded to her,
“As I have interviewed, observed, and read PDS literature, none, as I understand it, have this level of common understanding, shared decision making or shared language. Is there a school in the PDS NCATE Field Test Project where these critical elements are obvious with all partners?”

Other comments she made included, “What about distinguishing between collaboration and cooperation at the unacceptable level? A common issue is that you see both sides of the partnership cooperate very nicely but they really aren’t collaborating.” I explained to her,

“Given the definition of the critical elements of collaboration in an ideal PDS, it would be difficult to replace the idea of cooperation (getting along) with the idea of collaboration (moving across boundaries and sharing responsibility). Indeed, that is exactly the reason for the Innovation Configuration; it’s an operational definition of what a PDS looks like in its ideal state, what it looks like in an acceptable state, and what it looks like when it is not a PDS.”

And regarding Component 3 she wrote, “Not an area we have spent any time with in terms of how to identify length of time for focus. I would be interested in hearing more from you about what this means.” I suggested to her that, in the literature review, there were consistent statements about long-term common focus and common purpose, and those ideas were captured and discussed among the teachers in the collaboration meetings between the school and the university.

In relation to Components 4 and 5 she made these statements,

“You have very nicely identified the role of the university faculty in the school, but I do not see the teachers’ voice at the university. Recently, a university faculty shared her frustration about school faculty not being able to boundary span as well because they have not very likely been part of a university culture whereas the university faculty member probably started out as a classroom teacher. For real institutional change to occur, both school and university faculty need to be part of their partners’ culture.”
I assured her that was the focus of Component 5—collaboration. All teaching participants move across institutional boundaries to engage in collaborative activities, for children and adult learning. However, she was correct about Component 4—relationships; the focus is on professors in the elementary school. I told her this suggestion (as well as all of her comments) would be brought to the next collaborative meeting between our school and university, Fall 2000.

When referring to Component 7, she writes, "This is a big area of our revision process of the standards. It incorporates features like shared language, time issues, and inquiry is central to reforming these practices." This was very reinforcing to hear because Component 7, learning community, was deemed as pivotal to the success of our school/university community.

She concludes her comments with an update of her project work: "We are currently in the process of revising and restructuring the standards. We are also looking at the various options of how the newly revised standards will be used. (Used for developmental purposes on voluntary basis by partnerships, serve as a form of freestanding accreditation, etc.). Timeframe: December 2000—New standards completed. January 2001—Revision of assessment process for PDS sites. March 2001—NCATE board approval and decision about how to use them."

One other comment she made was of interest:

"As I read through your list, it struck me that it was designed for a single partnership between one school and one university. As we are learning in our work that is rarely the case. In fact, when considering the value of PDSs, one would hope the university would have all teacher preparation programs linked to PDSs, which means that multi-site partnerships are more likely the case."

(Volume 2, pp. 114-118)
My reply was simple: Because we are in a large parochial school/university system, and to our knowledge no one has completed a PDS Innovation Configuration within (or outside) the system, it would be advantageous to develop a systematic model that might be implemented throughout any educational organization. The literature review revealed that there had not been a systematic study of the establishment of a PDS. This seemed like the perfect opportunity to describe in detail how the school/university partnership is developed. But certainly, I added, we would be happy to encourage other elementary schools, middle schools, and secondary schools in our neighboring area to participate in developing multi-site partnerships! I expect our interaction over the net to continue as we strive to obtain the ideal PDS.

Because this PDS has just completed Stage 2, we have not had the opportunity to experience Stages 3, 4, or 5. However, being able to go through Stages 1 and 2 has led to preparing for Stage 3, as identified in the March 14, 23, and April 17 meeting agendas and outcomes (Volume 1, pp. 103–111).

**Summary**

This chapter presented (1) the stages of a partnership, (2) implications of national standards on a local PDS, and (3) implications of the stages on a local PDS.

Through this study I was able to provide answers to the third question. What are the implications of a PDS on local school change, school/university relationships, and national standards?

To summarize, we have completed Stages 1 and 2—getting organized and early success. Currently we are at Stage 3—implementation and waiting for results. The
implications for this stage could be disastrous because of the significant school governance and university faculty changes that have developed.

The implications of the national standards on our local PDS suggest we will have some refining to do as we implement the IC and continue to work toward the ideal PDS.

Several conclusions and recommendations can be drawn from the work of collaboration and the development of the Innovation Configuration for the Professional Development School. These are considered in chapter 7.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Back to the Purpose or This Is What Makes a Plane a Plane

The purpose of this study was to describe what the establishment of a PDS looks like in the context of its local development. In chapters 3 through 6, I presented a case study of the development of a PDS. The case study was used to: (1) describe a PDS in operational terms as well as to describe the context of its development; (2) to describe what the process of the establishment of a PDS looks like; and (3) to describe the implications of a PDS on school-university relationships, and national standards.

I described the case study by conducting a qualitative inquiry using interviews, observations, surveys, documents, literature, and field notes as tools for data collection. The analysis of the data and my interpretations of the findings led me to draw some plausible conclusions about implementing innovative school renewal initiatives. The findings of this research are documented in this chapter.

General Conclusions or Drawing Up the Blueprint

Through my review of the literature and the data from the study of the development of a PDS, I witnessed the well-documented struggle between theory and
practice that often presents a challenge to those educators who are implementing change initiatives (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Eisner, 1991). From my analysis of the data collected for this study I drew some conclusions that may apply to PDS developers and practitioners. These conclusions emerged as (1) defining the essential elements of a PDS, (2) developing relationships, and (3) identifying stages of the PDS.

**Defining the Essential Elements of a PDS or Now We Know It's a Plane That's Flying**

Until now, PDSs have not been described in operational and observable terms. Because we have defined and described its attributes, now we know it is a plane that is flying. It is not a bird. It is not a helicopter. It is not a hot air balloon. We can look at it through the Innovation Configuration (IC) "goggles," see the attributes and essential elements, and know it is indeed an airplane we are flying.

My survey of the literature on implementing innovations revealed that innovations need to be clearly operationalized before they can be developed and implemented (Charters & Jones, 1973). An Innovation Configuration (IC) is a system which can be used to operationally define and describe the goals as well as the attributes of educational programs (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987). The concept of PDSs is an important innovation in American schools. "They are the locus of extremely important work in renewing schools and the education of educators. . . . However, people who work in and study such schools have varying views regarding what they are" (Clark, 1999, p. 1). The PDS innovation configuration allows others who study, develop, and establish a PDS to understand the process of its development and to gain a historical perspective,
which they can use as a point of reference for interpretation, comparisons, and further research. Additionally, and perhaps most important, is that the PDS IC provides a level of accountability that has not been practiced before.

Developing Relationships or Flying Solo Is Dangerous

Traditional collaborations require little or no reform on the part of the larger organizations in which they exist because roles and authority relations remain fundamentally unchanged. Those collaborations maintain the view of teaching as a craft learned, in large part, through apprenticeship with an experienced mentor (Neufeld, 1992, p. 136).

Professional Development Schools, in contrast, would require changes in roles, role relations, ideas about teaching practice, and teacher education. PDSs pose new challenges because they require us to alter our image of teachers from one of lone practitioners working with groups of students to one of members of collegial teaching teams that support inquiry into practice as a professional norm (Neufeld, 1992, p. 137).

Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith (1994, p. 14) posit that the single greatest learning tool of any organization is conversation. Placing teachers, teacher educators, and pre-practice teachers in a culture where conversation is natural, encouraged, and rewarding results in increased learning.

Hord (1986b) defined collaboration as “a term that implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making.” She then suggested that cooperation, on the other hand, is “a term that assumes two or more parties, each
with separate and autonomous programs, agree to work together in making all such programs more successful” (Hord, 1986b, p. 22).

Hord (1986b) compares these definitions with the following, which were developed by the New England Program in Teacher Education in 1973:

Collaboration—development of the model of joint planning, joint implementation, and joint evaluation between individuals or organizations.

Cooperation—two individuals or organizations reach some mutual agreement but their work together does not progress beyond this level. (p. 22)

An essential point of difference often appears to be the extent to which the relating agencies function as equals, and in so doing are willing to give up some of their autonomy. That issue has been, and continues to be, central to the entire question of school/university relationships. There are school/university relationships that are simply defined as cooperative. However, to define a PDS, the relationship must be collaborative.

The data collected from the establishment of a local PDS confirms that KHES and WU have a cooperative relationship—not collaboration. A true school/university partnership is beneficially symbiotic (Clark, 1999, p. 33). The channels of KHES-WU communications do not include key leaders from Arts and Sciences, nor do they include a participating group of university education faculty, nor has there been open and frank exchanges of ideas involving teachers at both the university and school level.

This data demonstrates that although KHES teachers have read and reported, at great length about PDS’s and collaboration, they have not experienced collaboration with WU. In general their written statements reflected that they “liked working and learning
together.” However, they also reflected a serious lack of WU participation with frustrated comments like, “I find myself fighting discouragement and skepticism due to lack of WU involvement.”

A Professional Development School cannot exist without collaboration—as defined in the PDS IC. It will crash and burn. Flying solo is dangerous.

**Identifying Stages of the PDS or Is the Plane Ready to Fly or Is It in Need of Repair, or Is It Ready to Go to Plane Heaven?**

Although as Clark (1999) suggests we are ready for the third stage of implementation, with such a significant lack of WU participation, I am not sure we can implement the PDS. The stages tell us if we have collaborated we are at Stage 3. However, they also imply if there is not collaboration, we might still be at Stage 1, getting organized. Is this plane ready to fly, in need of repair, or should it just go to heaven (as Clark suggests in Stage 6, the death of a partnership)?

Traditional school/university interaction has been characterized by the hierarchical model of the university as the educators of teachers. Whereas recent attempts at interaction favor more collaborative relationships such as PDSs, successful partnerships utilizing a collaborative design have been complex and problematic (Lieberman & Miller, 1992; Sirotnik & Goodlad, 1988). Dixon and Ishler (1992) indicated that “given the anxiety produced by even the thought of change, it is not surprising that faculty of both colleges of education and schools would choose to ‘coast by’ one another for so many years” (p. 28).
Despite the challenges associated with using the collaborative design, it holds the potential of positively impacting all partnership stakeholder groups. Greater understanding, acceptance, and willingness to work through the complex issues surrounding the culture, tasks, and roles of both entities might allow for a greater degree of collaboration between them. The university could experience growth and impact schools in a more extensive way if they were perceived as willing to come into school/university partnerships as supportive learners. Button and Ponticell (1996) indicate that “this requires that university researchers give up the exclusivity of their expert status and welcome the expertise of others in the educational community as teachers, learners, and researchers” (p. 18). This stance could enable the university to take the first step to ease feelings of anxiety that are generated by collaborative change initiatives.

In this private Christian school system, there has been little collaboration between the university and its elementary school system. Previous attempts at collaboration were limited to university representatives serving on educational boards, executive committees, and a few curriculum committees (Brantley, 1995). Other attempts have included elementary school teachers teaching summer university-level classes with no training or mentoring. Thus, in striving to forge a collaborative partnership to develop and implement a PDS, KHES and WU were attempting something that has not been practiced in this school system.

In developing the PDS, representatives from KHES and WU were anxious to collaborate. But even with a seemingly high degree of commitment, and expertise on
both sides, there were still issues of roles, ownership, and professional identity. It was almost impossible for the group to adequately allocate time to communicate openly, clarify roles, and develop a common understanding about how to deal with all the issues that challenged them. When concern surfaced from KHES members regarding lack of attendance of WU members in meetings, efforts were made to deal with the feelings of frustration by the WU dean of the School of Education. She attended part of a KHES faculty meeting to explain that the reason the WU professors had not attended more meetings was because their teaching schedule would not allow for it. This statement was met with disdain and blank stares from the KHES faculty who had worked long and hard defining collaboration and PDS, with only 2 out of 6 WU faculty consistently in attendance. There was a limited level of success in collaboration because only 1 entity (KHES) seemed committed to the planning process during the first year.

**General Recommendations or Here's the Kit, Now Build the Plane**

School change developers would be wise to use a model like Innovation Configuration (IC) when developing and implementing an innovation. The IC can be used to operationalize the components of proposed change. Impact studies of innovations can only be valid when innovations are clearly articulated.

A study of the PDS stages developed by Clark (1999), in addition to the PDS IC, would be useful in determining next steps for the establishment and development of the PDS.
Initial and sustained collaboration time should be provided for those involved in developing and implementing PDS initiatives. A structure such as teacher study groups advocated by Henriquez-Roark (1995) could be used to provide the ongoing and extensive collaboration necessary for a successful PDS. There would be great opportunity to build relationships while working together in teacher study groups. The absolute necessity of collaborative school/university partnerships should be clearly defined and adhered to when establishing a PDS.

PDS partners should invest a significant amount of time in collaboration if they are to be expected to work together effectively. This time can enable the partners to experience all the developmental stages that affect groups. Besides the development of the innovation, this time could be used to address such issues as roles, communication, conflict resolution, curriculum development, teacher education/training, and other success factors for the PDS. Additionally, there is a genuine need, as defined in the IC, to develop a shared philosophy and language. The KHES teachers and WU professors were invited to join a month long, salaried intensive summer workshop to begin developing a common philosophy and language. As historically demonstrated, the WU faculty did not attend. Ninety percent of the KHES faculty did attend. They are developing a common philosophy and language that the WU professors have not collaboratively developed.
Specific Recommendations for the Developers of Professional Development Schools or Pilot Rules

Partnerships are evolutionary in nature. Mutually beneficial and satisfying partnerships take time to develop. In the case of PDSs, both school personnel and university faculty must learn to trust and understand each other. In essence, such partnerships are much like individual relationships. Each partner must share equally and, at times, be willing to meet the needs of the other partner. The ultimate goal is the establishment of a new kind of entity, one that is long lasting and positive in nature with the capacity to energize and produce sound ideas, decisions, and ways of getting things done. To that end, the following are general recommendations specific to KHES.

1. The innovation configuration should be used to guide the PDS implementation process.

2. Weekly collaboration time (at least one hour) should be allocated to address issues surrounding implementation.

3. The collaboration should include the partnership of more than one university professor.

4. Systematic formative and summative evaluation of the PDS should be conducted.

Recommendations for Further Study or Beyond Kitty Hawk

1. Conduct studies regarding implications of the PDS on students, and perhaps from the student perspective.
2. Conduct studies examining the match between the NCATE Draft Standards and PDS practice.

3. Conduct longitudinal studies of PDS implementation.

4. Determine if participating in PDSs affects the level of use of an innovation as described in the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hall, 1974).

5. Conduct a study addressing the 4 areas of interest identified in the literature—increasing professionalization of veteran teachers, promoting and conducting inquiry, providing a clinical setting for preservice education, and providing exemplary education for a segment of P-12 students.

Summary

In summary, the continuation of school/university partnerships may be dependent on what we do about the impact on students and how we go about demonstrating advantages and benefits associated with collaborative efforts. Ideally, partnership research and evaluation efforts should operate on two levels. Inquiry must provide insights into what happens to teachers, future teachers, and university professors and how schools, universities, and institutions change as a result of interinstitutional collaboration. In addition, inquiry should reveal how the interactions between schools and universities better serve student learning. The basic measure of success in school/university partnerships ultimately will be the improvement of teaching and student achievement. Without this measure of accountability, partnership schools will not survive (Freeman, 1996). Likewise, the basic measure of success for practitioner research ultimately will be
the demonstration of rigor in relation to an appropriate set of standards. Without this measure of accountability, collaborative teacher research will not persist.

The purpose of my study was to describe how a PDS is collaboratively defined and developed. Its descriptive focus was to determine the essential elements involved in an ideal, acceptable, and non-acceptable format, developed in the process of school/university collaboration. The stories that emerged from the study about practitioners and experts highlighted issues that were framed in the body of the study, and in the conclusions and recommendations. The findings of this research could be helpful to others charged with developing PDS initiatives in other education settings.
APPENDIX A

TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE PDS Draft Standards</th>
<th>Holmes Group Principles</th>
<th>NEA/TEI Guiding Principles</th>
<th>NCREST Commitments</th>
<th>NNER Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Condition 1.</strong> An agreement which commits school, school district, union / professional association and university to the basic mission of a PDS (see functions above)</td>
<td>Principle 5. Systematic change (external): Involvement in systemic change at the local, state, and national levels. Principle 6. Systemic Change (Internal): Restructuring the college / university around the following: e) stated mission and goals</td>
<td>Commitment 1. Centering schools on learners and learning-PDSs should develop a shared, publicly articulated vision and commitment to a set of core beliefs that apply to all learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Condition 2.</strong> Commitment by the partners to the critical attributes of a PDS</td>
<td>Implicit in work of Holmes Partnership</td>
<td>Implicit in work of TEI</td>
<td>Commitment 6. Parity in partnerships - All partners respect the knowledge others bring to the relationship; knowledge is defined and collectively owned by all of the partners - students, families, teachers, and teacher educators</td>
<td>Implicit in work of NNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Condition 3.</strong> Positive working relationship and a basis for trust between partners</td>
<td>Implicit in work of Holmes Partnership</td>
<td>Implicit in work of TEI</td>
<td>Commitment 4. Commitment to developing knowledge and promoting inquiry-school and university faculty are engaged in disciplined consideration of and discourse about professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold Condition 4.</strong> Achievement of quality standards by partner institutions as evidenced by regional, state, national or other review</td>
<td>Implicit in work of Holmes Partnership</td>
<td>Implicit in work of TEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit in work of NNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold Condition 5. Institutional commitment off resources to the PDS from school and university (time, money, personnel)</td>
<td>Principle 6: Inventing a new institution</td>
<td>Principle 6. Systemic Change (Internal): Restructuring the college/university around the following: a) changes in the reward structure to include clinical work, b) reallocation of resources (time and money), c) restructuring course delivery systems.</td>
<td>Under Enabling Considerations: 1. Rethinking the regularities of schools (time, personnel, financial resources, and content and process). 2. Resources-financial support is provided for collaborative strategic planning and for the ongoing activities of the partnership.</td>
<td>All purposes: Resources-partner schools are supported by sufficient people, time, and money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 7

**OVERLAP OF PDS FUNCTIONS IDENTIFIED IN DRAFT PDS STANDARDS AND STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLES, COMMITMENTS, AND PURPOSES OF NATIONAL PDS GROUPS AND NETWORKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCATE PDS Draft Standards</th>
<th>Holmes Group Principles</th>
<th>NEA/TEI Guiding Principles</th>
<th>NCREST Commitments</th>
<th>NNER Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Principle 2. Creating a learning community-classrooms and schools organized as productive, caring communities of teachers, students, staff, and parents who work together so that everyone learns.</td>
<td>Principle 4. Professional preparation and development: Coherent program which includes extended and ongoing clinical experiences, strong curriculum base, mentoring and support for beginning teachers and professional development for experienced teachers.</td>
<td>Commitment 1. Centering schools on learners and learning-with respect to learning of new and prospective teachers, PDSs provide a well-defined induction process that is guided by expert veteran teachers. Commitment 3. Connection and community-special functions must be built on norms, beliefs, and values that can support the preparation and development of preservice and inservice education and the building of professionwide knowledge.</td>
<td>Purposes 2. Prepare educators: partner schools help preservice teachers construct pedagogical skills, curriculum knowledge, and attitudes necessary to educate all learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Development</strong></td>
<td>Principle 4. Continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators. In the PDS, adults are expected to go on learning, too.</td>
<td>Principle 4. Professional preparation and development: Coherent program which includes extended and ongoing clinical experiences, strong curriculum base, mentoring and support for beginning teachers and professional development for experienced teachers.</td>
<td>Commitment 5. Shared responsibility for the learning of all members of the PDS community-school and university faculty take responsibility for their individual and collective professional development and beyond their own boundaries.</td>
<td>Purposes 3. Provides Professional Development: Professional Dev. Links theory, research, and practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 - Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning</td>
<td>Principle 1. Teaching and learning for understanding—All the school’s students participate seriously in the kind of learning that allows you to go on learning for a lifetime.</td>
<td>Principle 9. Teaching and learning: Linked to student outcomes, student needs, and authentic/alternative assessment</td>
<td>Commitment 1. Centering schools on learners and learning-PDSs should develop a shared, publicly articulated vision and commitment to a set of core beliefs that apply to all learners</td>
<td>Purposes 1. Educate Children and Youth: communicate to create learning community; seek equity and excellence for all enrolled students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Attribute 1: Learning Community</th>
<th>Holmes Group Principles</th>
<th>NEA/TEI Guiding Principles</th>
<th>NCREST Commitments</th>
<th>NNER Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCATE PDS Draft Standards Critical Attributes</td>
<td>Principle 1. Teaching and learning for understanding—All the school’s students participate seriously in the kind of learning that allows you to go on learning for a lifetime. May require radical revision of the school’s curriculum and instruction. Principle 2. Creating a learning community—Classrooms and schools organized as productive, caring communities of teachers, students, staff, and parents who work together so that everyone learns. Principle 4. Continuing learning by teachers, teacher educators, and administrators. In the PDS, adults are expected to go on learning, too.</td>
<td>Principle 3. Evaluation and dissemination: Ongoing reflection on practice, evaluation, action research, assessment, documentation, and contribution to the professional knowledge base. Principle 4. Professional preparation and development: Coherent program which includes extended and ongoing clinical experiences, strong curriculum base, mentoring and support for beginning teachers and professional development for experienced teachers. Principle 9. Teaching and Learning: Linked to student outcomes, student needs, and authentic/alternative assessment.</td>
<td>Commitment 1. Centering schools on learners and learning—PDSs should develop a shared, publicly articulated vision and commitment to a set of core beliefs that apply to all learners. Commitment 1. Centering schools on learners and learning—with respect to learning of new and prospective teachers, PDSs provide a well-defined induction process that is guided by expert veteran teachers. Commitment 3. Connection and community—communities of learners must be forged within schools and across traditional school/community boundaries. PDSs are deliberately organized and staffed to promote collegiality, reflective practice, and continuous improvement.</td>
<td>Purpose 1. Educate children and youth: partners communicate in such a way as to create learning community. Purpose 2. Prepare Educators: Partner schools help pre-service teachers construct the pedagogical skills, curriculum knowledge, and attitudes necessary to educate all learners. Purpose 4. Inquiry: Partners engage in reflective practice as a means of generating continuous improvement of education in the partner school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Critical Attribute 2 | Collaboration: A PDS is characterized by joint work between school and university faculty working as directed at implementing Principle 1, Partnerships: Collaborative relations with K-12 school districts, where all stakeholders are involved.

| Principle 2, Communication and collaboration: Teaching & learning require many opportunities for communication and collaboration among partner schools.

| Purpose 2, Prepare Educators: Educator preparation programs in partner schools are based on continuous collaboration among

| Commitment 2 | Committment 2. Communication and collaboration: Teaching & learning require many opportunities for communication and collaboration among partner schools.

| Commitment 3 | Committment 3. Shared responsibility for the learning of all members of the PDS community.

| Commitment 4 | Commitment 4. Commitment to developing knowledge and promoting inquiry-learning and learning about teaching and learning are brought to bear on the learning experiences of all members of the PDS community, adults as well as children.

| Commitment 5 | Committment 5. Shared responsibility for the learning of all members of the PDS community.

| Table 8 - Continued.
Table 8 – Continued

| the mission. Responsibility for learning is shared; research is jointly defined and implemented; all participants share expertise in the interests of children’s and adults’ learning. | collaboration among learners—adults and children. Commitment 3. Connection and community-connections are created to families, communities, and other agencies as an inherent part of the work of the school. Commitment 5. Shared responsibility for the learning of all members of the PDS community—all members of the PDS community are committed to the special functions of the school. Shared decision making takes place in the context of appropriately weighted but not separate and distinct responsibilities for different faculty roles—school and university educators pursue cooperative research, jointly plan and administer preservice and inservice education programs, test new instructional approaches, study the applicability of research to their schools and other schools, develop new assessments, and exchange teaching roles. Commitment 6. Parity in partnerships—school-university partnerships are | partners to assure that the partner school is an integral part of the total preparation programs. Purpose 3. Provide Professional Dev.: Professional development for educators is collaboratively defined and is based on the diverse needs of students to be served by the educators. |
| Critical Attribute 3. Accountability & Quality Assurance: The PDS is accountable to the public and to the profession for upholding professional standards for teaching and learning and for preparing new teachers in accordance with these standards | (Implicit in the work of the Holmes Group) | Principle 6. Systemic Change (Internal): Restructuring the college/university around the following: f) continuous improvement through authentic assessment. Principle 9. Teaching and Learning: linked to student outcomes, student needs, and authentic/alternative assessment | Commitment 4. Commitment to developing knowledge and promoting inquiry-school and university faculty are engaged in disciplined consideration and of discourse about professional standards and practice as they make curriculum decisions, evaluate teaching strategies, and develop school programs. Commitment 7. Continual renewal and improvement—the PDS as an organization and members of the PDS community are committed to continual reflection, self and organizational renewal, and the pursuit of ever more powerful and inclusive approaches to supporting student success. | (Implicit in the work of NNER) |
Table 8 – Continued.

| Processes and allocates resources and time to systematize the continuous improvement of learning to teach, teaching, and organizational life. | Administrators. Principle 6. Inventing a new institution. PDS will need to devise for itself a different kind of organizational structure for the school-one that can initiate these profound changes and support them over time. | Principle 5. Systematic change (external): Involvement in systemic change at the local, state, and national levels. Principle 6. Systemic change (Internal): Restructuring the college/university around the following: a) changes in the reward structure to include clinical work, b) reallocation of resources (time and money), d) restructuring course delivery systems, e) stated mission and goals. | A commitment to mutual trust, respect, and parity resulting in reciprocity and collective ownership of the enterprise. Under Enabling Considerations: 1. Rethinking the regularities of schools (time, personnel, financial resources, and content and process). 2. Resources-financial support is provided for collaborative strategic planning and for the ongoing activities of the partnership. 3. Governance and leadership—governance is shared. | Educators understand how professionals from various fields can best work together as part of an “educative community”. All Purposes: Resources-Partners schools are supported by sufficient people, time and money. |

| Critical Attribute 5. Equity: A PDS is characterized by norms and practices which support equity and learning by all students and adults. | Principle 3. Teaching and learning for understanding for everybody’s children. Overcome the educational and social barriers raised by an unequal society. | Principle 8. Equity and Diversity: Reflected in staffing, student population, and curriculum. | Commitment 3. Connection and community: respect and appreciation of diversity and the understanding that all learners bring to their work interest are met. Commitment 6. Parity in partnerships—partners understand their different and shared interests, recognize how their own interests can be met, and are willing to see that their partners’ interests are met. | Purposes 1. Educate children and youth: Partners seek equity and excellence for all enrolled students and other members of the learning community. Purposes 3. Provide Pro. Dev.: Professional development helps professionals work with special needs students. |
Table 8 – Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Explicit in NCATE Unit Standards)</th>
<th>Principle 6 c) strong linkages with Arts and Sciences faculty</th>
<th>Purposes 2. Prepare Educators: Partners exhibit knowledge of relevant academic disciplines from the arts and sciences. Purposes 3. Professional Development helps educators understand how professionals from various fields can best work together as part of an “educative community”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Explicit in NCATE Unit and Program Standards)</td>
<td>Principle 7. Technology: Involves technology with the teaching and learning process and has linkages with external technological resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B

UNITS OF INFORMATION
UNITS OF INFORMATION

Major themes developed from university deans (neighboring & out of state) interviews. "Units of information" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 344) were identified. These units consisted of a phrase, or a sentence. These units of information were used during our November meeting.

1. Total emersion of the university student in the PDS helps the student to identify with the real world and work of the teaching profession.

2. Professors from the university are usually present in the PDS several hours a week.

3. Professional Development Schools usually receive some amount of money from the University to be spent as the school wishes.

4. Professors are given load time for teaching classes and integrating ideas and materials at the PDS with university students.

5. Space at the PDS is typically needed for classes taught by university professor at the PDS school site.

6. Communication is essential between university and school — teachers, administration, and students.

7. Collaborative decision making between university and school personnel about the PDS is essential to a successful Professional Development School.

8. Conversations must take place between professors and teachers with regard to theory and practice in application.

9. Schools make the commitment to be a PDS — not individuals. (At least 80% teacher acceptance is necessary.

10. Not only does there need to be a significant amount of time spent in the development and implementation of a PDS, but also a significant period (length) of time must be allocated for ongoing conversations, change, and research.
Transformative change is clearly visible in school and university teachers, administrators, and students.

Relationships, synergy, the development of a bond, are considered the first thing necessary in the development of a successful PDS.

It is essential to identify and delineate responsibilities.

Partnership between the school and university must be defined.

Professors and teachers alike must be focused on inquiry and self-reflection/analysis for the purpose of supporting more kids success.

All levels of school and university administration must be prepared to experiment with systems change.

Professional development training of professors, teachers, and students together, helps to create an environment of shared learning and decision-making.

Educational reform initiatives, such as NCATE standards, assist in the development and establishment of PDS programs.

The liaison between the university and the school is considered a critical element to the success of a PDS.

It is essential that the schoolteachers and staff be willing to share expertise and knowledge with university teachers and students.

The university professor must become part of the PDS, not just a visitor at the school.

Methods courses should be collapsed or blocked when university students are practicing and studying in professional development schools.
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