

FASTBACK

352

Creating Professional Development Schools

Alan Colburn

Please Return to 170 EDUC - Utah State University - Logan, UT
Creating Professional Development Schools

352

REA



REA17195

PHI DELTA KAPPA
EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION



ALAN COLBURN

Alan Colburn is on the staff of the Science Education Center at the University of Iowa. He received his B.S. in biology from Carnegie-Mellon University and his M.S. in genetics and molecular biology from the University of Illinois. He worked as a research scientist at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia. He received a second M.S. in secondary science education at the University of Pennsylvania and taught high school chemistry at the Haverford School in Haverford, Pennsylvania.

While pursuing his Ph.D. in science education at the University of Iowa, Colburn supervised student teachers and became interested in teacher education programs that demonstrated close collaboration between schools and universities, particularly those programs associated with professional development schools. In 1992 he was awarded an AERA Fellowship, administered by the National Science Foundation, which allowed him to visit four professional development schools to learn how they were able to overcome some of the common barriers to school-university collaboration. This fastback is one of the outcomes of that investigation.

Series Editor, Derek L. Bursleson

0 1 7 1 9 5

REAVIS READING AREA
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES CENTER
U.S.D. COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Creating Professional Development Schools

by
Alan Colburn

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 93-83178

ISBN 0-87367-352-2

Copyright © 1993 by the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
Bloomington, Indiana

This fastback is sponsored by the Piedmont Area South Carolina Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, which made a generous contribution toward publication costs.

The chapter sponsors this fastback to celebrate its 16th anniversary and to honor the memory of Vance R. Bettis, a past president of the chapter. Through his steadfast dedication over many years, he conveyed to chapter members the importance of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation. The membership responded by consistently making the chapter eligible for the 20/20 Club and, in 1991-92, for the 25/25 Club.

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
What Is a Professional Development School?	9
The History of Professional Development Schools ...	13
Advantages of a Professional Development School ...	15
Starting a Professional Development School	18
Key Factors for Success	22
Factors that Interfere with Collaboration	29
The Role of School and University Administrators ..	32
Conclusion	35
References	36

Introduction

School and university connections should be as natural as those between schools of agriculture and farms or between medical schools and hospitals. Unfortunately, the two institutions rarely collaborate. Different goals, values, and governance systems often get in the way of the best intentions. Educators may start collaborative ventures; but soon the initial excitement wanes, and the collaborative effort fades away.

These barriers can be overcome. I have visited schools where teachers were excited about what they were doing, where discussions in the teachers' lounge focused on pedagogy and issues of professional concern. I saw teachers testing new curriculum materials and communicating their results to other schools via a modem and computer, which a university helped purchase. I watched a teacher and university professor struggle to assess what students had learned after being taught with experimental methods. I even learned about an after-school science club for latchkey children, which was led by practicum students from a university.

I visited four sites where people from a university and K-12 schools are collaborating in professional development schools (PDS). These sites are Virginia Commonwealth University, Kansas State University, Michigan State University, and the University of Northern Colorado. At these sites, I learned how people are overcoming the barriers to collaboration.

The first part of this fastback describes professional development schools, gives a rationale for their existence, and shows how successful ones have operated. This is followed by a discussion of the history of professional development schools and the lessons those earlier efforts offer for current programs. Those factors that contribute to the success of a collaborative effort are discussed, as are several questions that schools and universities should answer at the beginning of the collaborative process. The final section focuses on the things that administrators can do to make a collaboration succeed.

This fastback is devoted to helping the reader understand and overcome the various barriers that interfere with turning professional development schools into reality. Building relationships between K-12 schools and universities is difficult, but it is worth the effort. It may even be necessary.

What Is a Professional Development School?

A professional development school (PDS) is analogous to a teaching hospital. It is designed not only to educate novice teachers, but also to be a place where university and school faculty can collaborate on research and development – all within an administrative structure that encourages professional development and empowerment. In a PDS pupils are rewarded with the best possible education we can provide, just as patients get the best possible medical care in teaching hospitals. The ideal PDS is a school where teachers and researchers generate new knowledge about education, then put that knowledge into practice as teachers are trained at the cutting-edge of their field.

Stallings and Kowalski (1990) identify six general purposes for a PDS, and all professional development schools address some combination of them. The six purposes are:

1. educating pupils,
2. preparing new teachers,
3. developing innovative teaching practices,
4. conducting research,
5. providing inservice practice, and
6. disseminating educational innovations.

Amplification of these six purposes is provided in a Kansas State University publication (Parker et al. 1992) describing its PDS.

1. A PDS is based on collaborative relationships between content specialists, education specialists, and practitioners. Faculty from teacher education institutions work as partners with public school teachers and administrators to improve teaching.

2. A PDS serves as a site to integrate theory and practice in a clinical setting. Field work is aligned with course work.

3. A PDS can extend the knowledge base in teacher education through collaborative inquiry into the teaching/learning process. Site-based research and action research are expected at a PDS.

4. A PDS encourages experimentation and risk taking. Staff are involved in inventing and trying out new practices. Experimentation and sustained evaluation are integral components of a PDS.

5. A PDS is a center for long-term professional development. The expectation is that students, student teachers, regular teachers, supervising teachers, administrators, and university faculty are all learners. The PDS becomes a laboratory for observation, experimentation, and extended practice, with the goal of producing reflective and analytical teachers.

6. A PDS is an integral component in the professionalization of teaching. Teachers take on new roles and differentiated responsibilities involving goal setting, problem solving, decision making, student assessment, teacher preparation, scheduling, and staff development.

The PDS ties schools and universities together. Universities are traditionally charged with preparing new teachers and generating research; schools are charged with educating pupils. An excellent school needs teachers prepared by excellent university programs, using knowledge generated by research in colleges of education. And the university needs excellent schools in which to place preservice teachers. The PDS, at its best, is a symbiotic relationship between school and university.

Not surprisingly, a PDS looks much like any other public school. However, parts of the school may appear a bit crowded due to the

presence of extra people. Professors, university students, and other “outsiders” are ubiquitous. Professors may be observing classes, teaching classes, or talking to teachers. Perhaps they are meeting with several teachers at the same time. Or perhaps they are discussing upcoming events with the principal.

Student teachers and practicum students also are present. In one PDS, university students are responsible for an after-school science club. In some schools, practicum students are responsible for jobs normally done by teacher aides. In another PDS, a preservice teacher was in charge of a program where high school students worked with elementary school children.

However, the main difference a visitor sees is that many more teachers than usual are collaborating with each other. In formal meetings, informal meetings, even in the teachers’ lounge, teachers are discussing issues of content and pedagogy. A fair number of PDS teachers admit that they spend a lot more time discussing professional issues since they became involved with PDS activities. Many PDS teachers take on extra duties in addition to regular teaching. Thus more teachers are present in the evenings and weekends than are found in many schools.

Some of the differences between a PDS and regular schools can be illustrated best by examples from schools I visited.

Every Wednesday morning at Holt (Michigan) High School, students are not in attendance. The faculty use this time for meetings and staff development. The day I visited, the morning was divided into sessions in which staff discussed such issues as alternative student assessment, teaching for conceptual change, and helping students become more aware of the writing process. The sessions were led by a teacher or a teacher and a professor; but other staff contributed to a dialogue. Wednesdays also are days on which steering committees meet or teachers meet with administrators to discuss issues of school governance.

At the Kansas PDS I visited, virtually every teacher in the school seemed to have some special project or area of professional exper-

tise. Several had written grants or made presentations at professional meetings. Many had field-tested new science materials acquired by staff at the university.

Many PDS have at least one staff person who splits his or her time between the school and university. Acting as a liaison between the two groups, this person also coordinates preservice students as well as teaching half a day.

I also learned of a preservice teacher who interviewed science students to determine their preconceptions about a topic the supervising teacher was about to discuss. The supervising teacher, with the assistance of a university science education professor, was teaching for conceptual change. Both used the information the preservice student generated from the interviews.

A PDS site is not necessarily limited to K-12 schools. Universities also can be PDS sites. For example, at the University of Northern Colorado many changes are occurring in the undergraduate curriculum through collaboration between school of education and liberal arts faculties. New teaching practices are tried in introductory-level courses, using materials developed at the university; and education research takes place in college classrooms.

The History of Professional Development Schools

The current PDS movement is associated with the Holmes Group's *Tomorrow's Schools* (1986), with the Carnegie Foundation's call for "clinical schools" (1986), and with John Goodlad's (1990) school of pedagogy. These works describe similar kinds of partnerships between public schools and colleges of education.

All of these works, in turn, were influenced by the ideas B.O. Smith and his colleagues presented in *A Design for a School of Pedagogy* (1980). Smith recommended that, after completing a bachelor's degree program, preservice teachers spend two years in a special school of pedagogy, for which they would receive a master of pedagogy degree. In the school of pedagogy, the curriculum would focus on learning how to teach.

However, the history of the professional development school goes back much further. The name "professional development school" may be new, but the idea is as old as John Dewey's lab school at the University of Chicago. Dewey envisioned schools run jointly by colleges of education and public schools. Like the PDS of today, they would educate new teachers and serve as research sites. The lab school and the short-lived portal school of the 1970s (see Stallings and Kowalski 1990) reflect almost all the characteristics envisioned for a PDS.

Lab schools flourished until about 20 years ago. They eventually were condemned for being too different from the typical public schools and too expensive for many universities to operate. Critics argued

that if a lab school was radically different from the mainstream, then teachers educated at them would be unprepared for regular schools and the research generated there could not be generalized to public schools.

These criticisms were justified. The student body at most lab schools was not the same as that in most schools; most lab schools were overloaded with faculty children. Nor was funding received by most lab schools equivalent to that of public schools. Today's PDS differs from these earlier efforts because the PDS is an autonomously operated public school receiving the same amount of government funding and educating the same students as any other school.

The history of the lab school suggests the difficulty in integrating teacher education, the demonstration of exemplary teaching practice, and research. Lab schools were more likely to focus either on teacher education or on the other two goals. Even Dewey's lab school had little or no involvement with teacher education.

Moreover, collaboration between lab school faculty and school of education faculty often was minimal. University faculty commonly viewed the lab schools as research sites and places where student teachers could experiment with the new ideas received from their education professors. On the other hand, lab school teachers worked primarily with students and emphasized best practice over experimentation.

The experience with lab schools suggests several issues that must be resolved for a PDS to be successful. Participants at both school and university sites must have clear goals that are mutually agreed on and that benefit both groups. In addition, the PDS should not try to address too many goals, at least initially. Finally, it should be kept in mind that teachers and university faculty may have very different perceptions about their roles in a PDS.

Advantages of a Professional Development School

Pupils get a better education in a PDS, because teachers in these schools are enthusiastic about what they are doing. In addition, the pupils have access to computers and new instructional technology, new curriculum materials, more instructors to help them (including university professors, student teachers, and practicum students), exposure to a larger variety of teaching techniques, and better assessment strategies.

Almost everyone believes schools need reforming, and the PDS is an efficient way to do that. If you take a staff-development program that recognizes that teachers will change when the environment of the school changes and then add the notion of teacher development as a continuum that begins at the preservice level and continues to retirement, you have a PDS!

Levine (1988) discusses several important reasons for having professional development schools. First, public schools were established originally to educate many people in basic literacy skills and rote knowledge. But current goals are different; they stress creative and independent thinking and getting students to like classes and themselves enough simply to stay in school. Today's different goals require different school practices and instructional support. This point was emphasized by several teachers and principals I talked to. They pointed out that the children they are working with today are different from those even 10 years ago. They added that since the country

is changing from an industrial base to a service and information base, schools must change to reflect these societal changes. The PDS facilitates this change at the school site.

Second, collaboration will improve teaching practice. Levine (1988) states that "the same environment which supports the development of knowledge based, inquiry based professional practice is also one which enhances student learning" (p. 4).

Third, teachers consider field experiences the most important part of their preservice training. However, these experiences often are unstructured and unguided. Better cooperation between school and university increases the structure and guidance that prospective teachers receive in the field, increasing the value of their field experiences.

Fourth, to be a self-governing profession, teaching needs a structured induction experience conducted under the supervision of master teachers, who can attest to the competence of new teachers. To Levine, this implies the existence of standards of practice, developed and upheld by experienced teachers and required of novices. The PDS can provide this experience.

School-university collaboration can benefit everyone involved. University staff get a laboratory. They get a place to help educate new teachers. And they themselves learn more about teaching. Teachers in a PDS get to be on the cutting edge of new methods and materials. For example, at Kansas State University the PDS is a site for testing new and updated curriculum materials. In addition, PDS collaboration brings access to university resources. Special inservice opportunities are available, and university grants pay for staff development. Indeed, the PDS may take on the role of a staff-development center, with teachers playing key roles. Teachers get a voice in how future teachers are educated.

More important than special resources may be opportunities to collaborate with other teachers and education professionals from outside the school. Most teachers still tend to work in isolation, but they

can be invigorated by meeting regularly with other teachers to compare notes on professional issues and practices. Counterparts at the university or school provide alternative viewpoints. The teacher's job is further professionalized by taking on new roles and responsibilities.

Starting a Professional Development School

Fullan (1991) recommends starting by considering several questions about readiness for change. Honestly answering these questions can help a school decide if it is a good time to begin a PDS effort.

Does the PDS effort address a perceived need? To answer yes, you have to know what participants' needs are. Establishing goals for the PDS (based on teachers' perceived needs) is one way to begin.

The professional development schools I visited usually conducted their initial needs assessments through meetings between university and school staff. Usually, the university initially was concerned with finding out what the teachers' perceived needs were. The university then determined what resources it could offer the school; and school people decided if they wanted to work with the university.

The staff at Michigan State University, which works with more professional development schools than any other university, see their role at this point as people who listen and help others clarify their goals. They recommend that schools establish clear, realistic expectations. In other words, the schools must be sure that they are interested in more than money and attention. The teachers need to realize that establishing a PDS means more work and time, even if it is ultimately more rewarding. Sample questions include: What do you hope to get out of the PDS? What benefits do you think it will have for students? What do you think are its drawbacks? What does professional development mean to you?

At the same time that staff at the school determine their needs, university staff also should determine their needs and the extent to which the school can help them. Both research and common sense confirm that the best PDS collaboration is symbiotic, beneficial to all the partners.

Does the PDS effort represent a reasonable change? Some schools have tried to ensure this by having teachers and administrators first create a reasonable plan for the PDS effort and then frequently re-examine the plan as they learn from experience. This requires flexibility because every PDS is unique.

Because every school is different, what works at one school may fail at another. It is not always possible to adopt a successful model wholesale. Specific ideas can be transported from one school to another, and they may succeed; but one should not assume that these ideas will be successful without modification.

The factors discussed above also apply to colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education can change; and, as with K-12 schools, success is more likely if the faculty and administration are ready for the change. The faculty will be more ready if they see the proposed innovations as reasonable and as addressing perceived needs.

Do participants have the requisite knowledge and skills? Do they have the time? Consider, for example, a school that decides it is important to build a sense of community within classes and between teachers. Teachers, administrators, and university people may decide that cooperative learning and team teaching are two approaches toward this goal. However, if no one knows anything about cooperative learning or team teaching, the chance of success is very small. The next step for the staff at this school would be to learn more about these methods.

One prerequisite for success is learning about the change process and how to work together. Teachers and professors generally agree on this. However, the two groups seem to disagree about how much time needs to be spent on learning about the change process. Profes-

sors at Michigan State University and Kansas State University have reported that teachers often object to all the time spent on these issues. According to the professors, the teachers felt that the discussions on the change process were too theoretical and filled with jargon and that some of the time could have been better spent on other matters.

Are facilities, equipment, and materials available? District money, grants, or other sources of outside support almost always are necessary in the creation of a PDS.

Are other crises or change efforts in progress? There are limits to how much people can do.

Is the proposed change compatible with the culture of the school? A school's culture consists of a complex mixture of people's perceptions. The people include everyone who is a part of the school and its activities: students, teachers, administrators, parents, the local community, even state and federal education personnel. However, it is probably enough to start with teachers and administrators. The proposed changes in creating a PDS are more likely to succeed if they are supported by the school's teachers and administrators. What is needed is true support, beyond the level of mere lip service.

In the beginning, it is often difficult to gain support for significant change from all teachers and administrators. Change efforts usually begin with a small group of teachers and the principal, superintendent, or other influential administrator. If these people succeed, more people will join the effort and gradually the school's culture will change.

There is no one best way to start a PDS. However, the Holt High School PDS can serve as an example. First, there already was informal collaboration between some of the Holt teachers and Michigan State University faculty before any formal collaboration began.

The projects that eventually became the Holt High School PDS began one summer with a few math teachers at the school concerned about the small number of math classes taken by students and the stu-

dents' lack of confidence in their math abilities. The teachers and a university professor began to examine ways to increase students' math confidence. The professor observed target classes one or two days a week and met with teachers and a counselor one day a week. The counselor and one teacher had one hour of released time for planning (an intern from the university was hired to cover the teacher's class for that time). A Ph.D. student documented what was happening in the classrooms and interviewed students. Eventually, 14 teachers, three college faculty, and six graduate students were involved in the first year of activities.

This project started small. Teachers joined after seeing others succeed. The initial groups were people committed to trying new things. Also, the initial collaboration was among people who knew each other previously; and all were volunteers.

Key Factors for Success

Although every PDS effort is unique, there are some problems that occur in most of these efforts. This chapter presents suggestions that can ease the way. Some of these involve deliberate actions. Others are simply aspects of the process to be aware of.

Expect resistance. Blaming others for being resistant to change is never helpful, even though resistance to change is normal and is to be expected. Although some people will immediately be open to change and will be willing to examine what they are doing critically, others will change much more slowly. A few people at both school and university levels will never change.

One principal recommends appointing those most open and least open to change as members on a school restructuring committee, where differences can be ironed out early. However, most people who have been involved in a successful PDS recommend starting with the volunteers most open to the planned changes. These volunteers often include people who have collaborated on other projects before beginning the PDS project.

After the initial “pioneers” succeed, more will follow when they see the concrete success of the first group. These are the skeptics who don’t want to risk investing time and effort on the whim of someone else’s ideas about what will “work” at a school. Eventually, enough of the skeptics will become involved to make the PDS a schoolwide effort; a few may decide to leave the school. The process can take several years.

Fullan & Miles (1992) strongly caution against blaming other people's "resistance" as the source of difficulty in establishing the PDS:

Things hardly ever go easily during change efforts. Since change necessarily involves people, and people can commit willed actions, it seems natural to attribute progress that is slower than we might wish to their "resistance." . . .

But it is usually unproductive to label an attitude or action "resistance." It diverts attention from real problems of implementation, such as diffuse objectives, lack of technical skill, or insufficient resources for change.

Change does involve individual attitudes and behaviors, but they need to be framed as natural responses to transition, not misunderstood as "resistance." During transitions from a familiar to a new state of affairs, individuals must normally confront the loss of the old and commit themselves to the new, unlearn old beliefs and behaviors and learn new ones, and move from anxiousness and uncertainty to stabilization and coherence. Any significant change involves a period of intense personal and organizational learning and problem solving. People need supports for such work, not displays of impatience.

Blaming "resistance" for the slow pace of reform also keeps us from understanding that individuals and groups faced with something new need to assess the change for its genuine possibilities and for how it bears on their self-interest. (p. 748)

Like the proverbial occupant of a glass house, all involved in a PDS effort should look carefully at themselves before blaming others for being resistant. For example, a Michigan State University professor pointed out that it is common for professors to come to schools with preconceived notions about research and to be highly resistant to suggestions about what is or is not appropriate to do in a particular school. However, the same professors do not understand why the teachers reject their suggestions about changing their teaching!

Liaisons are critical. People accepted at both the university and the school are critical to the success of a PDS effort. Energetic, committed, enthusiastic people who can cross the school-university barrier are vital to sustaining the process.

However, these people are difficult to find. For example, while university professors may believe they are well suited to act as change agents, Huberman (1973) points out that a person from the university “has infrequent contact with teachers; he must first pass through an administrative filter; he is usually not asked to come to the school, and his advice is seldom valued unless he is or has been a school teacher” (p. 27).

Ideally, university faculty will spend a lot of time with teachers and pupils in the PDS; and some PDS teachers should be familiar with how the local university operates. This kind of exchange helps break down the barriers between the institutions.

It is especially important for university faculty to spend a lot of time in the schools. Teachers I interviewed frequently commented on the misconceptions professors have about today’s schools and their pupils. The teachers said it was important for professors to at least sit in on classes and perhaps occasionally teach some classes.

University faculty must first be accepted by the school’s staff in order to earn their respect. This takes time and energy, but it is critical. The literature on successful change, including creating professional development schools, repeatedly points to the influence of a single individual who is accepted at both the school and university. The importance of such a person becomes apparent when, as sometimes happens, the person leaves and the project falls apart.

Let’s talk. Communication is important for breaking down barriers and helping participants understand each other. Large-scale change is more likely when participants have many opportunities to observe and talk to each other about what they are doing. For communication to happen, the school week must be structured so that teachers have time to talk and collaborate. But time, by itself, does not guarantee collaboration.

One problem is that some people will be ready to start before they have established clear goals. Or they will be ready to start before they fully understand what is involved in undertaking a project. Impatience

is human nature. Thus it is important that one of the first things that participants do is establish worthwhile goals in planning the PDS. In this way, those who are eager to do something can be guided in doing things that accomplish project goals.

Ill scratch your back if you scratch mine. The PDS collaboration should be symbiotic. Everyone involved must believe they are getting something out of the effort. Teachers should know that they are getting special resources and, most important, that they are treated like professionals. Professors should know that they are getting the opportunity to try out innovative ideas and have a place to do research and send preservice students. Administrators should know that they will receive the recognition that comes from implementing something innovative.

There are many other ways in which collaboration between a university and PDS is mutually beneficial. For example, at the University of Northern Colorado, teacher mentors at the PDS help in the revision and delivery of teacher education courses, thus keeping instructional practices in the university courses congruent with K-12 realities by modeling effective teaching strategies for professors and students. At Virginia Commonwealth University, K-12 teachers serve as instructors in both education and subject-matter courses. At Kansas State University, they help coordinate the preservice program. The practical approaches these teachers bring have resulted in changes in how university classes are taught and in greater satisfaction among preservice students.

Know whom to talk with. Open and clearly established lines of communication are essential for successful collaboration. It is important to establish these lines of communication both between the institutions involved and within each institution. It is frustrating to call a university and be unable to reach the person with whom you need to speak or to be shuffled from person to person. This sort of experience alienates both university staff and K-12 teachers.

If a problem arises, participants should know whom to contact and how to reach that person. That person could be the liaison discussed

earlier, or it could be a coordinator at the university or school who can get back to the caller if she or he cannot answer the question. It is comforting for everyone to know whom to contact with a question or problem.

The right kind of governance structure. Teacher involvement is needed in every aspect of governance. Leadership positions can be co-chaired by representatives from the university and the school. Important decisions are made by small committees representing the key groups. Committee members must stay in close contact with those they represent. For example, Holt High School essentially is run by various committees. These committees usually include teachers, professors, and administrators. Even the school principal sits on a committee and has to abide by its decisions. He has one vote, just as everyone else does.

A centralized, bureaucratic school system or university hinders collaboration. People find it harder to feel empowered within large organizations, where decisions must be cleared through layers of bureaucracy and where suggested changes must be cleared through superiors. Thus the chance of success is higher if the PDS is part of a small or decentralized school district.

Big-city professional development schools do exist. The Houston Teaching Academy, jointly run by the city school district and the University of Houston, is an excellent example. However, this school has been freed from some bureaucratic control.

Try something new. Establishing a successful PDS means more than just doing better what already is being done. Doing a better job is an admirable goal, but doing something different is much harder to accomplish. Perhaps the best way to encourage people to try something new is to talk to the teachers implementing an innovation.

But this one is different. Negative experiences in the past often interfere with collaboration. Such experiences are one reason K-12 teachers dislike or distrust professors. The PDS's I studied indicate clearly that K-12 teachers' negative feelings toward university profes-

sors can be changed over time by sincere professors who demonstrate their commitment to collaborate with K-12 teachers as equals. Professors need to come to the schools regularly, get to know the teachers, and spend time in classrooms as observers or perhaps teaching occasionally. The goal is for professors to gain credibility with teachers while creating a sense of collegiality.

For example, a science education professor at Virginia Commonwealth University spends approximately one day each week working with science teachers in a nearby middle school. Another professor during her sabbatical traded places with a high school English teacher; the professor taught the teacher's English classes, and the high school teacher taught at the college. The experience was rewarding to both parties. It also is common for professors and teachers to meet and discuss the teachers' professional needs. The professors use the outcomes from such meetings to write teacher enhancement grants, which are then carried out by local teachers.

Participants need to realize that achieving true collegiality takes a year or more of working together. A professor should not pay one or two visits to a school and then decide its teachers are resistant to innovation.

Finding time for collaboration. Time is a scarce resource for both teachers and professors. Successful professional development schools find ways to give their teachers the time needed for collaboration. In one school, four teachers are released one half-day a week to work on projects related to the PDS mission. During this time, their classes are taught by specialists who offer lessons in multicultural studies, a requirement of the local school district. The specialists are recent university graduates who previously had worked in a PDS.

A school in New Hampshire solved the time problem by going to a four-day school week with the fifth day reserved for meetings and staff development. By using an extended school day from 8:00 to 3:30 Monday through Thursday, no instructional time was lost. And the school even saves money on building utilities and by not having to run the school buses.

Another time factor to remember is that school and university people operate on different daily and annual schedules. Many teachers are involved in extracurricular activities; university people often travel. It can be difficult to find time to meet. Arrangements should be made as far in advance as possible. Generally, it is easier to change university schedules than school schedules.

Don't overlook community resources. Support from the larger community can make a positive difference for a PDS. Leaders of local business associations are good people to contact regarding possibilities of business involvement in the collaborative effort. Businesses can provide financial support, access to resources, and increased opportunities for pupils to connect school with the world of work. For example, students at the Holmes Middle School in Michigan work in local hospitals. This liaison with members of the local health-care community gives students exposure to career opportunities in the health field and makes them more knowledgeable consumers of available health services, such as free clinics and neonatal care units.

To establish these kinds of liaisons, begin with the local business associations and the “movers and shakers” within these groups. Then go and talk with them to find out their needs and see if the PDS can help them. The local superintendent already may have made some of these connections.

Factors that Interfere with Collaboration

Schools and universities have different cultures. To have a successful collaboration, it is important for all involved to understand these differences. As Brookhart and Loadman (1989) explain, culture is “shared frames of reference people use to interpret what others say and do as well as to determine how they will speak and act themselves” (p. 3). You must understand a culture to speak meaningfully with its subjects.

One difference has to do with *work tempo*. Public school teachers do several things at once; their work life is constrained by bells and rigid schedules. Little time remains for review or reflection. On the other hand, university professors use their time to conduct and review research in their field, to prepare lectures, and to serve on faculty committees. They have more flexibility in how they use time. These differences lead to different perceptions of professional time. A “long-term project” may mean six weeks to a school teacher and six years to a professor.

Professional focus is another cultural difference. Teachers’ work centers on activities and action-oriented plans, on doing things. Presentations at teacher conventions usually feature new activities to use in the classroom. Resource activity books are popular items for teachers to buy. Professors’ interests are more likely to be in the areas of theory and policy; they tend to think in broader terms than teachers.

The two groups also have different *career reward structures*. Teachers are rewarded by seeing their students succeed. Professors' rewards are for publications, research grants, recognition in an academic field, and academic rank. Too often the university setting works against faculty involvement in K-12 schools; institutions of higher education rarely reward this kind of work. The key point is that teachers' rewards are generally more intrinsic than those of professors, whose rewards generally depend on other people's judgements.

Teachers and professors have a different sense of *personal power and efficacy*. University professors sometimes feel they have more power and status than teachers. Teachers understandably dislike being perceived in that way. Irvin (1990) discusses other differences. Professors generally have more autonomy than teachers. They are largely self-policing and often make hiring and promotion decisions. In schools, on the other hand, administrators typically are in charge of teachers; they observe and evaluate teachers. Professors are treated more like professionals than are teachers. The difficulty comes when professors think of themselves as being more professional than teachers.

Academic freedom is another difference. Professors generally have more of it than teachers. Professors develop their own courses, whereas teachers are expected to follow K-12 curricula developed at the central office. Teachers often are discouraged from probing the frontiers of knowledge or pedagogy.

Another cultural difference between university and school people concerns *preservice teacher education* (Winitzky et al. 1991). University professors commonly emphasize critical analysis of teaching and the meshing of theory and practice. Teachers, on the other hand, often prefer an apprenticeship where preservice teachers spend time in the classroom learning from experience and replicating the skills of their mentor teachers. These different perspectives are a source of tension between school and university people. School people may believe university people are too theoretical and do not give preservice

teachers a realistic view of what it is like to work with 25 to 30 children in the classroom. University people may feel the teachers are undermining faculty efforts.

The Role of School and University Administrators

Principals are often unsure of what their role in a PDS should be, according to Barbara Markle, a former principal and superintendent who now works full time for the Michigan State University PDS. Principals have been taught to be managers more than change agents. While comfortable with giving teachers increased responsibilities, they may be uncomfortable with releasing ultimate responsibility. After all, it is the principal who still deals with teacher unions, staff evaluations, parents, and the larger community. Regardless of what is happening in the school, the district administrators and most members of the community still assign ultimate responsibility to the principal.

Markle suggests that principals must make their own staff development a priority. She also suggests they attend some of the same staff-development activities as their teachers in order to make themselves more accessible. Principals need to attend designated principals' workshops and regularly attend the inservice sessions provided by the facilitators in their building. Attending workshops shows the principal's support for the PDS effort and helps ensure that she or he knows what is happening in the project.

District administrators also are vital for a successful PDS effort, as well as for any other type of school-university collaboration. There are specific commitments that district administrators must make for the school-university collaboration to succeed (Powell and Hackett 1992):

1. New curriculum materials in areas relating to the project should be consistent with the goals of the project.
2. Participating districts must agree to a minimum two-year implementation program. A three- to five-year commitment would be even better. In addition, each participating school should give the PDS project a large enough focus so that teachers are not overwhelmed with other distractions.
3. The district must commit enough funding to maintain supplies over a period of time that is probably longer than that provided by outside funding.
4. At least one trainer must be released part-time to coordinate the implementation efforts for the district, even in a very small district.
5. Building-level facilitators need released time throughout the project to plan and deliver inservice instruction, to conduct demonstration lessons, and for peer coaching.
6. Time and money must be allocated to adequately support the PDS implementation process, even when outside funding is being used.
7. Visible support from top-level administrators is critical to ensure budget allocations needed for PDS implementation and to encourage the support of principals and other curriculum specialists.
8. Districts need to provide adequate incentives for participation in all activities.
9. School people involved in training others must be committed to attendance and active participation in all workshops. Regardless of how much money is available, this usually translates to extra time and effort.

University administrators can encourage university-school collaboration, but first they must recognize the advantages collaboration has for them. Of course, school-university collaboration projects can bring grant money to the university. However, more important is that col-

laboration represents positive public relations and community service. In addition, collaboration can result in better teaching at the university; and a PDS effort certainly can improve a preservice teacher education program.

Another advantage is that school-university collaboration recruits students. High school graduates who know some of the university's faculty, and perhaps know their way around campus, might be more likely to attend that university. This type of strategy has been used especially for attracting under-represented populations of students into higher education.

One way that the university administration can help is by rewarding school service activities when it comes to promotion and salary increases. At Virginia Commonwealth University, department heads work with faculty to arrange a schedule that melds school service with college teaching and research. Faculty sometimes are given released time to work in the schools, which usually entails hiring adjunct faculty to teach one course for one semester.

Generally only tenured faculty are rewarded for school service. For example, the policy at Virginia Commonwealth University is that junior faculty establish a strong teaching and research record before beginning intensive collaboration. In fact, the vast majority of faculty working in the professional development schools I visited were tenured. An exception is Michigan State University, where junior faculty work one-fourth time in the schools. They are, however, expected to generate research papers or products reflecting university-level scholarship as a result of their work in the PDS.

Conclusion

The path to creating a professional development school is neither straight nor easy. Just as there are limits to how much someone can tell you about how to walk the path, so are there limits to how much I can tell you about creating a PDS. Perhaps the best advice I can offer is that there are those who already have established successful professional development schools. The path is walkable.

References

- Brookhart, S.M., and Loadman, W.E. "Work Perceptions of University and Public School Educators." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1989. ERIC No. ED 309 720
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. New York, 1986.
- Fullan, M.G. *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991.
- Fullan, M.G., and Miles, M.B. "Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't." *Phi Delta Kappan* 73 (June 1992): 745-52.
- Goodlad, J.I. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Holmes Group. *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Developmental Schools*. East Lansing, Mich.: Holmes Group, 1986.
- Huberman, A.M. *Understanding Change in Education: An Introduction*. Paris: UNESCO, 1973.
- Irvin, G. "Collaborative Teacher Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 71 (April 1990): 622-24.
- Levine, M., ed. *Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1988. ERIC No. ED 313 344
- Parker, B., et al. *Development of an Innovative Model for the Preservice Preparation of Elementary Teachers for Enhanced Science, Mathematics, and Technology Teaching*. Manhattan: Kansas State University, 1992.

- Powell, D., and Hackett, J. *Critical Components of the Elementary Science Implementation Project*. Greeley: University of Northern Colorado, 1992.
- Sinclair, R.L., and Harrison, A.E. "A Partnership for Increasing Student Learning: The Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement." In *School-University Partnerships in Action*, edited by K.A. Sirotnik and J.I. Goodlad. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- Sirotnik, K.A., and Goodlad, J.I., eds. *School-University Partnerships in Action*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- Stallings, J.A., and Kowalski, T. "Research on Professional Development Schools." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by W.R. Houston. New York: Macmillan, 1990.
- Winitzky, N., Stoddart, T., and O'Keefe, P. *Great Expectations: Emergent Professional Development Schools*. 1991. ERIC No. ED 338 576

Fastback Titles *(Continued from back cover)*

281. **Personalizing Staff Development: The Career Lattice Model**
282. **The Elementary School Publishing Center**
283. **The Case for Public Schools of Choice**
284. **Concurrent Enrollment Programs: College Credit for High School Students**
285. **Educators' Consumer Guide to Private Tutoring Services**
286. **Peer Supervision: A Way of Professionalizing Teaching**
287. **Differentiated Career Opportunities for Teachers**
288. **Controversial Issues In Schools: Dealing with the Inevitable**
289. **Interactive Television: Progress and Potential**
290. **Recruiting Minorities into Teaching**
291. **Preparing Students for Taking Tests**
292. **Creating a Learning Climate for the Early Childhood Years**
293. **Career Beginnings: Helping Disadvantaged Youth Achieve Their Potential**
294. **Interactive Videodisc and the Teaching-Learning Process**
295. **Using Microcomputers with Gifted Students**
296. **Using Microcomputers for Teaching Reading in the Middle School**
297. **Using Microcomputers for Teaching Science**
298. **Student Privacy in the Classroom**
299. **Cooperative Learning**
300. **The Case for School-Based Health Clinics**
301. **Whole Brain Education**
302. **Public Schools as Public Forums: Use of Schools by Non-School Publics**
303. **Developing Children's Creative Thinking Through the Arts**
304. **Meeting the Needs of Transient Students**
305. **Student Obesity: What Can the Schools Do?**
306. **Dealing with Death: A Strategy for Tragedy**
307. **Whole Language = Whole Learning**
308. **Effective Programs for At-Risk Adolescents**
309. **A Decalogue for Teaching Mathematics**
310. **Successful Strategies for Marketing School Leives**
311. **Preparing Better Teacher-Made Tests: A Practical Guide**
312. **Planning and Conducting Better School Ceremonies**
313. **Educating Homeless Children: Issues and Answers**
314. **Strategies for Developing Children's Listening Skills**
315. **Strategies for Involving Parents in Their Children's Education**
316. **Using Electronic Mail in an Educational Setting**
317. **Students and the Law**
318. **Community Colleges in the 1990s**
319. **Developing an Effective Teacher Mentor Program**
320. **Raising Career Aspirations of Hispanic Girls**
321. **Street Gangs and the Schools: A Blueprint for Intervention**
322. **Restructuring Through School Redesign**
323. **Restructuring an Urban High School**
324. **Initiating Restructuring at the School Site**
325. **Restructuring Teacher Education**
326. **Restructuring Education Through Technology**
327. **Restructuring Personnel Selection: The Assessment Center Method**
328. **Restructuring Beginning Reading with the Reading Recovery Approach**
329. **Restructuring Early Childhood Education**
330. **Achieving Adult Literacy**
331. **Improving Instruction in Middle Schools**
332. **Developing Effective Drug Education Programs**
333. **How to Start a Student Mentor Program**
334. **Adult Education: The Way to Lifelong Learning**
335. **Using Telecommunications in Middle School Reading**
336. **School-University Collaboration**
337. **Teachers for Tomorrow: The Pennsylvania Governor's School for Teachers**
338. **Japanese and U.S. Education Compared**
339. **Hypermedia: The Integrated Learning Environment**
340. **Mainstreaming Language Minority Children in Reading and Writing**
341. **The Portfolio Approach to Assessment**
342. **Teaching for Multiple Intelligences**
343. **Asking the Right Question: The Essence of Teaching**
344. **Discipline Strategies for Teachers**
345. **Learning Strategies for Problem Learners**
346. **Making Sense of Whole Language**
347. **English as a Second Language: 25 Questions and Answers**
348. **School Choice: Issues and Answers**
349. **State Academies for the Academically Gifted**
350. **The Need for Work Force Education**
351. **Integrated Character Education**
352. **Creating Professional Development Schools**
353. **Win-Win Discipline**

Single copies of fastbacks are \$1.25 (\$1.00 to Phi Delta Kappa members). Write to Phi Delta Kappa, P.O. Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789, for quantity discounts for any title or combination of titles.

PKD Fastback Series Titles

182. **School Public Relations: Communicating to the Community**
186. **Legal Issues in Education of the Handicapped**
187. **Mainstreaming in the Secondary School: The Role of the Regular Teacher**
189. **Challenging the Gifted and Talented Through Mentor-Assisted Enrichment Projects**
191. **What You Should Know About Teaching and Learning Styles**
193. **The Teaching of Writing in Our Schools**
194. **Teaching and the Art of Questioning**
197. **Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Student**
201. **Master Teachers**
203. **Pros and Cons of Merit Pay**
205. **The Case for the All-Day Kindergarten**
206. **Philosophy for Children: An Approach to Critical Thinking**
207. **Television and Children**
208. **Using Television in the Curriculum**
209. **Writing to Learn Across the Curriculum**
210. **Education Vouchers**
213. **The School's Role in Educating Severely Handicapped Students**
214. **Teacher Career Stages: Implications for Staff Development**
216. **Education in Healthy Lifestyles: Curriculum Implications**
217. **Adolescent Alcohol Abuse**
218. **Homework—And Why**
219. **America's Changing Families: A Guide for Educators**
220. **Teaching Mildly Retarded Children in the Regular Classroom**
221. **Changing Behavior: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Parents**
224. **Teaching About Religion in the Public Schools**
225. **Promoting Voluntary Reading in School and Home**
226. **How to Start a School/Business Partnership**
228. **Planning for Study Abroad**
230. **Improving Home-School Communications**
231. **Community Service Projects: Citizenship in Action**
232. **Outdoor Education: Beyond the Classroom Walls**
233. **What Educators Should Know About Copyright**
234. **Teenage Suicide: What Can the Schools Do?**
235. **Legal Basics for Teachers**
236. **A Model for Teaching Thinking Skills: The Inclusion Process**
237. **The Induction of New Teachers**
239. **Recruiting Superior Teachers: The Interview Process**
240. **Teaching and Teacher Education: Implementing Reform**
241. **Learning Through Laughter: Humor in**
242. **High School Dropouts: Causes, Consequences, and Cure**
243. **Community Education: Processes and Programs**
244. **Teaching the Process of Thinking, K-12**
245. **Dealing with Abnormal Behavior in the Classroom**
246. **Teaching Science as Inquiry**
247. **Mentor Teachers: The California Model**
248. **Using Microcomputers in School Administration**
249. **Missing and Abducted Children: The School's Role in Prevention**
250. **A Model for Effective School Discipline**
251. **Teaching Reading in the Secondary School**
252. **Educational Reform: The Forgotten Half**
253. **Voluntary Religious Activities in Public Schools: Policy Guidelines**
254. **Teaching Writing with the Microcomputer**
255. **How Should Teachers Be Educated? An Assessment of Three Reform Reports**
256. **A Model for Teaching Writing: Process and Product**
257. **Preschool Programs for Handicapped Children**
258. **Serving Adolescents' Reading Interests Through Young Adult Literature**
259. **The Year-Round School: Where Learning Never Stops**
260. **Using Educational Research in the Classroom**
261. **Microcomputers and the Classroom Teacher**
262. **Writing for Professional Publication**
263. **Adopt a School—Adopt a Business**
264. **Teenage Parenthood: The School's Response**
265. **AIDS Education: Curriculum and Health Policy**
266. **Dialogue Journals: Writing as Conversation**
267. **Preparing Teachers for Urban Schools**
268. **Education: By Invitation Only**
269. **Mission Possible: Innovations in the Bronx Schools**
270. **A Primer on Music for Non-Musician Educators**
271. **Extraordinary Educators: Lessons in Leadership**
272. **Religion and the Schools: Significant Court Decisions in the 1980s**
273. **The High-Performing Educational Manager**
274. **Student Press and the Hazelwood Decision**
275. **Improving the Textbook Selection Process**
276. **Effective Schools Research: Practice and Promise**
277. **Improving Teaching Through Coaching**
278. **How Children Learn a Second Language**
279. **Eliminating Procrastination Without Putting It Off**
280. **Early Childhood Education: What Research Tells Us**

(Continued on inside back cover)