Indiana State University

Sycamore Scholars

2000

A study of Indiana State University's PDS partnerships through qualitative review of liaison activities,collaborative inquiry and teacher perceptions.

Kevin Bruce Bolinger
Indiana State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds

<div align="center">

Curriculum Vitae
Kevin Bruce Bolinger
(217) 826-3488
(812) 237-2884

</div>

Education

September, 1980 to December, 1985	California State Polytechnic University Bachelor of Science: Behavioral Science, Sociology Specialty Minor: Criminology
January, 1997 to January, 1998	Indiana State University Master of Education: Curriculum and Instruction History Specialization
January, 1998 to Present	Indiana State University Doctor of Philosophy Program Curriculum and Instruction: History Specialization

Professional Experience

1986-1988	Chaffey Joint Union High School District Secondary Special Education Teacher
1988-1994	S.G.V.T.C. Residential Facility Administrator of Residential Treatment Facility for Developmentally Disabled Adults
1993-1994	Normal Life, Sheridan, IN. Administrator of Residential Treatment Facility for Developmentally and Physically Disabled Children
1997-2000	Indiana State University Student, Doctoral Fellow

Presentations and Publications

Presentations:

◇ <u>Spring 1999 ATE-National Conference</u>, Chicago "Summative Assessment of INTASC Standards; One Institutions Perspective"

◇ <u>Fall 1998 PDS Conference</u>, Indiana State University "Quantitative and Qualitative Measures of PDS Success: a Research Proposal"

◇ <u>Fall 1998 ATE-Indiana Conference</u>, Turkey Run, IN. (Field Directors Forum) "Developing a Student Teaching Assessment Instrument Based Upon INTASC Principles"

◇ <u>Spring 1998 ATE-Midwest Conference</u>, Terre Haute, IN. "Perceptions, Myths and Realities of Standards Based Reform in Teacher Education."

◇ <u>Fall 1997 ATE-Indiana Conference</u>, Turkey Run, IN. " a NBPTS Model for a Master's Degree in Curriculum and Instruction"

◇ <u>Winter 1998 ATE-National Conference</u>, Dallas TX. "INTASC Based Student Teacher Assessment" Developed by Kevin Bolinger, Presented by Della Thacker and Bob George.

Publications:

◇ Bolinger, Kevin & Gilman, David. 1997. <u>Student Mobility and Demographics: Relationships to Aptitude and Achievement in a Three Year Middle School</u>. ERIC Document Services # ED409-273.

◇ Bolinger, Kevin. 1987. <u>Alternative Curriculum Model for Learning Disabled Students in a Public High School</u>. Published under a grant from the California Department of Education. 1987.

◇ Bolinger et al. 1985. <u>Suburban Punks A Comparison in Southern California</u>. Pacific Sociological Journal.

Affiliations:

1997-1998   Teacher Education Committee, Graduate Student Representative
1998-1999   Graduate Assistant Representative, Center for Teaching and Learning
1997-Present Member Association of Teacher Educators
1989-1992   Served on Vendor Advisory Council, State of California, Department of Developmental Disabilities.

Honors and awards:

Member Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society
Criminal Justice Student of the Year, California State University, 1985.

A STUDY OF INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY'S PDS PARTNERSHIPS THROUGH

QUALITATIVE REVIEW OF LIAISON ACTIVITIES, COLLABORATIVE

INQUIRY, AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Kevin Bruce Bolinger

August 2000

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation of Kevin Bruce Bolinger, Contribution to the School of Graduate Studies, Indiana State University, Series III, Number 807, under the title *A Study of Indiana State University's PDS Partnerships Through Qualitative Review of Liaison Activities, Collaborative Inquiry, and Teacher Perceptions* is approved as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.

_____6/5/00_____
Date

_____
Committee Chairperson

_____
Committee Member

_____
Committee Member

_____
Committee Member

_____
Committee Member

_____8/4/00_____
Date

_____
For the School of Graduate Studies

ABSTRACT

The purpose of his study was to examine the characteristics of the Professional

Development School partnership between Indiana State University and several local

school sites to determine the extent of institutional commitment, the roles which are

valued and practiced by university liaisons, and the types of collaborative inquiry

research which are conducted by university and school personnel. A survey of school

teachers within PDS school sites was conducted to elaborate on the perceptions and

opinions about the function and results of the PDS partnership. A sample of 425

teachers was non-randomly selected from five PDS sites; 171 teachers completed and

returned the survey. Additionally, 18 past and present university liaisons were surveyed

to provide descriptions of both their activities and priorities as a liaison. Fourteen

liaisons returned the survey. A review of the collaborative inquiry projects funded by the

ISU PDS program over the past six years was conducted to classify the types of research

occurring within the program. Sixty-six projects were examined.

Results showed that classroom teachers' expectations of the program are

commensurate with the goals of the ISU PDS program, but that 58% of the respondents

could not or did not cite specific changes within the school resulting from the partnership.

70% of the respondents cited lack of involvement or lack of collaboration as a weakness

of the ISU PDS Program. The liaison survey results showed a high degree of

disagreement between liaisons as to the priorities and performances of their roles as

liaisons. The collaborative inquiry review showed a majority of qualitative projects

primarily investigating instructional techniques or teaching methods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Robert Williams, Director of the ISU PDS program for his gracious assistance and help gathering materials necessary for this report, and for providing feedback on ideas throughout the planning and implementation of this dissertation. I owe an additional thanks to Wandell Gabey for her untiring assistance with anything and everything. She provides the faculty and students in the School of Education with more than can be measured or credited.

I would like to express my gratitude to all of the members of my committee: Drs. Robert Clouse and Bill Warren, who provided a unique historical perspective to the work, as well as a vantage point from outside of the School of Education, and Drs. Jerry Summers and Gail Huffman-Joley, who advised me expertly, drawing upon a wealth of experience in Professional Development Schools and educational reforms in general.

I would like to extend a special thanks to Dr. Cathleen Rafferty, my dissertation committee chair and friend. Her assistance on this project predates its conception. I not only received copious direction and feedback for this dissertation, but continue to benefit from her insights. Beyond any requested assistance, Cathleen provides me with a model for professional achievement. Her performance and dedication are well noted as exemplary by her colleagues, and I have been extremely fortunate to have benefitted from her tutelage.

I would also like to recognize my soon-to-be wife, Ann. I owe her many countless hours of support and encouragement which I hope to repay with her upcoming

dissertation. She kept the other strands of my life from unraveling during the long sequestered hours at the computer. I hope to find the patience and kindness which she is so naturally blessed with to give her the support that she has given me.

I dedicate this dissertation in memorial to my father, Clarence Henry "Doc" Bolinger. As a first generation college graduate he made his family proud and instilled expectations and confidence which continue to drive his children. His unusually short life was remarkable in its effect on so many people, his wit was tempered with kindness, his intellect measured by compassion, and he provided the model for all that I am or hope to be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

According to the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1998 edition, the

population of the United States has reached 270 million persons, 25% of whom are 18

years old or under. Of the 75% of us who are not of school age, 1.1 million are in prison,

1.3 million are unemployed, and there are 11.9 million single parent families. All of

these numbers are down compared to recent years, and have been indicative of a trend for

the past ten years which has seen lower crime rates in all categories, continually falling

unemployment rates, and state sponsored welfare reduction programs (U.S. Census

Bureau, 1999). Since for many years the school system was blamed for the decline of

America as witnessed by the yearly inflation of crime and poverty statistics, it seems

only fair to credit the American educational system with the slow but undeniable reversal

of these trends. Still, one million prisoners is not a badge of honor, and uncounted among

the unemployed are the underemployed and those not seeking employment. Since 25%

of the nations population is under the influence of the school system the opportunity for

mass social change through educational reform is ever present. Is this the charge of the

public school? Many say that the purpose of the school is to instruct, and diluting this

mission with moral and social agendas will only diminish the quality of instruction,

accomplishing nothing, that we need to go back to the "old fashioned" ways.

If we venture back to the genesis of the American school system, however, we will find the origins of our environment were steeped in moral tradition and maintaining social order. The Quaker schools, established by the Old Deluder Satan Act in 1647 (Pulliam, 1982), created the first public funded mandatory school system in the Massachusetts colony. The curriculum was simple: reading, writing, and religion. Strict disciplinary measures and harsh moral lessons were intended to transmit the puritan values which would prevent societal decay in a new colony separated from the civilizing influence of England. Schools were charged less with the academic development of the child than the moral development of the child. Socialization through biblical instruction was paramount, and reading and writing skills were necessary to meet that end. Much later, mathematics entered the curriculum, though not as prominently as the other three subjects. The school operated six days a week except in the summer. The function of the earliest American schools was inseparable from the needs of the civic body and the direction of the community.

Students with aspirations of going through the university, Harvard at first then other Ivy league schools like Princeton, Rutgers, and Brown in the 18th century, attended Latin Grammar schools starting at age 8 for six to eight years. Latin Grammar schools were tuition-based and not for everyone. Although education is not mentioned in the federal constitution, many of the state constitutions do mention education and early models relied on the Massachusetts programs originating in the 17th century. Early efforts at establishing a national school system were proffered by Jefferson and others, but dismissed by the Congress due to excessive war debt of $75 million dollars. By contrast in 1998 expenditures for public education exceeded $351 billion.

American education in the 19th century evolved to meet the needs of industrialization, expanding the curriculum and developing primary and secondary schools in some areas. Teacher education remained a product of subject knowledge, as only a few normal schools developed after the civil war, but by 1900 there were 345 normal schools for teacher preparation in the United States (Pulliam, 1982). During the progressive era, theorists such as John Dewey helped educational theory break free from the theological framework on which it had been established. During this same period many of the normal schools became teacher colleges and by 1940 most of the normal schools were gone (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). As teacher training became more formalized, theory rather than practice began to dominate teacher preparation curriculum. The Depression years led to an oversupply of teachers and the raising of teacher standards as a consequence. Many states now require skills exams, subject exams, and pedagogical exams prior to certification, though states that are experiencing a teacher shortage often overlook these exams and issue emergency certificates to insure a body in the classroom.

During the Cold War era, the United States began to measure its educational products through a lens of international competition. Specifically, the space race with the Soviet Union produced a national anxiety about the effectiveness of our school systems. After the 1957 launch of Sputnik, academic excellence was stressed through the Defense Education Act which promoted science and technical offerings in public high schools and colleges. Competing with this focus on academic excellence, the Civil Rights Movement of the sixties brought social equality agendas to the steps of the schools leading to an overall schizophrenia about school curriculum by 1980. Reform efforts ran the gamut from back to basics movements to discovery learning, from open classrooms to individualized instruction. John Goodlad noted in 1984 the lack of direction and focus of

reform efforts (Goodlad, 1984). He points to reform efforts which simply centered on trying harder and narrowing the mission of the school. Goodlad predicts the failure of simple yet wide reaching reform efforts by detailing the confounding societal influences, primarily the breakdown of supportive institutions such as the household and church, as a unaccounted variable in the simple reform equations.

The public perception of both the success of the schools and the validity of reform in general was forever changed in 1983 when the National Commission on Excellence in Education Presented a report to the United States Department of Education entitled "An Open Letter to the American People-A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." The underlying statement of the document questioned the effectiveness of American education in preparing young adults to enter a competitive world economy, and the declining standards of excellence within our schools which put our nation "at risk." The commission stated that

> our nation is at risk ... we report to the American people that the educational
> foundations of our society are presently being eroded by the rising tide of
> mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people...we have, in
> effect, been committing an act of unthinking unilateral education disarmament
> (NCEE, 1983).

The basis for such broad and condemning statements may have been fraught with interpretive error, but the impact was nonetheless compelling and comprehensive. The report mobilized a constituency to produce measurably successful schools. Many groups worked in different ways to offer a plan for broadly applied systemic reform. One plan devised by university faculty and deans moved to create a link between the schools of education and the public schools which would insure continual renewal and growth through the establishment of Professional Development Schools.

The Professional Development Schools (PDS) initiative authored by the Holmes

Group Consortium (Holmes Group, 1990) is now in its second decade. The initial proposal and its subsequent trials at universities nationwide have attempted to improve school success and student learning through collaboration, research, and dissemination of knowledge and skills between universities and public elementary and secondary schools. Early PDS research has been mainly anecdotal in its efforts to recognize those elements of structure which cement the PDS partnership, and the enigmatic program features which support new forms of learning and teaching in individual schools. Further description is needed to identify those activities within a PDS relationship which contribute to structural cohesion, and those activities which contribute to particular school needs, and which of the PDS activities contribute to both or neither. A closer examination of one program which describes the challenges and triumphs of a single institution and its PDS partners may shed further light on the evolving nature of the PDS program both within that partnership and throughout other across the nation.

This study proposes to examine three components of the PDS structure which are vital to its success and which may indicate positive performance results in one university program. A qualitative evaluation of the Indiana State University PDS program from the perspectives of both school site teachers and university liaisons will be conducted to determine both the level of institutional commitment by both school and university, and the types of activities which lead to further development and success of this particular PDS model. Three instruments for evaluation of the ISU PDS program are used;

1. 1995 oral interviews and 2000 survey results measuring school site teacher response to the PDS program.

2. A survey of activities performed by the PDS university liaisons and a ranking of activities valued by PDS liaisons.

3. Records of research projects conducted within school sites by teams of school and university faculty for the benefit of either the school population or the general knowledge base.

This study will qualitatively examine descriptive statistics from each of the three data sources and provide a content analysis. Conclusions will be based both upon the discrete data collected and inferences with known school success indicators. Activities which result from PDS collaboration will be categorized and counted, but the extent of impact on student achievement can only be estimated from literature supporting the success of such activities. Isolating the direct influence of individual programs or efforts is not possible within the design of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The intent of this study is to examine one PDS partnership and identify the essential characteristics which are evident from both school and university perspectives, and to determine what impact that program has had over the past decade. These essential characteristics may be similar to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) critical attributes (NCATE, 1997), or initial Holmes Group expectations (Holmes Group, 1990), or they may be new and as yet unidentified components which are a product of individual school collaborations. Examination of the various perspectives from both school and university PDS personnel will illustrate both the expectations of the partners and the level of collaborative institutionalization attained. What will not be determined, however, is the exact extent to which student learning has improved as a result of PDS involvement. It would be difficult to isolate a causal relationship between a PDS partnership and student learning when there are numerous

reforms and changes at any school which could account for either an improvement or decline in student achievement. What can be noted, on the other hand, is school improvements which are credited with PDS relationships as a product of collaboration, research, or pre-service development. How and in what ways has each school has benefited from PDS involvement, and how has the university improved teacher preparation and expansion of its knowledge base are valid and answerable questions.

Limitations and Delimitations

Investigation of the PDS program at Indiana State University (ISU) may not be generalized to the larger population of PDS's, over 200 partnerships nationally, yet it may provide a detailed view of the organizational structures which have been developed, both by design and circumstance, through its evolution, and ultimately add to the larger body of literature available to PDS researchers. The purpose of this study is to examine the structural relationships of Indiana State University's PDS program and to provide at least a partial description of these relationships and developmental processes which have come to define the PDS program. In addition, this study will examine specific relationships such as the PDS liaison, in light of their impact on the structure and mission success on the program. The PDS liaison serves in a crucial capacity at the juncture between the school and university. The types of activities which are common or rare among the various PDS liaisons may well determine the eventual success of any single partnership, and either contribute to or diminish the institutionalization of reform.

Nature and Scope of the Problem

The largest problem in determining the impact of PDS or any reform program on

actual student learning is isolating the causal relationship in a way which shows direct influence from a defined antecedent. Many schools experience improvements and declines in student performance as determined by standard test scores and college entrance, etc., but this can be due to a number of variables such as administrative change, turnover in the faculty core, or curriculum changes. If, however, we can establish that certain activities within the school promote student learning from a review of prior research, then cataloging those activities in a PDS school which result from PDS relationships should lead to inferential conclusions about the success of the PDS partnership. Additionally, structural components which strengthen the PDS partnerships and promote its longevity can be identified and measured within each of the school sites and the university.

Contribution of the Study

New PDS partnerships are being formed every year, and many others are still evolving through the initial stages of development. If the PDS program is to remain an effective long term reform effort which can adapt and evolve with the changing needs of society, then a unique institution must be created which has the structural elements necessary for long term adaptive problem solving. Much in the same way as corporations have adapted their missions from industrial to post-industrial needs, surviving and thriving through change, the PDS program and all its participating members must focus on institutional stability as a prerequisite priority to delivering reform. If the structural components of one institution can be identified and classified, then predictions of institutional success or failure might be inferred from the examination and applied to developing or evolving PDS programs. In this study the initial reactions of stakeholders,

primarily teachers, should provide valuable information about the state of institutionalization of the PDS program at ISU three years after its inception. Additional current research will measure the changes in teacher attitudes and expectations of the PDS program five years later.

A survey of inquiry and directed research conducted in the schools, along with specific educational reforms initiated or aided through PDS collaboration should provide further information on the types of activities which have productive results in a PDS partnership. There have been many research projects conducted under the auspices of the PDS program at ISU during the last eight years, and results which have informed practice or altered curriculum or administrative delivery have had an impact on the schools and the students within those schools. What may not be determined, however, is the positive or negative effect each reform based upon inquiry has had on student learning. Again, it is only through research validation that we may know the value of any of these programs or findings.

A further contribution of this study may be to provide a close examination of the types of activities which form a productive liaison relationship. Some of the duties of the liaison in ISU's PDS program are detailed in a job description provided, though many others are a matter of interpretation and idiosyncratic differences. A survey report of the types and priorities of various activities of each of the 15 ISU university liaisons may provide a more precise notion of the role of the liaison. Furthermore, a comparison with the types of activities which occur in each school site may yield some interpretations of effective liaisonships. It is hoped that an ideal or archetype liaison can be developed utilizing this data.

The function of the liaison is a most critical role within a PDS partnership. The

roles that they fulfill within the school may determine the types of structural changes which will be institutionalized. When a liaison provides unrestricted conduits for communication, opens avenues for inquiry which are exploited by both university and school faculty, provides professional growth opportunities for resident staff, and assists in creating meaningful and effective restructuring within the school, they have provided for growth in the essential characteristic of a PDS program. Liaison questionnaires used in this study will determine the extent of these activities as they are practiced by each liaison. While no singular approach to a complex relationship such as the liaison can be suggested, there may be types of activities which can be associated with positive school change, or further institutionalization of the PDS program.

The data gathered from this study should provide information valuable to the further development of ISU's PDS program. If the results are examined in comparison with the NCATE draft standards for PDS programs, a clear picture of the developmental level of ISU's program should emerge. This is not, however, entirely a qualitative study. Quantitative measures of the types of inquiry and teacher response to PDS changes will provide a measurable level of impact resulting from the PDS partnership at ISU. Three sets of data will provide a descriptive framework for the analysis in this study. Teacher interviews conducted in 1995 examining the impact of PDS programs on the participating schools and a proposed follow-up on these interviews, liaison questionnaires, and a survey of action research will provide the data for analysis. The value of this study should be apparent to new or emerging PDS programs which may emulate some of the structural facets of the ISU program with expectations of similar results, or develop a more fully articulated liaison training program based upon the qualitative examples provided. New or emerging PDS programs may build structural components into their

design based upon programmatic developments which occur serendipitously within ISU

program, avoiding the trial and error approach that so many PDS programs had to rely

upon in the earlier phases of the initiative.

Definitions of Terms

A professional development school is the term introduced by the Holmes Group

in 1986, but other names have been applied to the same concept. They are also known as

professional practice schools, clinical schools, or a variety of other terms, (Abdal-Haqq,

1998), but all share common goals. The following terms will appear in this study:

Collaborative Inquiry: Classroom research jointly proposed, conducted and analyzed by

at least one school and one university member.

Intern: A pre-service teacher, usually assigned by the university.

Internship: position and responsibilities designated to pre-service teacher student teaching

in a PDS school site.

Liaison: a university or school assigned position responsible for maintaining

communication with the PDS steering committee and officers.

Practicum students: Pre-service teachers who are observing or assisting in school sites

prior to their internship.

PDS Faculty: School or university teachers who work in a PDS school site.

PDS Steering Committee: Advisory committee comprised of PDS stakeholders and

governing body officers, sets regulation and policy of PDS.

School faculty: Teachers practicing in a PDS elementary or secondary school site

Students: P-12 PDS school site students.

University faculty: University teacher.

Education has evolved into a discipline where change is a constant, and reform is the only standard in the education school curriculum. We have, for the past 20 years, molded pedagogy into the paradigm of reform such that no permanent solution or methodology is sought or expected. This may seem odd, but it should be viewed in contrast to other disciplines. In both the sciences and social sciences new paradigms are constantly sought out which will either fail to reject the existing ways of thinking or establish a new contradictory schemata. Such was the case when Einstein challenged Newtonian physics. Furthermore new paradigms may add to older ways of thinking without completely destroying the old paradigm, just as Darwin's theories built upon the work of Huxley and Lamarck. In the Social Sciences this process of assimilating ideas or rejecting them to create new ideas is also a standard procedure, though the older paradigms rarely lose all favor, nor do the new paradigms completely replace older ways of thinking. Mills conflict theories of the 1950's built upon Marx's ideas of a century earlier but did not replace Marxist thought, just as Behaviorism exists along side its opposing paradigm, Psychoanalysis in psychology.

In schools of education competing and opposing paradigms challenge reform efforts to remain cohesive and comprehensible. In other academic disciplines the dichotomy of competing models energizes scholarly debate which in turn adds to the body of knowledge and the complexity of paradigms within that discipline. In education, however, theory must meet practice in a professional environment which is differentiated from pure academics. In this sense education is closer to the sciences, which do not so easily entertain multiple competing paradigms, than the social sciences. The PDS initiative as authored by the Holmes Group recognizes this rare and difficult position.

Education must renew itself with a constant agenda of reform, but the types of reform can not be mandated from a singular national paradigm, but rather must result from each individual partnership in response to the school's unique needs. In this way competing paradigms can be adopted and practiced in a professional environment without the need to secure a singular and correct philosophy.

In the coming chapters further definition and discussion of the Holmes Group and PDS schools will be given. In Chapter two the Holmes Group will be discussed and its goals along with them will be reviewed. NCATE's draft standards for PDS partnerships will be presented, extant PDS research will be reviewed, and Indiana State University's PDS program will be introduced and compared with the national goals for PDS.

In Chapter three the methods and procedures for this study will be detailed. Included will be the hypotheses under investigation, the sources of data and the collection and treatment procedures. Chapter four will review the findings of the three instruments used for this study, a teacher survey, a review of collaborative inquiry projects, and a liaison survey. Chapter five will present a summary, conclusions, and recommendations from the data gathered from the Indiana State University PDS program.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The challenge to schools preparing students to enter a post industrial economy is

to develop scientific and technological skills which are vital to adapting in a fast paced

rapidly changing economy. Previous industrial needs included fundamental skills and

basic levels of knowledge, but the decline of manufacturing industry in America, and the

rise of technological service industries has created an unfilled need for workers with

adaptive skills.[1] Adaptive skills are developed from problem solving abilities and

interdisciplinary connections which permit students to understand and create new skills

beyond their high school years. Adaptive skills may not be reported in standardized test

measures, but can be encouraged in a curriculum which challenges students to solve

problems and create new solutions while identifying emerging problems. Traditional

education, for instance, presents a problem to a student and requires them to solve it. The

means by which they solve it is of little consequence as long as the correct response is

achieved. In more advanced programs the student may work in teams and detail the

solution process, spending as much time examining the process of creating the solution as

[1] U.S. Department of Commerce statistics for 1996 show that expenditures for new plants and equipment in the manufacturing sector dropped from $192 billion per year in 1990 to $144 billion per year in 1994. At the same time expenditures for plants and equipment in the non-manufacturing sector rose from $399 billion to $412 billion. Clearly the post-industrial economy in the United States is shifting the workforce distribution. In 1995 the US Bureau of Labor Statistics reported over 50% of the US workforce with some college education, and nearly 1/3 with a full college degree, compared to only 25 years earlier when only 14% of the workforce had a college degree. Schools which do not prepare all students for college entrance should prepare all students to compete in a non-manufacturing sector which requires a different set of skills than has previously been part of the American curriculum (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1999).

they do solving the problem. Through this process a student develops metacognitive strategies which develop their adaptive skills for future, not yet identified, employment. A further step, which is necessary for information age economic development, lies in the discovery of the problem. It is becoming increasingly important to employers in this new age to build a work force which can not only work at solving new and complex problems, but also a work force which can identify and define those problems a`priori. Students with skills that permit problem identification and solution are necessary for further economic evolution, and will have to be produced by schools which emphasize a constantly adapting and challenging curriculum; schools where reform is the norm. The professional development school provides such a model.

The Holmes Group and Professional Development Schools

In 1986 the Holmes Group was formed from a collaboration of 250 professional educators and deans of university education schools. The group sought to create a blueprint for school improvement which would address the apparent decline in education indicated by the National Commission on Excellence in Education report.[2] The Holmes Group recognized that school improvement must proceed from a collaborative effort involving all the stakeholders in American education. Reform efforts which begin and end solely confined within the public schools have a life and investment which is limited to current practitioners, and wavering levels of enthusiasm. Additionally, reform programs

---

[2] In 1983 the National Commission on Excellence in Education presented a report to the United States Department of Education entitled "An Open Letter to the American People-A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform." The underlying statement of the document questioned the effectiveness of American education in preparing young adults to enter a competitive world economy, and the declining standards of excellence within our schools which put our nation "at risk". The commission stated that "our nation is at risk...we report to the American people that the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by the rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and as a people...we have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking unilateral education disarmament" (NCEE, 1983). The basis for such broad and condemning statements may have been fraught with interpretive error, but the impact was nonetheless compelling and comprehensive.

which are designed in academia may not account for the distinct and complex problems of each individual school. A generic approach to school reform clearly discounts these unique conditions and the level of investment required by diverse stakeholders such as parents, administrators and researchers. The problem facing the Holmes Group was to develop a macro-reform program which was micro-administrated. In other words, the Holmes Group set out to develop a template of reform which could be adapted to the unique needs of individual schools, while providing a standard which would insure improvement in practice throughout the nations school districts. To accomplish this the Holmes Group has concentrated its effort on the preparation of new teachers and the enrichment of the existing teacher core. As they state in *Tomorrow's Schools*, "The Holmes Group doesn't have any business telling the community what kind of schools it should have, but it does have a right to say how teachers should be prepared" (Holmes Group, 1990, p.# 10). The Holmes Group began with five goals published in their 1986 work, *Tomorrows Teachers:*

1. Make teaching intellectually sound. This requires a broader approach to teacher preparation, one which insures sufficient content knowledge, yet equally provides for exemplary teaching methodology. Teachers must know more of what they teach, and be better prepared to teach as a result of their preparatory instruction and activities. Specifically the Holmes Group suggests that beginning teachers candidates:

- Earn a bachelor's degree in at least one academic subject,
- Integrate research findings about teaching and learning into their practice,
- Be able to demonstrate lessons which are challenging and effective,
- Are prepared to work with culturally and socioeconomic diverse students,
- Have demanding supervised assignments which demonstrate success in the

classroom.

      2. Recognize the differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment. A major flaw in previous reform efforts stemmed from the hegemonic view of the teaching core. Talents of the teachers in any school vary, and a singular approach to reform which does not account for the exceptionality of the teachers both limits investment in the program and fails to employ the talents which are a natural resource within the school. A program which could account for and utilize these talents has a greater chance for success. The Holmes Group suggests two actions to meet this objective.

- Structure practicums and field experiences that insure that beginning teacher candidates receive the assistance and supervision that they need.

- Prepare experienced teachers for advancement in their careers through leadership in the schools where they teach.

The second of these tasks is especially critical given the failure of previous reform efforts which did not account for the structure and culture of public schools which has discouraged academic leadership among peers.

      3. Create relevant and intellectually defensible standards in teaching. Unlike other professions, teaching had not developed a set of universal professional standards which would guide and direct the development of the teachers beyond their induction into the profession. Professions such as medicine, law, and engineering rely not just on a core of knowledge, but also on a demonstration of minimum competency based on a set of professional standards prior to and throughout the professional career. Teaching needed a similar set of standards which would establish similar professional expectations. Rather than prescribe a set curriculum for professional preparation, as previous reform efforts had done, the Holmes group set the following expectations on standards for teachers.

- Develop multiple evaluation instruments which measure varying levels of competence throughout the teacher candidates preparation.

- Work to encourage minority candidates to enter teaching.

- Replace standardized tests as licensing exams.

Recognizing varying levels of competence throughout the teacher preparation program further recognizes the developmental nature of the teaching skill. Although this recommendation ends with the teacher's induction into teaching, the logic which supports a developmental portrait of the teacher also supports continuing professional development, which would become a hallmark of the PDS program. Nationally accepted standards for teacher performance such as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards for beginning teachers, and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) standards for professional growth, have added peripheral support for the Holmes Group objectives.

4. Connect schools of education to the public schools. It is not only important that the public schools and universities be connected, but also that the connection be bidirectional. Previous ideas of connection included the university leading reform and the schools following, which was a weak connection at best. Reform designed in the university may have made its way into the public schools through idealistic young practitioners, but without structural support from an adaptive administration, and cultural support arising from an open and encouraged dialogue amongst teachers about teaching, long term change was unlikely. The sheer number of reform efforts in the past 25 years, and their lack of longevity, demonstrate the need not for a radically different kind of reform, but rather a fundamentally different delivery system. In the Holmes' vision, reform is not a unidirectional mandate from academia, but a collaborative

investigation into local and specific problems, yielding equally collaborative and evolving

solutions. Each school's unique needs and unique talents could hardly be the motivation

or foundation for broad based school reform. In a collaborative inquiry model, both the

needs of the school and the talents which must be considered in any implementation of

reform are blended into the construction of reform. The Holmes Group offers several

guidelines for establishing a collaborative connection between schools and universities.

- Reciprocity, or a mutual exchange and benefit between research and practice.

- Experimentation, which is defined as a willingness to try new forms of practice
and structure.

- Systematic inquiry, or the requirement that new ideas be subject to careful study
and validation.

- Student Diversity, or commitment to the development of teaching strategies for a
broad range of children.

To accomplish these objectives requires a contractual agreement between collaborating

schools and universities. Such a contract would require a detailed explanation of the roles

and responsibilities of the parties involved, along with a clear structure which permits and

encourages discourse between the school and university. Defining this relationship is

what leads ultimately to a description of a PDS partnership. Questions which need to be

resolved before establishing a PDS partnership included how reciprocity,

experimentation, systematic inquiry and student diversity will be maintained and

improved through a contractual relationship. If the contract between a school and a

university does not establish structural avenues which encourage these four activities,

then it is left to individual initiation, and subject to the variation in quality which comes

from variable interest and commitment. For this reason, the contract established to

initiate a PDS partnership can be the most critical prerequisite to effective and lasting reform.

5. Make schools better places for teachers to practice and learn. This is the heart of the PDS program. Public schools become learning centers for the teachers as well as the students. In the medical profession, teaching hospitals serve as both centers of exemplary practice, and instructional labs for intern physicians. The vision of the PDS school partnerships is to establish school sites which are both centers for exemplary practice as well as laboratories for investigation and inquiry. The school site is not seen solely as the destination of reform, as in previous models, but the site of origination as well. Additionally this objective seeks to establish an environment conducive to professionalism by encouraging recognition of teachers' work and nurturing relationships among university professors and practicing teachers. If a peer relationship can be established which recognizes the teacher's worth and potential for contribution, the resulting professionalism will raise both the expectations for school performance as well as the level of pre-service education provided at the site. The benefit is clear to both the university and the school. The role of the university liaison, or point of contact between the university and school site, becomes critical to establishing and maintaining equitable peer relationships and disseminating research and information between the two partners. The liaisons are the hinge pins which hold the partnership together, and as such should be highly valued in the level of responsibility they hold.

A plan for broad based yet individualized reform was born from these principles in 1990. In that year the Homes Group outlined the Professional Development School. In essence it would be a collaboration between public schools and universities designed to meet the five goals of the original Holmes Group report. In Tomorrow's Schools, the

Holmes Group examined the type of education which should be the product of increased collaboration and dissemination of information through the PDS program. They define the types and qualities of learning which should occur in an ideal PDS school site. These are detailed in six principles which might also be viewed as outcomes sought through the PDS alliance. They are:

1. Teaching and Learning for Understanding

2. Creating a Learning Community

3. Teaching and Learning for Understanding for Everybody's Children

4. Continuing Learning by Teachers, Teacher Educators, and Administrators

5. Thoughtful, Long-term Inquiry into Teaching and Learning by School and University Faculty Working as Partners

6. Inventing a New Institution

The first of these principles is most likely to drastically challenge the existing curriculum of the school site. Teaching and learning for understanding encompasses both the content of the curriculum and the delivery method used to convey it. This requires active learning experiences which help empower the student beyond the knowledge presented and further insure lifelong learning as is necessary in a rapidly changing social and economic environment. The challenges of the information age can only be met by creating new learning experiences which emphasize the role of the learner over the object of what is learned. In other words, the process of knowledge acquisition is the goal of modern education not the mere acquisition of knowledge. This may present difficulties to PDS school sites which serve under another mandate as well. Standardized testing, which continues despite its failure to evaluate necessary post industrial skills, also influences the curriculum and may present a dichotomy for administrators and teachers attempting to

satisfy both the demands of standardized test preparation and the goals of an enlightened

PDS partnership. It is this principle, however, which promises the greatest direct impact

on student learning, which is the ultimate goal of all PDS reforms. The other principles

lend support to this initial directive, and should be viewed in consideration of their own

impact, and to the degree which they enable principle one to be met.

The second principle embodies elements of the third as well. Both tend to view

the classroom as an egalitarian forum, one which exercises the principles of full inclusion

democracy, as well as creates universal expectations and opportunities. Creating a

learning community, and teaching everybody's children, both create expectations of a

shared common experience for all children which centers on the development of the child

as a learner. Community implies not only the full inclusion of all students, but the larger

network of stakeholders in the child's education. In order to promote a full community of

learning, a PDS site must invest responsibilities in the entire social world of the child.

This includes parents of course, but also business and political interests within the

community which will inevitably become part of the students' economic and cultural

experience after school. A successful PDS partnership should encourage community

based education and community input into the curriculum development process.

Principle three also proffers a difficult proposition, that all children can learn. The

impression left by multiple summative exams throughout a student's career is that some

students cannot learn. In order to rank and ordinally evaluate students we have long relied

on the summative knowledge-based exam, rather than the formative informal assessments

necessary to reflect upon and remediate instruction. The grade system itself works

contrary to the proposition that all children can learn. What is often interpreted from

summative grades is that some children learn, others learn less, and still others never catch

on. An important starting point for a truly inclusive school, which begins and ends with the proposition that all children can learn, is in the examination of evaluations. A school which can discard summative evaluations for grading purposes, and establish criterion based multiple formative evaluations has the greatest chance of overcoming the negative influence of rank ordering students.

The fourth principle directly enables the first three, as well as the next two. Like other professions such as medicine and law, teaching must accept the need to constantly update its members with new and innovative methods and knowledge. As stated earlier, the expectation for an information age economy is that students must leave school with the ability and motivation to become life long learners. The same applies to both the teachers and teacher educators. A successful PDS site must be adaptive, inviting new inquiry and practice to meet the changing needs of society. New inquiry and practice must be authored by both the PDS teacher, who is open to new forms of practice and willing to test the effectiveness of new programs, and the teacher educator, who assists teacher candidates in investigating and piloting innovative techniques. Both the school teacher and university teacher educator must constantly initiate inquiry to measure the effectiveness of current practice and assess further need within the school. All of these activities are further enabled by the school administrator who must provide time and resources to allow these activities to exist along side and in support of the general practice of the school. Collaboration and communication are an imperative for a successful PDS partnership, and must be established early and permanently for any PDS program to endure.

The fifth principle is merely a further elaboration of the types of inquiry which should take place in a PDS site. The forms of inquiry into school practice should follow

the general forms of inquiry accepted in research. In other words, success or failure of any program should be determined by disciplined, replicatable inquiry. Programs and practices which are not verified by investigation lack any statement of validity. If we truly expect PDS reforms to change our schools then we must rely on the certainty of research to validate the hosts of changes suggested by any partnership. Even existing practices, which may predate a PDS relationship, can and should be examined by collaborative inquiry.

Finally the sixth principle calls for what should be obvious by examining the first five. Inventing a new institution will be the product of any successful PDS partnership. Schools which do business as usual after establishing a PDS partnership have not institutionalized the changes necessary for the broad yet specific reforms which result from a successful PDS partnership. There may be many reasons why a school/ university partnership fails to meet the idealized standards of the Holmes Group; the school may have some mandates which conflict with PDS objectives, the school faculty may not fully invest in the collaboration necessary, the university faculty may not invest enough time or resources to school improvement, or the level of inquiry may not support the changes attempted in practice. All of these, however, are a product of the same shortcoming; the failure to establish a new institution which combines and recreates the structures of both contributing institutions. The extent to which either the school or university remains unchanged by the PDS program thus determines the likelihood of its failure.

One of the enduring problems facing the Holmes Group and universities embracing their vision, is establishing and maintaining a partnership which is general enough to be adapted to the unique needs of each partner organization while still maintaining the

specificity necessary for a coherent local reform effort. Responsibilities and outcomes need operational definitions when creating a new institution. Precise job definitions of the actors involved in a PDS partnership can help institutionalize relationships and open conduits for permanent structural change. They can also limit the scope of that change, and undermine the investment of any or all of the parties involved in the partnership. A middle ground must be found, between precise determination which limits the actions and innovations of the participants, and ill defined responsibilities which can lead to a unidirectional and unguided focus for the partnerships The contractual definitions for a PDS must provide the greatest freedom of action while promoting the maximum amount of structural development.

NCATE PDS Draft Standards

In an attempt to identify and thus support those characteristics of a PDS partnership which lead to tangible, positive results, The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 1997) has begun to develop draft standards for the evaluation of PDS programs. Data gathered through national surveys of PDS sites, focus groups, interviews at selected sites, and a review of the available literature on PDS programs has led to an initial identification of exemplary characteristics of the programs. The goal of the project is stated in two parts: identifying distinguishing characteristics of PDS's and the types of support necessary to promote quality development of PDS's. One must be done before the other. Because PDS partnerships are a new and novel form of interaction between schools and universities, the characteristics which define these interactions are neither prescribed nor plainly evident. The evolving nature of PDS programs requires a detailed investigation to discover those elements which are requisite to development of

quality programs, and ultimately, better education. Now a full decade into the PDS partnerships, NCATE is attempting to qualify elements which have been structured into the successful PDS programs and thus chart the path for future successful partnerships.

There are a few essential criteria upon which NCATE has based their analysis. These are that PDS programs should be consistent with developing standards of teacher education, specifically the INTASC and NBPTS principles; they should create an environment which integrates adult and children's learning; they should adopt parity for university and school partners on all issues of practice and policy; and they should provide simultaneous renewal for both the school and university. The NCATE project has thus far yielded two matrixes, in draft form, which measure the level of structural attainment a PDS partnership has achieved and the degree to which they contribute to the educational goals stated above. These are categorized as threshold conditions, and critical attributes, or quality conditions. The threshold conditions define and measure the emerging characteristics of a PDS partnership, while the critical attributes define and measure the quality conditions which should exist in a well established and fruitful PDS partnership.

There are three developmental levels of structural attainment for PDS programs identified by the NCATE draft standards. The first is identified as the pre-threshold stage, and describes neophyte partnerships which are beginning to build relationships between schools and universities, and establishing collaborative structures which will ensure future productive relationships. The partners recognize the need to integrate the four main functions of a PDS: pre-service teacher preparation, staff development, research, and support of children's learning, but as yet have not integrated these into a cohesive programs which addresses each of these needs by contributions from all

stakeholders through an organizational structure which demands cooperative collaboration. True collaboration, according to NCATE, requires shared roles between teachers, learners, researchers, and teacher educators. There are no standards developed for this stage as yet, though many PDS partnerships exist in this pre-threshold condition.

The second stage of development identified by the NCATE standards is the threshold stage. Partnerships which have entered the threshold stage have met five conditions established for this stage, which are seen as prerequisite to the attainment of quality PDS partnerships. These threshold conditions are:

1. An agreement which commits school, school district, union/professional associations, and the university to the basic mission of a PDS.

2. A commitment by the partners to the critical attributes of a PDS.

3. A positive working relationship and a basis for trust between partners.

4. The achievement of quality standards by partner institutions as evidenced by regional, state, national, or other review.

5. An institutional commitment of resources to the PDS from school and university.

From each of these conditions NCATE has developed a list of discrete indicators and exemplary activities which would suggest the condition is met. For example, under threshold condition #1, an indicator is offered which states: PDS mission and mission of school and university cohere. Left alone this is a high inference variable which is confounded by subjective interpretations. Three examples are cited which give a clearer picture of what might indicate mission coherence. However at this point it is unclear if all three need be met, or just any one of the three, in order to satisfy the objective. They are, *university identifies PDS in its teacher education mission; school faculty are*

knowledgeable about the philosophy, goals, and expectations of the teacher preparation program; and the larger school community respects and supports the work of the PDS colleagues. Of course these examples are not entirely objective either, though completely objective indicators would only be possible if a rigid and prescribed structure were detailed, and this would prevent the kind of flexibility PDS's are intended to provide. Other examples cited, such as *partners serve on each other's governance committee,* provide additional and somewhat more measurable criteria.

Threshold condition #2 refers to the "critical attributes" of PDS's, and provides a long list of examples which indicate adherence. These examples help to illustrate or typify a quality productive relationship amongst PDS partners, and provide a blueprint for structuring activities which will help attain a quality partnership. There are five critical attributes listed in the standards which deserve much discussion, and may provide a groundwork for investigations into PDS success such as this study. These critical attributes are the essential condition for quality review and represent the core proposition for a PDS.

The first critical attribute identifies the PDS as a learning centered community. Specifically this means that there is an inquiry basis to teaching and learning; that practice is continually redefined by the process of inquiry by both interns and teachers, school faculty and university faculty, and that dialogue about teaching is both formally and informally encouraged by the design and practice of a PDS program. There are many examples cited which indicate development of a learning community. Interns challenging teachers to reflect, action research is valued, data collected is used to systematically change and inform practice, and children's work at the focus of PDS discourse are a few which typify the inquiry orientation of a learning community. Understanding diversity of

learners and expanding knowledge of how to meet diverse learner needs is another indicator which is typified by examples such as interns working in multiple classrooms, and PDS faculty visiting each others' classrooms. Further indicators prompt interns to be integrated into the school program and teaching practice, teacher learning and professional development to be integrated into practice, teaching and learning which are collegial, and knowledge generated in the PDS which is disseminated within the school and university to other schools in the district.

The learning community attribute of the NCATE standards, along with critical attribute #2, collaboration, summarize expectations which are at the heart of the PDS program. Connecting research with practice, in a way which promotes the betterment of both is the most obvious and reasonable expectation of a university public school collaboration. Critical attribute #2, collaboration, cites indicators such as shared responsibility and expertise, and program development which is determined by jointly defined needs, to measure levels of collaboration. Defining how the new institution of a PDS communicates, shares resources, and divides responsibilities among the source organizations is necessary for the development of structural collaboration which insure the longevity of these relationships. If the lines of communication and collaboration are weak and ill defined, then success for any collaborative venture is a product of circumstance and temporal efforts. Many ventures are accomplished in this short term agreement surrounding an immediate task, but task oriented groups dissolve when the task is finished, and a new task may not bring together the same level of commitment or even the same collaborators, thus producing an uncertain future for all or part of the PDS.

Critical attribute #3 departs from the process to examine the product. While the previous critical attributes defined the structural interrelationships which were

prerequisite to a successful PDS institution, critical attribute #3 seeks to measure the desired products of a successful partnership. This attribute, (accountability and quality assurance), states that 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. The standards cited in the examples are drawn from the INTASC standards for new teachers and the NBPTS for PDS faculty. INTASC is already a part of many state licensing patterns and is a required framework for new teacher preparation in these states regardless of any PDS involvement. The PDS program should, however, insure that INTASC is not only a set of criteria for summative demonstration of teaching ability, but that all participants, teachers and interns alike, are dedicated to the fulfillment of all ten INTASC principles. Teachers, university faculty, and interns are required by the indicators of critical attribute #3 to demonstrate knowledge and performance of the standards. University course work should center on the INTASC standards, intern teachers should be aware of how they are developing via the INTASC standards, and school teachers should be able to model and monitor INTASC based teaching. A PDS program which fails to disseminate INTASC standards throughout its constituent members, or does not demand INTASC based performance in its instruction and practice, fails to meet critical attribute #3 of the NCATE PDS standards. No matter how solid the process of a PDS becomes, the product must still be based upon the improvement of teaching and learning, and it could be reasonably argued that the INTASC standards are an effective measure of teaching and learning.

Critical attribute #4 returns to organizational indicators and cites examples of resource allocation and time management which support the PDS structure. If the PDS involvement was entirely predicated on volunteer enthusiasm, then the inevitable

encroachment of daily responsibilities outside of the PDS commitment would lead to the erosion and decline of the PDS program. It is essential that the PDS program not be cast as a peripheral project which depends upon the hard work and dedication of a few, but rather a guiding integrated organization which defines missions for both the university and schools involved, through the collective membership of all stakeholders. This is easier said than done. It seems unlikely that PDS designation alone will change they way in which people view their roles within a school or university. In order for PDS to become the first designation, with the school or university as the second, all the actions specified thus far must become institutionalized and common practice. If any participating member was unaware of their changed role as a product of PDS involvement, it is unlikely that full organizational coherence has been established, and ergo, unlikely that the goals of the PDS will be insured in the long term.

The final critical attribute is yet to be fully developed by NCATE. Critical attribute #5 describes equity between the various partners and students within a PDS, and includes indicators such as *school and university curricula reflect diversity and are non-discriminatory*, and *interns work with children with diverse needs* (NCATE, 1997, p. 21). All of the indicators listed under equity may be satisfied by INTASC standards. What may be yet to come is a further example of equity between partners with diverse needs. Though this critical attribute does not list a discrete indicator for equity between partners, it will be noted in the early literature review that many of the first PDS school partners feared domination and loss of autonomy to the universities. If this is still a common fear among school partners, and there is no reason to suspect that it is not, then insuring equity and democracy within the PDS might be suggested for future NCATE PDS draft standards.

Indiana State University Professional Development School Program

The Indiana State University PDS program began in 1992 with 10 schools from four different local districts. In 1994-1995 five more urban schools were added to bring the total to 15 public schools from all grade levels in both rural and urban settings. ISU began with four program goals for their emerging partnerships, (1) increase learning for all youngsters in PDS sites, (2) provide optimal learning environments for pre-service educators in schools committed to restructuring and continuous professional development for faculty, (3) provide meaningful professional development for university and school faculty based on their needs; and (4) support school and university collaborative inquiry (ISU, 1999). These goals are guided by the overarching principle of linking reform in schools to reform in educator preparation, and further facilitated by restructuring efforts to meet the Indiana 2000 program. As part of the Goals 2000 program, the Indiana 2000 program has initiated block grants available to schools which meet restructuring criteria. These criteria are that the school restructuring program be site specific, the school organization be flattened, (removing hierarchical decision processes to involve a wider range of stakeholders into school operations), and that the school be committed to continual professional development of all educators. Each of the PDS designated schools are encouraged to apply for Indiana 2000 status by ISU. Sources of fiscal support for each of the PDS schools include:

1. A block grant of $1,000 per year from Indiana State,

2. 15 semester hours of fee waivers for staff development, and

3. A Lilly endowment of approximately $13,000 for each school for the first 3 years. (This initial endowment has changed and may not be provided currently for the full

approximate amount for new members joining the partnership).

Fiscal and restructuring support offer both incentive and direction for reform, but the

contractual obligations of each site and ISU detail the more permanent institutionalization

of reform.

The contracted agreement between ISU and the PDS school sites describes the

types of activities and relationships, along with specific responsibilities of the partners

which are necessary to meet the goals of the PDS. Along with fiscal commitments to be

met by ISU, the university sets expectational provisions for staff liaisons to be provided

by the school site, a level of commitment by at least 51% of the school staff toward

educational reform, and recently adjoined voluntary participation in the Learning Alliance

program intended to enhance learning environments. The definitions of a PDS school

provided in the contract, however, give support to the initial goals of the PDS

partnerships. These definitions expand on the expectations of a PDS school, and serve to

differentiate them from non-PDS sites. Specifically these definitions call for a PDS

school to:

1. Use effective curricular, instructional and administrative practices by
   a. operating with the belief that all students can learn regardless of their
   cultural and academic backgrounds;
   b. basing instructional practices on the recognition that students actively
   involved in learning achieve better than ones treated as passive learners;
   c. engaging students, parents, and other community members, not solely
   teachers, in the delivery of instruction;
   d. selecting curriculum content which reflects an understanding that the
   information, skills and values which will best serve individuals are ever-
   changing and that students themselves should have a major role in
   determining what that content will be; and
   e. drawing parents. other community members, teachers, counselors, and

other school service personnel into broad-based participatory approaches to curricular decision-making and school management.

2. Provide for renewal, professional growth, and continuing education of all participants through:

a. offering scheduled opportunities for conversations about teaching strategies among all educators participating at the school;

b. employing teams of teaching peers to use mutual observation and feedback in integrating innovative instructional strategies into the classrooms;

c. being a location where teachers and administrators from other schools and university faculty can work for a limited period to gain fresh ideas about curriculum, instruction, and administration;

d. providing occasions for professionals at the school to try out new responsibilities in the school;

e. being a site of district-wide staff development sessions conducted by educators for inside the school and outside;

f. using a collaborative process for setting annual and long-term goals for the school, its students, and its staff and for developing strategies to achieve those goals;

g. giving a special support for teachers, administrators, and other professional personnel from the school to participate in state and regional conferences; and

h. hosting class meetings of courses offered by the cooperating university.

3. Serve as a site for pre-service educator to work in a stimulating learning environment with outstanding practitioners. In general, it allows prospective teachers and other educator-in-training to experience the full range of responsibilities of practitioners in their professional fields. The responsibilities may include:

a. working individually with challenging pupils;

b. experimenting with innovative small-group instructional techniques;

c. implementing lesson plans prepared in collaboration with teachers at the school and university faculty;

d. working with a team of teachers in planning inter-disciplinary approaches to instruction;

e. participating in parent-teacher conferences;

f. cooperating with teachers at the school, parents, and students in developing classroom management and discipline procedures;

g. administration of assessment instruments individually with students who appear to need special instruction;

h. supervising field trips; and

i. trying out participatory approaches to school management.

4. support inquiry, research, and exchange of professional knowledge. For instance, it may:

a. be the site of collaborative research projects conducted by teams of teachers, pre-service educators, and university faculty;

b suggest questions and problems for university faculty to investigate in the current research of literature so that these faculty members and teacher at the school can jointly develop possible answers and solutions;

c. host topic centered colloquia to allow participants to develop new understandings about instruction and other responsibilities of educators;

e. provide opportunities for practitioners in the school and university faculty to identify common interests and prepare conference papers and articles reflecting those interests; and

f. support conference participation by educators at the school so that they can present findings and ideas developed in collaboration with university faculty (Indiana State University Professional Development Schools Program generic contract, ISU, 1999, p. # 4).

Each of the four goals for the PDS program is therefore detailed in these four definitions of responsibilities of PDS schools. How well these definitions have become institutionalized in the PDS school sites should determine how well each school is achieving the set goals of the PDS program. The mechanisms for assisting schools in meeting these definitions and assuring their continual renewal toward the PDS mission are

what provide for the institutionalization of the program. Policies and guidelines provide some of these mechanisms, structuring the pre-service practicums, establishing collaborative committees, developing an ongoing steering committee which includes diverse stakeholders, and detailing responsibilities of university faculty toward continued reform in the school. It is the position of the liaison, however, which carries the primary responsibility of disseminating information between the university and school partners. ISU provides for two liaisons for each PDS site, one school staff member, and one university faculty or administration member. The school liaison carries information regarding PDS involvement to the general staff at the school, and provides a point of contact between university faculty seeking practicum placements, research opportunities, or professional growth opportunities such as seminars or inservices. The university liaison serves on the school site improvement team, assisting the school in planning for improvement activities, meets with other liaisons to coordinate activities between school sites, coordinates ISU faculty involvement within the school, and disseminates information about the school to university colleagues.

The liaisons, both university and school site based, are in a unique position to inform and monitor practice and the institutional development of the PDS. The goals of the PDS can be indirectly measured in the types and amounts of activities performed by the liaison. This study will attempt to determine the success of ISU's PDS program from both university and school site perspective. Through a survey of liaison activities, inquiry and research, and teacher perception, the study will detail the structural developments which in turn may be paired with educational success. Though student achievement indicators, as stated earlier, do not necessarily measure the isolated effect of PDS impact, known effects of several programs and lines of inquiry within the schools

can be established through a review of previous literature, and subsequently measured by their presence in ISU's PDS program.

Extant PDS Literature

There has been a flood of literature describing emerging PDS programs since the Holmes Group first developed the concept. Much of the early literature described and elaborated upon the unique characteristics of these new organizations. With no clear blueprint for developing a PDS, the field required the mostly anecdotal accounts of new PDS programs to describe the processes of formation and pave the way for new collaborations. However, 10 years after the initial PDS partnerships, research continues to elaborate on the emergent aspects of PDS leaving a noticeable gap in examinations of outcomes (Teitel, 1996; Abdal-Haqq, 1998). What is clearly needed is a body of evidence which demonstrates that the outcomes of the PDS program have been met locally, regionally, and nationally. The research examining the initial goals of the PDS is beginning to develop, but the underlying premise of the PDS program, as with all reform efforts, is not measured; that is, student achievement. What is called for, though beyond the scope of this report, is a longitudinal study controlling for confounding variables which measures the pre and post PDS academic achievement of students. As discussed earlier, the difficulties with such a study are compounded by the number of confounding variables, but with multiplications of this type of study a pattern of success in PDS schools might be concluded by the sheer weight of the evidence. This would entail many university partnerships from around the country examining achievement data from PDS sites over a decade of time. Achievement data would also need multiple indicators. Standardized test scores, drop-out rates, and college entrance rates might be combined to

indicate a pattern of success, rather than a single, often misleading variable. This is no small project, but would indeed be worthwhile.

Of the primary goals of the PDS initiative, improving pre-service teacher education, promoting staff development, supporting inquiry and research, and improving students' learning, only student learning is conspicuously absent from the literature. There have been many anecdotal tales of teacher success and collaborative inquiry which lead to assumptions of student performance, though the causality can not be truly determined. The first goal of the PDS, improving pre-service teacher education perhaps provides the largest body of literature. Many universities view this as the PDS objective which best describes their interests in the PDS program. Consequently, much has been written on the subject, but some of the research is not altogether complementary toward the universities in this regard. One qualitative review (Meyers, 1996), suggests that universities devote too much time on the mechanics of establishing a relationship between the pre-service teacher and pre-service environment, and little is done to alter the context of the pre-service experience to improve teaching and learning. The author is looking for specific change procedures within the PDS, however, and may fail to consider the possibility that open dialogues and collaborative agreements between universities and public schools may in and of themselves, promote change and growth.

A quantitative study between PDS prepared teachers and traditionally prepared teachers (Blocker & Mantle-Bromley, 1997) did indicate that the PDS prepared teachers were able to cite theory as it applied to classroom instruction significantly better than traditionally prepared teachers. Though the numbers were small and the study un-replicated, it provides an example of one possible benefit from PDS preparation. Further benefits of PDS teacher preparation programs cite a greater range of methods and

practices (Miller & O'Shea, 1994; Zeichner, 1992). These studies show that PDS-prepared teachers come to the classroom with a greater variety of teaching techniques than their traditionally prepared counterparts, and display a greater range of practice in their instruction.

One important and often overlooked necessity is that beginning teachers often enter the classroom with little knowledge of the school culture beyond their classroom walls. Research on PDS candidates shows that new teachers trained in PDS schools enter the classroom with more knowledge of the school routine (Trachtman, 1996; Levine & Trachtman, 1997), and more confidence in their knowledge and skill as professionals (Book, 1996). PDS prepared teachers are thus more capable of quickly assimilating into the broader school culture and adapting to the multiple tasks which accompany classroom instruction.

The long term benefits of PDS teacher preparation do not include, according to one study, reduction in attrition (Kelley, et al., 1997). This study of 1760 new teachers in Michigan (new teacher defined as teaching 6 years or less) demonstrates that the alarming rate of exodus from the profession in the first six years (44% in MI), is not influenced by the nature of their pre-service education when comparing PDS and traditional programs. Another study indicates that the attrition rate is lower for PDS prepared teachers (Hayes & Wetherill, 1996). As more universities incorporate PDS principles into their teacher preparation programs, the evidence may become more conclusive. The extent that various PDS programs directly alter the environments in which teachers practice may have a more lasting effect on teacher attrition than the nature of their pre-service field experiences. It can be reasonably argued that investing practitioners in the process of reform is a renewing activity which should produce

occupational investment and prolong careers. It is somewhat indicting toward the PDS movement that the levels of attrition are not falling rapidly as a product of collaborative reform.

Recent research into the problems facing emerging and established PDS partnerships has found that lack of commitment and communication among partners is a primary source of PDS failure, (Kochan, 1999). These "Human Frame" problems accounted for 34% of the problems cited in a survey of PDS stakeholders, while structural problems such as coordination of activities and accomplishing goals were cited by 32% of participants. Political problems arising from authority and leadership accounted for a further 25% of the problems cited, and responses categorized as "symbolic" , relating to tradition and culture accounted for just 9% of the problems cited. The author concludes that organizational commitment must be established for the long term success of the PDS initiative. Individual commitment and efforts are confounded by human interactions and the problems which arise from the simultaneous cooperation and competition which occurs in a large organization with multiple agendas. It is likely that the stakeholders interviewed for this study did not fully appreciate the complexity of the problems facing their particular organizations, as they may have had perspectives formed by their unique vantage point. It would be safe to say that the vantage point of stakeholders immersed in the process of maintaining a PDS program is not an objective top down view, but rather an experiential reaction to the circumstances which prevent them from fully realizing their objectives, which may be simultaneously in conflict with other stakeholders' objectives. It is interesting to note that although only 9% gave examples of PDS problems which arose from school culture and history, structural and human problems, which accounted for 66% of the responses, probably could be traced to

or anticipated by the school culture.

Further identification of the challenges to developing institutions such as a PDS partnership have illuminated structural barriers which are unique to education. Linda Darling-Hammond identifies four barriers, turfism, tradition, scarce resources, and inexperience with collaborative decision making which impede institutionalization of partnerships (Darling-Hammond, 1994). When organizations attempt collaborative reform institutionalization of the partnership is necessary to overcome the barriers which will inevitably diminish enthusiasm and involvement leading to a small cadre of PDS delegates carrying on the work which should be shared by all of the stakeholders involved.

The wide variety of research being conducted in and around PDS partnerships is undoubtably a product of the multiple goals and expectations placed upon the initiative. Each of the stakeholders involved in the various programs brings an agenda which is particular to their needs, yet surrounding the higher objective of improving student performance. Research has shown how many of these multiple compatible agendas are being met within the PDS programs including teacher preparation, dissemination of research, and local levels of inquiry. This study examines the connections between one university and several PDS partner schools.

Chapter three will describe the methods and procedures for this study. Three measures were used, examining teacher perceptions, liaison activities, and collaborative inquiry projects. Surveys were used to measure teacher perceptions and liaison activities and priorities. The collaborative inquiry projects were categorized by type and personnel involved in the project. Limitations and treatment procedures will also be described.

Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study examines relationships between the Indiana State University PDS

stakeholders and numerous PDS school teachers to determine the level of institutional

commitment, and to further define the expectations placed upon the partnership by these

teachers. All of the teachers practicing in PDS elementary, middle and secondary schools

in Vigo County were surveyed for the 2000 study (N=435). A smaller sample was drawn

from the same population for the 1995 oral interviews. Further, this study also examines

the nature of liaison activities performed by past and present university liaisons (N=16)

assigned to school sites to coordinate collaborative efforts and the types of inquiry

conducted within the school sites by both university and school personnel.

Specific questions to be answered are:

1. What are the types of activities in which university liaisons engage which

encourage further PDS development and the attainment of ISU PDS goals as measured by

time spent by the university liaisons?

2. How do the school faculty within the ISU PDS program evaluate the

effectiveness of the PDS program, and its impact upon the school and students?

3. What are the types of research conducted in PDS sites through collaboration

between university PDS faculty and school faculty?

The study's primary thesis is that the ISU PDS program has had a measurable influence on school practice. Additionally, it is assumed that liaison activities within the ISU PDS program either support, hinder, or have no discernible impact upon the growth and success of the program, and can be detailed to determine the influence of these activities. A final thesis is that research conducted in collaboration between the university and school sites supports both school's need to validate programs and procedures affecting learning, and the greater body of knowledge about the science of teaching.

Research Method and Design

The duties and priorities of the university liaison are examined through the use of a survey both ranking the tasks performed by frequency and prioritizing tasks as interpreted by the liaison. Relational patterns are determined, though no causal patterns are identified. The sample used is a population of 16 past and present ISU university PDS liaisons. The aim is to record activities of the university liaison through examination of each liaison's report of activity, and their assumptions on the value of those activities through a ordinal ranking. Structural analysis will be used to examine the liaison reports to illuminate constructs, themes and patterns of liaison behavior.

The collaborative inquiry review examines a collection of documented research proposals from 1994 through the 2000 school year. Codification and classification of the reports details research types and designs according to preestablished categories. The resulting review is analyzed with descriptive statistics to further illuminate trends within the collaborative inquiry projects.

Survey results from a 1995 oral interview and the 2000 survey will be

qualitatively reviewed using descriptive statistics to examine the strength of the

relationship established between seven local school sites and the ISU school of education

through the PDS program.

Sources of Data and Collection Procedure

A codified longitudinal survey of PDS school faculty, given through oral interview

in 1995 and with a closed response survey for this study in 2000, was employed to detail

early and current reactions of PDS school teachers to the PDS program. The

questionnaires examined teacher opinion toward PDS involvement within their school.

The 1995 data was collected by the ISU PDS program through oral interviews with

several teachers at PDS sites. The 2000 data was collected using the same questions on a

survey form, with limited scaled responses. The following questions were codified from

the 1995 oral interviews, and appeared on the 2000 survey:

- What are some recent changes in the school or classroom?

- What recent changes in the school or classroom are related to PDS involvement?

- What were your initial expectations for the PDS program (or ongoing expectations

  for the 2000 study)?

- Has PDS met these expectations?

- Define PDS?

- What are the strengths of the PDS partnership?

- What are the weaknesses of the PDS partnership?

The values for each of these variables are defined by an initial examination of the 1995

data, and range from positive to negative responses, and include environmental,

interpersonal, social, and programmatic response categories.

Research grants given by the ISU PDS program provided the necessary data for descriptive statistics on types, quantities and personnel involved in research. Reports for the past six years contain detailed descriptions of action research conducted by both university and school site personnel. The types of research are classified using both content and methodological criteria for each school site.

The liaison summary is a self reporting instrument which classifies various activities such as planning and executing professional development activities in the school, preparation of grants and proposals, developing or implementing restructuring plans within the school, assisting instruction or program development within the school, inservices, steering committee work, and field placement duties. Liaisons were asked to rate the amount of time they spent on various activities in the performance of their job and to rank order the same activities by the importance or value they place upon the activity.

Treatment and Analysis of Data

Content analysis was aided by use of descriptive statistics for both the survey of teacher responses and the collaborative inquiry examination. Mean scores for responses and categorical types of research are calculated, along with deviation scores and modal responses. Nominal variable assignment for the teacher oral interviews and the proposed teacher survey prevent inferential statistical analysis. The review of collaborative inquiry was accomplished through codification of the types of research conducted, both methodology and content were considered, and recording the types and numbers of staff involved from both the university and school sites. The liaison survey contains ranked responses which create ordinal data. The mean and standard deviation for each question

has been calculated and the ordinal position of the ranked responses reported.

Limitations and Delimitations

Content validity is a concern for the evaluation of teacher responses to the PDS program, both in the 1995 data and the 2000 survey data. The constructs measured in both instances represent the strengths, weaknesses and definitions of the PDS program from a school faculty perspective, but codification of these responses from the 1995 data may be diminished by categorical limitations which were not placed upon the original subjects during their interview process. Response validity for the 2000 survey has been maintained through limiting options on the survey form, thus concurrent validity may suffer. Internal validity is not a concern as a causal relationship is not attempted in a descriptive case study. External validity may not be achieved due to the singular peculiarities and variety of PDS programs nationwide, though it may be argued that favorable comparison to the NCATE draft standards for quality PDS programs establishes a form of external validity.

Self report measures such as the liaison summary may be less reliable due to the relationship of the respondent to the response items. Since job performance indicators are being self reported, the reports were collected anonymously to promote candid disclosure. The results from this study are not intended to apply to the whole of PDS partnerships, though inferences about the ISU PDS may have significance to similar partnerships. Chapter four presents the findings and discusses their meaning and possible significance. Chapter five will provide the summary and recommendations.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Teacher Survey Results

For the 2000 survey 425 teachers in seven different PDS school sites were sent

questionnaires asking the same questions posed during oral interviews in 1995. During

the 1995 study 48 classroom teachers from the same PDS sites selected for this study

were asked the following open ended questions:

1. What recent changes in the school or classroom are related to PDS

    involvement?

2. What were your initial expectations for the PDS program?

3. Has PDS met these expectations?

4. What are the strengths of the PDS partnership?

5. What are the weaknesses of the PDS partnership?

The responses were categorized for the purposes of comparison with the data from this

study and those response categories were included on the current survey. 171 teachers

returned the current survey which was mailed twice to the PDS classroom teachers (40%

return rate). Both the survey and cover letters for the two mailings are provided in the

appendices. Some of the questions provided for multiple responses so that all of the

totals reported do not reflect 171 responses. The results for both the 1995 oral interviews and the 2000 survey are provided in the following tables.

Table 1
Recent Changes in School or Classroom

	2000		1995	
Environmental	106	62%	7	14%
Personnel	86	50%	18	37%
Instructional	81	47%	17	35%
Programmatic	51	30%	14	29%
None or no response	14	8%	12	14%

When asked to cite recent changes in their school or classroom, a majority of the PDS teachers during the 2000 survey listed environmental changes such as new equipment or physical plant changes, and personnel changes which would include additions of teachers or support staff. Teachers were given the choice to respond to more than one category in this question thus instructional changes such as new curriculum or teaching methods, and programmatic changes such as scheduling changes were also chosen frequently by the 2000 survey respondents. The 1995 data shows a near even distribution among personnel, instructional, and programmatic changes cited, though environmental changes were not as prevalent during this time period. This could be indicative of a district wide plant renewal occurring during the 1999-2000 school year, or simply more visible changes in 2000 which are more easily recalled. A small number of respondents for both the 2000 survey and the 1995 oral interviews did not or could not cite any recent changes within their school or classroom.

Table 2

Recent Changes in School or Classroom Related to PDS Involvement

	2000			1995
None or no response	99	58%	20	41%
Instructional	43	25%	14	29%
Programmatic	29	18%	4	8%
Environmental	25	15%	3	6%
Personnel	16	9%	14	29%

The second question asks PDS teachers whether any of the recent changes in their school or classroom can be attributed to PDS involvement. The majority response for both the 2000 surveys and 1995 interviews was could not or did not cite any changes due to PDS involvement. It is noteworthy that the percentage of teachers who did not or could not cite PDS related changes rose from 41% to 58% from 1995 to 2000. This could indicate a dilution of PDS activity in the schools or simply a circumstantial effect of other activities occurring which were not PDS related and which took primacy in the mind of the respondent at the time of the survey. The 1995 data also shows a greater percentage of teachers citing personnel changes resulting from PDS involvement (29%) than the 2000 survey data (9%). This may be a product of newly formed partnerships in which roles are still being prescribed and delegated. Neither the objective of the ISU PDS program nor the Holmes Group outline would suggest that personnel changes would be the most evident result from a PDS partnership.

Table 3

Teacher Expectations for the PDS

	2000			1995
Staff Development	130	76%	5	10%
Collegiality / Collaboration	120	70%	13	27%
Instructional improvement	107	63%	5	10%
Financial Assistance	97	57%	2	4%
Curriculum Changes	37	22%	2	4%
Administrative structure	12	7%	4	8%
Administrative personnel	7	4%	0	0%
No expectations	5	3%	4	8%
No response	12	7%	25	51%

Table 3 lists the teacher expectations for the PDS partnership. As with the above questions, the teachers were allowed to record multiple responses. As might be expected during the first years of this program, the 1995 interviewed teachers' most frequent response was no response (51%). It should be noted that this does not indicate that the teacher ignored the interviewer, but rather could not give an expectation for the PDS program. Additionally, 8% of the teachers in the 1995 study stated that they had no expectations of the PDS program. In the 2000 survey this changes significantly. This may provide a contrast to Table 2 in that over 50% of the teachers cited at least four different expectations from the PDS program. Whereas the teachers in the 2000 study know what they expect from the PDS program, Table 2 indicates that they do not know how it is being achieved. Staff development, collegiality, and instructional improvement are all listed along with financial assistance as expectations of the PDS program by more than 1/2 of the teachers. Table 4 may add further to this line of thought.

Table 4

Has PDS Met Your Expectations

	2000		1995	
Completely	11	6%	11	22%
Mostly	53	31%	9	18%
Somewhat	50	29%	12	24%
Not at all	9	5%	1	2%
Not sure	47	27%	14	29%
No response	1	1%	1	2%

Though the percent of teachers who said that the PDS program had completely met their expectations was much higher in the 1995 interview, it is clear from Table 4 that the expectations of the teachers in 1995 was less well defined. The 2000 survey shows that the expectations of the PDS program are still met either mostly or somewhat, a combined total of 60% chose these two options, which may indicate, along with the data from Table 3 that there are clear expectations placed upon the PDS program which are being met, but that the exact mechanisms by which they are being met is unknown to the majority of teachers within the PDS sites. The combined impression from Tables 2, 3, and 4 is that teachers know that what they expect from PDS is occurring, but that they don't know how or where it is happening. This may allude to a marginalization phenomenon wherein a core of dedicated PDS insiders are conducting the business of PDS without full inclusion of all school personnel. An analogy might be drawn from the public perception of the stock market. Many people know that it moves up or down, but do not know how or why that it affects them. We all experience and contribute to the economy, but only a few of us are economists. Further discussion of this speculation will occur in Chapter five.

Table 5

Teacher's Definition of PDS

		2000
University / School partnership	66	39%
Pre-service teacher training	18	11%
Instructional collaboration	17	10%
Fiscal assistance for schools	9	5%
Lab schools	4	2%
Other	3	2%
None	2	1%
Multiple response	32	19%

Table 5 shows data collected only from the 2000 survey. The teachers were asked to give their definition of the PDS program, selecting only one response. Though the instructions to select only one of the provided definitions was highlighted, 19% still chose more than one. This may indicate a carelessness on the part of the respondent, or an inability to choose only one definition for the program. Given the earlier patterns of response it seems more likely that they were simply careless in reading the instructions for this particular question. For those surveyed who gave only one response most saw the PDS program as a university school partnership. Precisely what that partnership means must be inferred from the previous and following questions.

Table 6

Strengths of the PDS Partnership

		2000		1995
Teacher training / development	115	67%	11	22%
Financial assistance	94	55%	3	6%
Collegiality / Collaboration	91	53%	8	16%
Introduction of new ideas & teaching strategies	79	46%	13	27%
Classroom assistance	56	33%	1	2%
Curriculum improvement	42	25%	0	0%
School restructuring	14	8%	4	8%
None or no response	8	5%	9	18%
Other	8	5%	0	0%

Table 6 reports both 1995 and 2000 responses to the question of strengths of the PDS partnerships. There are some disparities between the two sets of data which are not easily accounted for. In 1995 for instance, only 6% of the teachers believed that financial assistance was a strength of the PDS program whereas 55% of the 2000 surveyed teachers felt this was a strength. Similarly, only 2% of the 1995 teachers thought classroom assistance was a strength of the program and 33% of the 2000 teachers saw this as a strength. This may indicate an ideological shift to the more practical and accountable measures of success. The 1995 teachers thought teacher training (22%) and introduction of new ideas about teaching (27%) were the major strengths of the program. While the 2000 teachers retained and increased these expectations, they also listed financial (55%), classroom (33%), and curricular (25%) assistance as a strengths of the program. It is interesting to note as well that although school restructuring was a prerequisite to the PDS partnership, only 8% in both data sets viewed this as a strength of the program. How this might have changed if administrators were the primary

respondents is unanswerable with this study but may be worth pursuing in subsequent

research.

Table 7

Weaknesses of PDS Partnership

	2000		1995	
Lack of involvement among school staff	50	29%	4	8%
Lack of involvement among university staff	41	24%	6	12%
Lack of collegiality or collaboration	29	17%	12	24%
None	27	16%	13	27%
Liaison is unavailable or unproductive	30	18%	0	0%
Other	26	15%	4	8%
No Response	26	15%	4	8%
Restructuring efforts are ineffective	25	15%	1	2%
Pre-service teachers are unprepared	15	9%	15	31%

Table 7 shows the weaknesses of the PDS program as identified by PDS teachers

in both the 1995 and 2000 studies. For the 2000 survey the top three responses, which

were also a product of multiple response options, all pointed to a lack of involvement.

Whether it was involvement among school staff, university staff, or between the two

staffs, the major weaknesses of the PDS program from the teachers' perspective could be

traced to a diminished investment in the program. This seems a natural consequence of

organizational malaise, and may indicate a need to reenergize the program. The earlier

data showed a concern for pre-service teacher preparation which is reduced in the 2000

results. One third of the 1995 respondents saw unprepared pre-service teachers as a

weakness of the program, but only 9% of the 2000 teachers recognized this as a weakness. This may indicate a stronger connection between teachers and the pre-service program which has resulted from the partnership.

The number of original teachers and administrators interviewed during the 1995 study was low (48 were represented by the schools used for this study), and methodological differences between the 1995 interviews and the 2000 surveys prevent any direct comparison. It may be that the types of responses provided to an interviewer who is in a relative position of authority (they were university professors), are different based upon the respondents' assumptions of what the interviewer was asking, or how they felt their answers would be interpreted by someone who may have been or will be in a position of authority over them. There is also the possibility that prompts and cues were given by the interviewer, unintentionally, which shaped the response of the subject. In any case, the disparity between the 1995 results and the 2000 results, though the same questions were explored, does not necessarily indicate a change in the perception of the program. The 2000 data were collected anonymously and represents 40% of the teacher population in Vigo County PDS schools. This is a significant enough sample to draw some valid conclusions about the popular perception of the ISU PDS program among current practicing teachers in PDS sites.

Collaborative Inquiry Review Results

The next set of data collected for this study was a compilation of descriptive characteristics of the collaborative inquiry projects funded by the Indiana State University PDS program. Collaborative inquiry projects are defined as action research projects which take place in the PDS school site and involve a team of researchers

consisting of at least one PDS school faculty or administrative person and one university researcher. All 66 of the projects funded during the six years that the collaborative inquiry program has been in place were examined and categorized. Summary data is presented below.

Table 8

Collaborative Inquiry Review Summary of Findings 1994-2000

Location of Research	Type of Research	Department Involved	Faculty Involvement
25 Studies @ Elementary School Sites	44 Qualitative	32 Secondary ED	89 University Faculty*
16 Studies @ Middle School Sites	22 Quantitative	19 Elementary ED	181 School Faculty*
25 Studies @ High School Sites		15 Other SOE Departments	
66 Total	66 Total	66 Total	270 Total

* Many school and university faculty were involved in more than one project over the six year period under study. The numbers reported represent the total involvement of faculty, not the distinct number of different faculty.

The distribution of collaborative inquiry projects by location is roughly equivalent with the distribution of PDS partnerships established with ISU. The departments involved represent the principle university author or authors and show a tendency for secondary education professors to co-author collaborative inquiry projects. At ISU middle school endorsements can be obtained from both secondary and elementary education departments which may explain the high number of middle school sites involved with collaborative inquiry projects. The faculty involvement shows a 2 to 1 ratio of school staff to university staff which is appropriate considering the topics of

research are originating from within the school sites. Quantitative projects were defined as those employing either empirical methods or experimental design, while qualitative designs were identified as discovering meanigs or interpretations through case study or natural settings.

Each of the 66 collaborative inquiry projects was coded into one of nine classifications based upon the subject of inquiry. Additionally, methodology was reviewed to determine whether each project was primarily qualitative or quantitative in design. Elaborations on the definitions of each category are provided in the discussion section of this study. The percentages listed are percent of total (N=66) funded projects. Table 9 gives the percentages of types of study as categorized for this study.

Table 9

Types of Collaborative Inquiry Projects

			% of Total
Investigating Teacher Characteristics	4 Qualitative	2 Quantitative	9%
New Instructional Program Assessment	5 Qualitative	3 Quantitative	12%
Assessing Student Progress	3 Qualitative	3 Quantitative	9%
Investigating Learner Characteristics	7 Qualitative	0 Quantitative	11%
Investigating Teaching Methods	9 Qualitative	6 Quantitative	23%
Effective Administration or Supervision	1 Qualitative	0 Quantitative	1%
New Curricular or Non-instructional Program	3 Qualitative	7 Quantitative	15%
Measuring Teacher Training / Preparation	8 Qualitative	0 Quantitative	12%
Investigating Community Characteristics	3 Qualitative	2 Quantitative	8%

Examination of the types of inquiry projects conducted through funding and approval provided by the PDS program illuminates the function of the PDS site which is least traditional. Preparation of teachers and communication or negotiation between the university and school surrounding pre-service placements have some basis in long running established relationships, but conducting research at the school level for the purpose of aiding that particular school is something new. Research since the progressive era has been conducted by universities to validate reform proposals and further the scholarly acceptance of teaching as a social science (Clifford & Gutherie, 1988, p. 337). Research gains validity with larger population size. In order to make both qualitative and quantitative research more broadly acceptable, researchers have been forced into applicable general studies which rarely applied in full to the unique demographics of any particular school. The PDS program at ISU demands research questions be directed to the unique needs of individual schools. As collaborative projects, each research design is created by both a university faculty member, often times the liaison, and at least one school site representative. Each of the 66 projects examined was coded as a qualitative or quantitative project, the site level at which it occurred, the number and type of faculty involved, and one of nine categories of investigation.

Two thirds of the projects were qualitative. This is not surprising given the current qualitative trends in educational research. It was noted earlier in the text that a majority research about PDS is qualitative (Abdal-Haqq, 1998) and it should come as no surprise that research conducted *within* PDS programs is also qualitative. Curriculum demands may prevent many of the researchers from approaching a problem with an experimental design, and the use of a control group may present ethical problems when measuring the success of an implemented program. These types of considerations that

are present in an actual operating school may explain the 2/3 majority of qualitative research noted. The one category of study which was primarily quantitative was the non-instructional program assessment. These types of assessments can be new behavioral interventions or management strategies which are often tried with a few children, leaving an untreated control group for quantitative analysis. Conversely, one category, measuring teacher training or preparation, had 8 qualitative studies and no quantitative studies. This is not surprising considering the difficulty in determining an adequate measure of teacher success. Many of the projects, like this dissertation, looked at the structural elements of the teacher training program to identify successful models of pre-teacher and environment interaction. It is difficult to measure success of teacher training based upon any data available at the time of the training, and long term longitudinal studies are hampered in part because teacher success has only been indicated by attrition or lack thereof. Differentiated success among the existing teaching core is only sparsely recognized by rare awards or recognitions. The assumption of an undifferentiated teacher core has prevented analysis of teacher success based upon measurable criteria or attributes. This, however, will change in the State of Indiana beginning in the year 2000 with adoption of a license structure which recognizes stages of professional attainment much like other professions. Under the new license structure in Indiana teachers will be categorized as inductees for the first two years of practice and then accomplished or proficient practitioners based upon educational attainment and demonstration of professional growth.

The most frequently proposed study involved investigating teaching methods. 23% of all of the studies at all levels of school examined the effectiveness of various methods of instruction. Both qualitative and quantitative measures were used and this

may reflect a paradigm shift within education which has introduced performance-based criteria into beginning teacher evaluation. As ongoing teacher evaluations become more performance based it is likely that adaptive and reflective skills will be necessary for demonstration of success. The collaborations within the PDS program which help to identify and promote successful strategies help both to insure the continual growth of professional development among the teaching core, and to provide validation for the reform efforts backed by the PDS partnerships. The ultimate goal of the PDS program, and indeed all of educational reform, is to promote student achievement. Whereas it has been shown that direct correlation with the PDS program and student success can not be determined, inquiry projects which measure the success of teaching methods within the partner schools hold the promise of demonstrating how the partnership can contribute to student success. To the extent that any of the project categories such as investigating teacher or learner characteristics provides a better understanding of the effectiveness of strategies or styles within a particular school and with a particular population, the PDS program is providing inquiry at a level of investigation which can be demonstrated to contribute to the success of the school.

Liaison Survey Results

The third and final measure to be examined was the liaison study. A survey was sent to the 18 past and present PDS university liaisons to determine both the types of activities which consume their time as liaisons, and the types of activities which they value or would prioritize ideally. The 10 activities were derived from both the job description provided by the ISU PDS director and indicators drawn from the NCATE PDS Standards Project Critical Attributes. Of the 18 surveys sent out in two mailings, 14

were returned, representing a 89% return rate. The 10 activities that were ranked are:

1. Preparation of grants and proposals

2. Development or implementation of site restructuring plans

3. Planning or implementing collaborative inquiry proposals

4. Providing inservices training for school staff

5. Providing mentorship to beginning teachers

6. Coordinating program development with PDS and university personnel

7. Reporting PDS site activities to other ISU faculty, departments or committees

8. Teaching university teacher education classes at the PDS school site

9. Communicating university policy, roles or structures to PDS site staff

10. Working with EFE students or student teachers at the PDS site

Each liaison was asked to rate these activities as frequent, occasional, rare or

never. Each liaison was also asked to rank order the activities according to the level of

importance that they placed upon the activities. The level of agreement between the PDS

liaisons was low on both measures. The time that they spent on the activities as

measured by their self report is displayed in Table 10. A four point scale was developed

to code the data from the first part of the survey. A (4) indicated a frequent activity , a

(3) indicated occasional activity, a (2) was coded for a rare activity, and a (1) was assigned

to a never response. The mean scores and standard deviations are provided in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequency of Liaison Activities

	$\overline{X}$	*Sd*
Preparation of grants and proposals	3.09	0.90
Providing inservice training	2.91	0.87
Communicating university policy	2.64	0.97
Planning collaborative inquiry proposals	2.64	1.09
Working with EFE students	2.55	1.37
Teaching university classes at the school	2.55	1.23
Development of site restructuring plans	2.55	1.07
Reporting PDS site activities	2.45	0.79
Coordinating program development	2.27	0.94
Providing mentorship	1.55	0.67

The activities shown in Table 10 show a great deal of the liaison's time is spent on typically bureaucratic activities such as preparing grants and proposals. Whereas these proposals no doubt help the PDS school through increased funding, they may not be the best use of the liaison's time. Providing inservice training, however, ranks only slightly below occasional at 2.91 (3 being occasional), demonstrating a further link between theory and practice. Other activities such as planning collaborative inquiry proposals also show a high degree of frequency, while providing mentorship shows a less than rarely (2 on the scale), average. The activities listed between inservice training and providing mentorship range from occasional to rare.

The rank order of ideal priorities also showed little agreement among the liaisons. In other words, there was much variation in activities deemed most valuable when

respondents rank ordered the ten activities from 1 to 10, with one or first being the highest rank, or most valuable activity, and 10th being the least worthy activity. The activities displayed in Table 11 are listed in rank order from the lowest average rank to the highest average rank, or from the most valuable activity to the least valuable activity.

Table 11

Priorities of the University Liaison

	$\overline{X}$ Rank Score	Variance	Sd
Develop site restructuring plans	4.09	8.57	2.93
Working with EFE students	4.82	10.08	3.18
Providing Inservice training	4.82	6.27	2.50
Preparation of grants / proposals	5.36	6.45	2.54
Coordinating Program development	5.64	8.70	2.95
Planning collaborative inquiry proposals	5.36	4.27	2.07
Teaching classes on site	6.45	7.54	2.75
Reporting site activities	7.27	7.33	2.71
Communicating university policy	7.73	7.54	2.75
Providing mentorship	8.45	6.57	2.56

It is curious to note that the highest ranked priority by university liaisons is development of site restructuring plans. It ranks fourth from the bottom of currently practiced activities, and was ranked the least among strengths listed by teachers in both the 1995 and 2000 studies. This is difficult to explain and may be a product of expectations communicated to liaisons in early PDS development which centered around

Indiana 2000 implementation which was concurrent with PDS designation during the inception of the program at ISU. As noted earlier, site restructuring was a requisite activity to gain Indiana 2000 funding. Providing mentorship to new or beginning teachers is cited as the least prioritized activity and it was also noted to be the least frequent activity as well. Reporting university policy also shows a great disparity between the frequency which it is reported and the importance placed upon it as a priority activity. Though it has an average rank of 7.73 on the priority scale, it was recorded as the third most frequent activity.

Discussion

The 2000 surveys provided the most data, and reveal the most about the perceptions of the PDS amongst its members. One of the primary goals of a PDS partnership is to establish an equal and lateral collaboration which both provides for the propagation and dissemination of action research, and the empowerment of classroom teachers in the arena of reform. As was noted previously, no reform effort lasts long without the investment of the stakeholders. Classroom teachers are at the center of all educational reform efforts and are in a unique position to either enable or disable the reform agenda. To this end, the perceptions of the PDS site teachers about the program, its goals and methods, can provide a valuable predictor of future success and current institutionalization of the program.

In response to the question defining expectations of the PDS program (Table 3) the school teachers chose staff development 76% of the time. Along with collegiality and instructional improvement, which also ranked over 60%, the expectations of the classroom teacher are commensurate with the stated goals of the PDS program. It is

interesting to note, however, that liaisons rank mentorship of teachers as last among ten

activities provided (Table 11), and co-planning collaborative inquiry proposals sixth.

This, in part, may explain the distribution of the next question which asked teachers

whether or not the PDS has met their expectations (Table 4). Although the total

responses were positive, 66% replied somewhat or better, only 6% were completely

satisfied with the program. The responses display a rather normal distribution, with only

a few responses at the completely and not at all and the majority in the mostly and

somewhat categories. This may simply reflect the nature of respondents to avoid

extremes of full endorsement or complete rejection of the program.

The number of respondents who were unsure as to whether the program had met

their expectations is also noteworthy. Fully one quarter of the respondents chose this

option, though only 10% stated that they had no expectations or did not list expectations.

Given this comparison, it is certain that some of the 27% of teachers who were not sure

if the PDS program had met their expectations at least were aware of what their

expectations were. This may be indicative of a communication problem within the school

or between the PDS partners both at the university and school site which results in an

"insiders" phenomenon. Once the initial fanfare of a new reform movement has died

down, it is up to the dedicated few to continue the work of the project, and often times

these become the PDS insiders who are involved with the program though not necessarily

sharing their involvement with the remaining site or university staff. A recent qualitative

study of liaison roles identifies these insiders as "Dream Keepers" (Simmons et al., 1999).

Dream Keepers in that analysis defined liaisons or university coordinators as those who

expended their time renewing investment among partners and keeping the original

objectives of the program on the agenda, a sort of torch bearer for the Holmes Group.

There is another indicator of the Dream Keeper phenomenon at work. When asked to cite the weaknesses of the PDS program (Table 7), the top three responses pointed to a lack of involvement among and between university and school site staff. There are a number of reasons why this may be so. Schools are often bombarded by an array of tasks which compete for the time and resources of their personnel. Although the highest ranked response to the question of recent school changes (Table 1) was environmental changes, this was the lowest ranked response in the question asking about recent changes related to PDS involvement. Clearly there are agendas within the PDS schools which do not involve the PDS program in any way. Over half of the respondents could cite no recent changes resulting from the PDS program. The danger of marginalizing the partnership seems evident. If the PDS program becomes a tool by which some university faculty gain access to the schools and some school teachers gain recognition or empowerment from the university, then the program will become marginalized and an "insiders game". The goal of creating an institutional bond between the university and school sites is not evident in these data.

The liaison survey data shows how little agreement there is among the university partners as to what the dream is that is being kept. Both the activities as rated by frequency (Table 10) and the priorities as ranked by importance (Table 11) show a great disparity among liaisons. Of the 14 liaisons past and present who returned the survey, none ranked their duties by frequency or priority the same. As to how the liaisons spent their time, eight of the ten categories ranged from frequent to never depending upon the liaison. Two of the categories were not selected by any liaison as frequent activities: providing mentorship to beginning teachers and coordinating program development with PDS and university personnel. Though providing mentorship was cited last on both the

frequency and priority measures, coordinating program development averaged sixth among priorities. The only activity performed by liaisons which rated on average better than occasional was preparation of grants and proposals. At first glance this may seem to serve the university more than the school site as much of the PDS funded research conducted in the schools is also used for publication aiding in promotion and tenure. However, both the grants and collaborative inquiry proposals which are funded by the PDS program have criteria which focuses the research or project toward the benefit of the school. Ultimately the research must be cosponsored by school personnel serving the needs of the school or its personnel.

Following closely behind the preparation of grants and proposals is providing inservice training for school staff. On the four point scale, providing inservice hours rated a 2.91 on average. This is a valuable activity which maintains the connection between the university knowledge base and school practice, but the high priority of this activity may indicate some of the top down philosophy which was inherent in previous university/school relationships, and so feared by initial school partners. It is difficult to escape this perspective when faculty who serve as liaisons are primarily charged with the training and development of future teachers. There is an expectation of expertise which may not be wholly unjustified, but in order for institutional partnerships to form collaboration must eventually be seen as an equal enterprise where the value of both the university and school representatives are equality weighted. It should in no way be inferred that the liaison covets or promotes a sense of power over the school staff, however. The rewards for the liaison are few. The pay does not compensate for the time required; there are many other activities available which would compensate them more. Further, the data from the surveys shows that PDS teachers see training and

development as the PDS program's greatest strength. Teachers and liaisons agree that the university has expertise to offer. The practicing teacher has much to offer as well, though, and it seems prudent to create a conduit for their expertise to be expressed and appreciated.

The activity with the most variation in response, 1.37 standard deviation on a four point scale, is working with EFE students or student teachers at the PDS site. Five liaisons cited this as a frequent activity, another four claimed to have never done this. This is even more polar when cross examined with the priority data. The four liaisons who do not routinely work with university students at the school site ranked this activity 8th on average, and the six liaisons who claimed this was a frequent activity ranked it 2.6 out of 10. One must revisit the original goals of the PDS program both as stated by the Holmes Group and the ISU PDS charter to adequately understand how this perception effects the mission of the PDS program at ISU. The second goal stated by the ISU PDS charter is: (2) provide optimal learning environments for pre-service educators in schools committed to restructuring and continuous professional development for faculty. When ISU abandoned their lab school program and adopted the PDS model, the expectation was clearly that the PDS model offered some of the same opportunities in teacher development so conveniently afforded by the on campus laboratory school (Huffman-Joley, 1998). Liaisons, however, come from all of the departments within the school of education, including Educational Psychology, Educational Leadership and Foundations, and other programs which do not directly prepare teachers. Opportunities to work with field students and further develop the school as a training model, do not present themselves so clearly to faculty in departments which do not prepare teachers. Does this mean that their interests and expertise should not be regarded as highly? No. Much of

the liaison work done by non-teacher preparation faculty provides research work and opportunities that are not traditionally offered to classroom teachers. Educational Psychology and School Counseling faculty within the schools offer new perspectives on theory and practice which have too long remained an academic exercise. Dissemination of research is also both a national and ISU stated objective which is furthered by the presence of these unique liaisons.

The results of the teacher survey indicate that a significant portion of the school teachers working in PDS schools may not be aware of the unique function and opportunities within their school resulting from their partnership with the university, though many are aware and involved in such activities as collaborative inquiry. The liaison survey indicates that a wide variety of tasks are being performed by the various liaisons which may provide many unique opportunities for collaboration, but that consistency of performance may hamper universal understanding of the function of the PDS partnerships among various schools. The review of collaborative inquiry projects demonstrates a range of research which benefits both the university and the participating school sites.

How does the data reflect ISU's performance in relation to the NCATE draft PDS standards? The first standard seeks to measure the level or intensity of learning community that has been established. A learning community in NCATE definitions is one which promotes dialogue about teaching and learning and encourages reflective practice. Structural components of ISU's program such as the monthly steering committee and funded collaborative inquiry projects indicate a willingness to establish and foster a learning community, but the inability of PDS partners to identify the exact impact of the program within their schools may indicate a need to further develop this

relationship. Reflective practice may occur individually, but a collective dialogue about these reflections is not evident in the survey returns or the liaison data. The wide range of collaborative inquiry projects, however, does indicate at least limited involvement in examination of practice.

Collaboration is the second NCATE critical attribute. Again this is evident on a limited scale, most prominently among those involved in collaborative inquiry projects. The number of projects and faculty involved is promising and is a strong indication of a successful component of the ISU program. Expanding the scope and participation in these projects may provide additional opportunities to cement collaborative relationships and, as stated above, promote a strong learning community. The third NCATE critical attribute is closely related to the performance based standards movement which is guiding new teacher preparation in the state of Indiana. The PDS program at ISU does not currently include standards based assessment in either its contract or operations. There are two ends to be met with quality assurance and accountability: one, that the quality of instruction is measured and its results inform practice, which is at the heart of performance standards such as INTASC, and two, that both the university and school partners are accountable for the success of the partnership in meeting its primary goals. Neither is satisfactorily addressed by the current structure of the ISU PDS program, though successful teaching as measured by INTASC will by necessity become a major concern of the school partners when the INTASC based license structure becomes fully implemented in 2002. As performance standards become part of the nomenclature of the practicing teacher it is likely that concerns surrounding this transition will move forward on the agenda of the university partners and liaisons.

Establishing and improving organizational roles and structures is the fourth

NCATE critical attribute. Much of the resource allocation and time management which supports PDS structures was initially established in the contract phase of the partnership. Time and money are necessary for full institutionalization of the PDS partnerships, but broad and self-renewing investment are also necessary. The marginalization phenomenon pointed to in earlier discussions of the data may indicate a weakened organizational structure which requires efforts at renewal and rejuvenation. As a PDS partnership matures it is expected, within the NCATE standards, that a growing number of stakeholders become involved as active participants in the partnership. The data in this study seems to indicate that a diminishing number of stakeholders are carrying the partnership, and that it may in fact be less institutionalized as time goes on.

The fifth NCATE standard measures the equity between partners. Though not fully developed at the time of this report, the standard examines both the equity of responsibility and authority within the partnerships. NCATE recognizes the necessary investment from all of the stakeholders in any collaborative effort, and that investment is insured only through shared responsibility and decision making. The collaborative inquiry projects point to a form of shared decision making and the majority of survey respondents who clearly articulated expectations of the partnership in the 2000 study also lends support for a strong sense of equity among the partners.

The data collection in this study was not designed to specifically measure the NCATE PDS standards, however, and speculation based upon this data may not be an accurate measure of how well the ISU program has met these criteria. It may be that the ISU PDS program has more indicators of success than are apparent in this data, or conversely that the program does not meet the critical attributes in areas where it seems to have met them. Further study is recommend when the NCATE PDS draft standards

are completed and the indicators are fully described. The final chapter will draw

conclusions and make recommendations based on insights gained from this study.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The survey data from 2000 and the interview data from 1995 demonstrate a

pattern of increasing expectations placed upon the PDS partnerships. Only 10% of

teachers in the 2000 study could not or did not cite expectations from the partnership,

down from 59% in the 1995 interviews. Actual changes in the schools which could be

traced to PDS involvement became more obscure or undetectable by the PDS teachers in

the 2000 study. Nearly 58% of all respondents could not cite a change which resulted

from PDS involvement in 2000, up from 41% of the teachers who did not or could not

cite PDS related changes in the 1995 study. Teacher expectations of the PDS partnership

increased during the five years between studies. In the 1995 study 59% of the teachers

could not or did not cite expectations for the partnership, while the teachers responding

to the same question in 2000 cited four different expectations in 50% of the surveys

returned. As to the ISU PDS partnership meeting these expectations, only a slight

reduction in favorable response was recorded.

The strengths of the PDS partnership were in congruence with the expectations of

the teachers. The top four strengths listed, three of which were cited over 50% of the

time, matched the top four expectations: teacher training, financial assistance, collegiality,

and instructional improvement. The weaknesses cited by teachers in the 2000 survey center on lack of involvement from or cooperation between teachers and university personnel. One weakness which was most prominent in the 1995 data and nearly absent from the 2000 results is lack of preparation of pre-service teachers. During the past ten years Indiana State has expanded their pre-service experience to include multiple practicums throughout the teacher preparation program, introducing education students to the PDS classrooms as early as their freshman year. The increased experience and familiarity with the PDS classroom may have much to do with the change of heart regarding the preparation level of the pre-service student. Improved communication and collaboration with the host teacher through PDS joint efforts may also have contributed to the greater satisfaction with pre-service student preparation.

The review of collaborative inquiry projects showed a large number of research projects being conducted within the PDS schools. A total of 66 projects was funded in the six years under review, many of them qualitative, but 33% identified as quantitative. The types of investigation ranged from identifying teacher and learner characteristics to measuring student progress and instructional effectiveness. Investigating teaching methods was the most common type of study (15 projects). The projects were distributed among several sponsoring departments within the ISU school of Education, and equally represented in elementary, middle, and high school sites.

The liaison survey illuminated the great variation in activities which are conducted by university school site liaisons in the course of their duties. Each of the 10 activities listed ranged from frequent to never in the variety of responses given. Most of the activities averaged between occasional and rare though providing mentorship to beginning teachers averaged between rare and never. Each of the liaisons was asked to rank order

the same 10 activities by priority or value to the PDS partnership. Although there were slight differences between the rank order of priority and the average frequency of the tasks as performed, providing mentorship to beginning teachers remained a little practiced and little valued activity, placing last on both scales. One contradiction between the two scales was evident. Communicating university policy was ranked next to the bottom in priority, though it was third from the top in frequency, indicating an often performed duty which may be seen as necessary, but not necessarily beneficial by the liaisons.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Disseminate the skills of the liaisons through rotation of appointment

One challenge facing the ISU PDS program is how to nurture all of the activities of a successful liaison in one faculty member. It would be perhaps beneficial to rotate the assignment of liaisons so that the skills and talents of that individual can be shared among a wide variety of schools. Since their is no clear agreement on the priority of activities, and each liaison's priority is likely to be linked to the talents which they have to offer, it seems clear that a shifting rotation of liaisons provides a solution which does not diminish the range of activities provided by liaisons by overly prescribing their duties. Each of the ten activities listed, which are a composite of both the job description provided by the ISU PDS program and the NCATE Critical Attributes cited in an earlier chapter, had at least one liaison rate its frequency as never. If a long term relationship with a single school is maintained then that activity will not be offered to that site. This may or may not be a loss to the PDS program, but since each of the ten activities has been determined as valuable according to either the ISU charter or the NCATE PDS standards, attempts should be made to provide similar and comprehensive opportunities at each PDS site.

In addition, it may be profitable to explore the activities which are neither frequently performed nor highly prioritized. The role of the mentor, which may simply be too time consuming for a faculty liaison who also carries a full time teaching load, may nonetheless be a valuable function which is being removed from the liaison role ad hoc. New licensing standards in the state of Indiana recognize the developmental nature of the beginning teacher and the necessity of establishing a strong mentor relationship during the first two years of practice (IPSB, 2000). Liaisons who could serve in at least a limited capacity in this role may help develop not only the apprentice teacher, but also help to develop the vague and unexercised role of the mentor among school personnel. The undifferentiated structure of teaching has left a core of qualified though unprepared mentor teachers. Since mentor status has not been promoted or encouraged in many schools, many excellent practitioners lack the peer recognition which would have naturally encouraged their mentor role. Vigo county schools have a limited mentor program which assigns the duty without creating the role. Mentorship comes from a recognition of accomplishment as much as an assignment of duty. Development of the mentor role is and should be a priority for both the university and school sites, a priority which can be served through the PDS program.

2. Recommit partners through development of a shared vision and co-authored plan for success

There is evidence that a great number of school teachers within PDS programs are unsure about the nature and direction of the program. As this program enters a stage of maturity which typically threatens reform based movements, it may be advisable to renew the contracts and relationships with the schools on a broad basis. Dream Keepers

within the PDS program can and should spread outside of their marginalized tasks and into the population as a whole, both at the university and schools. To accomplish this, it is clear that communication and active involvement with all PDS site members must occur. Logistically this is difficult to achieve. Teachers in the schools rarely are afforded time away from class, and university personnel operate on a widely divergent schedule. It may not be necessary for all of the stakeholders to be organized for a singular communication though. Renewal can be orchestrated, just as the PDS model has been established, on a local school level. A task which would achieve rededication and commitment might be to challenge each school partnership to develop a short term plan for their PDS alliance. Each school might create their own mission statement with precise attainable goals set for a short and measurable period. These goals could be linked to expectations which have already been demonstrated to be clear in teachers minds from the survey data. Thus each school could set their own PDS agenda and prescribe tasks which might be met by a variety of university and school personnel.

3. Examine the liaison role

On the teacher survey 58% of the teachers could not or did not cite recent activities in their school due to PDS involvement. The liaison surveys and collaborative inquiry projects show that there are many recent activities in each of the school sites which are prompted by PDS involvement. A good start toward developing a more universal understanding of PDS designation could occur in a comprehensive liaison training program. The types of activities valued by the liaison are likely to be the values communicated to the school. Any PDS program looking for a common agreement on its mission among school personnel, must first establish a common agreement among

university personnel who represent the program. As with any organization, renewal begins with revisiting the charter or mission statement with which it began. Liaisons whose duties evolve from either the most accessible or most demanded activities may in time become stagnated by their routines. Reestablishing a mission statement or goals list for a liaison core may help to encourage some of the prioritized though infrequent activities.

The unique strengths and weaknesses of the liaisons can not be disregarded for the purpose of creating a generic liaison, though, and the program which recognized this can work with the talent at hand to rotate and provide varying opportunities to the PDS schools. It is also recommended that school personnel be recognized for their talents in an equilateral exchange. As licensing structures begin to recognize the unique abilities and varying competency of teachers, it would do well for the PDS program to recognize these talents as well. A PDS program which could assist in the identification and development of mentor teachers fulfills needed roles within the schools, and helps to further invest teachers into the PDS program. These recommendations are made without consideration to funding and may indeed remain fiscally unattainable, but the survival of the PDS program at ISU and other institutions relies not just on further funding but renewed devotion and broadened investment.

4. Institutionalize partnerships through development of permanent structural collaborations.

For the ISU Program or any collaborative effort to succeed in the long term, new structural connections must be forged and maintained. The way in which either the school or university does their own business affects the business of collaboration. There

are a few activities which might help to promote a perception of a PDS institution rather than a school or university working collaterally with each other. The first recommendation would be to increase field based teaching. Conducting university classes in the school sites not only familiarizes both the university and school partners with the business of the PDS, but also familiarizes the pre-service students with the school culture. The connections and relationships formed through increased presence in the school would benefit other activities of the PDS as well. The downside to this proposition, however, is the possible perception among the school teachers that their school is being overrun with university personnel. In order to promote equity and collaboration, school teachers should be involved in the development of site based curriculum, placing them into a mentor role and/ or as co-teachers thereby recognizing their contribution to the process of teacher development.

A second method for institutionalizing the PDS partnership would be to include school staff in university curriculum decisions. Whereas university professors may not welcome committee participation while developing their syllabus, there are levels of preparation which naturally invite school site input. The requirements for practicums are frequently reinterpreted by the host teacher, therefore it makes sense to allow them an opportunity to assist in the design of that experience. By bringing the school site teacher into the practicum planning process, we improve their modeling and assessment skills during that practicum as well as promote collaboration and equity.

5. Set measurable short term goals

As with any organization it is important to know what the task at hand is. The goals and direction of the PDS program are so broad and diverse that it is easy to get lost

in the big picture. As with many organizations it is advisable that short term goals which operationally define the immediate concerns discrete components of the program be set. By this I mean that individual partnerships should know exactly what they hope to achieve through that partnership, and when they hope to achieve it. Each year or two planning committees could set out these discrete and obtainable goals while defining the participation of individual stakeholders toward the attainment of that goal. Measurement of the success of that goal must reliably occur in order to direct renewal at prescribed times.

6. Establish student success criteria and track this data over a long period of time

This is perhaps the most important and most neglected inquiry of the PDS program. If PDS programs are going to maintain support both within the schools and universities, then they must provide evidence of success. If schools continue to falter, in the mind of the public more so than in reality, then new reforms will be called for which may alter or disband the PDS initiatives. What must be demonstrated through careful data collection is that PDS partnerships are having a positive impact on student success. All of the anecdotal evidence of collaboration and establishing relationships will do little to promote the permanency of PDS if student success is not realized. Of course, in order to track student success we must define it first. It is advisable that a number of low inference indicators be used to demonstrate success. SAT scores, graduation rates, grade point averages, college entrance rates, and post high school employment are indicators which may supplement standardized test scores.

Conclusion

What can be determined about the ISU PDS program, and other programs in similar stages of development from the data analyzed? The collaborative inquiry projects show a range and diversity of research which is meeting the promise of linking research with practice. The number of faculty involved both in the school of education and the PDS sites exceeds the primary stakeholders of administration and university liaisons. This component of the program seems to have caught the imagination of the greater body of parties involved, and may hold the promise of creating a broader base of investment in the future. Collaborative inquiry projects should not only continue to be funded, but should be expanded to include an even wider group of teachers and university personnel. PDS success can in this way be demonstrated by the very process of being a PDS, through collaborative inquiry.

The PDS initiative has survived longer than many other reform efforts and continues to grow and thrive across the country. ISU's program is expanding to include four additional elementary PDS sites and continues to garner enthusiasm from both university and school personnel. PDS programs both nationally and at ISU demonstrate their success through their proliferation. It is evident that the initial enthusiasm for collaborative partnerships has not diminished measurably, but growth and evolution toward an institutional stage of development may be stagnating as evidenced by some of the data presented here, institutionalization occurs when consensus is built upon mutually derived goals; which also happens to be the definition of a partnership.

REFERENCES

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Blocker, S.L., & Mantle-Bromley, C. (1997). PDS Versus Campus Preparation: Through the Eyes of the Students. The Teacher Educator, 33 (2), 70-89.

Book, C.L. (1996). Professional Development Schools. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), Handbook of research on teacher education (2nd Ed., pp. 194-210). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan

Clifford, G.J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). Ed school: A brief for professional education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Darling -Hammond, L. (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A Place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Hayes, H.A., & Wetherill, K.S. (1996). A new vision for schools, supervision, and teacher education: The professional development system and model clinical teaching project. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

The Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

The Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's schools : Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.

Huffman-Joley, G. (1998). Reconstruction the Community of the School of Education: Influencing Habits of Mind, Discourse, Work, and Results. In Thiessen, D. & Howey, K.R. (1st Ed.), Agents, provocateurs: reform minded leaders for schools of education. (pp. 97-126). Washington D.C.: AACTE Publications.

Indiana Professional Standards Board. (2000). IPSB License structure. Available:http://www.state.in.us/psb/internship/internship.htm.

Indiana State University School of Education. (1999). Office of professional development schools online guide. Available: http://web.indstate.edu/soe/pds/

Kelley, J., Stetson, R., Stetson, E. (1997). Effects of traditional and professional development school pre-service training models on teacher attrition after three years. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University, 1997. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED.408 256).

Kochan, F.K. (1999). Professional Development Schools: A Comprehensive View. In Byrd, D.M., & McIntyre, J.D. (1st Ed.), Research on professional development schools. (pp. 29-45). Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Corwin Press.

Levine, M. & Trachtman, R. (1997). Making professional development schools work: Politics, practice, and policy. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Meyers, C. B. (1996). Beyond the PDS: Schools as professional learning communities. A proposal based on an analysis of PDS efforts of the 1990's. New York, NY: American Educational Research Association. 1996.

Miller, L. & O'Shea, C. (1994.). Partnership: Getting broader, getting deeper. NCREST reprint series. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). A Nation at risk. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1997). Draft standards for quality professional development schools. Available:http://www.ncate.org/projects/pds/pdsstand.pdf.

Pulliam, J.D. (1982). History of education in America. Columbus, Oh.: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Simmons, J.M., Konecki, L.R., Crowell, R.G. & Gates-Duffield, P. (1999). Dream Keepers, Weavers, and Shape-Shifters: Emerging Roles of PDS University Coordinators in Educational Reform. In Byrd, D.M., & McIntyre, J.D. (1st Ed.), Research on professional development schools. (pp. 29-45). Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Corwin Press.

Teitel, L. (1996). Professional development schools: A literature review. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from Professional Development School Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, DC 20036).

Trachtman, R. (1996). The NCATE Professional Development School Study: A Survey of 28 PDS Sites. Unpublished manuscript. (Available from Professional Development School Standards Project, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, DC 20036).

U. S. Census Bureau. (1999). Statistical abstract of the United States. Available: http://www.census.gov

U.S. Department of Commerce. (1999). Bureau of labor statistics. Available: http://www.bls.gov.

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). National center for educational statistics. Available: http://nces.Ed.gov/index.html

Zeichner, K. (1992). Rethinking the Practicum in the Professional Development School Partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 296-307.

APPENDIX A

Teacher Survey Cover Letter First Mailing

February 11, 2000

Dear school colleague,

In 1995 ISU conducted interviews with teachers in your school to inquire about the impact and effectiveness of the Professional Development School Program. Now that the program is in its 9th year we would like to follow up on this original study and ask for your opinions about the PDS program within your school. Please take the time to complete the enclosed brief questionnaire. Even if you have little knowledge of the PDS program, your answers may help us to further refine our partnership.

You may return the questionnaire in the enclosed addressed envelope via school mail. All responses will remain anonymous, please do not sign them. Thank you for your prompt participation in this survey. Your completed survey will serve as your informed consent for participating in this project.

Kevin Bolinger
Indiana State University
School of Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

APPENDIX B

Teacher Survey Cover Letter Second Mailing

March 7, 2000

Dear School Colleague,

Recently you received a questionnaire asking your opinions on the ISU Professional Development School Program. Your school is designated as a PDS site, and your feedback as a member of a PDS school is highly valued. If you have not yet completed the brief questionnaire please do so now. An additional questionnaire and return envelope have been provided. If you have already returned your questionnaire, thank you and please disregard this mailing.

You may return the questionnaire in the enclosed addressed envelope via school mail. All responses will remain anonymous, please do not sign them. Thank you for your prompt participation in this survey. Your completed survey will serve as your informed consent for participating in this project.

Kevin Bolinger
Indiana State University
School of Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

APPENDIX C

Teacher Survey

PDS Questionnaire

1. What are some of the recent changes in your school or classroom? **Please check all that apply** and give an example.

□ Environmental or Physical Plant. (e.g., computers or room

changes)_____

_____

—

□ Programmatic (e.g., curricular or extracurricular

changes)_____

_____

—

□ Personnel (e.g., additional teacher or support

staff)_____

_____

—

□ Instructional (e.g., teaching

methods)_____

_____

—

□ None

2. Have there been any recent changes in the school or classroom related to PDS involvement? **Please check all that apply** and give an example.

□ Environmental or Physical Plant. (e.g., computers or room

changes)_____

_____

—

□ Programmatic (e.g., curricular or extracurricular

changes)_____

3. What are your expectations for the PDS program? **Check all that apply.**

□ Administrative personnel changes
□ Administrative structure changes
□ Collegiality / Collaboration
□ Curriculum changes
□ Financial assistance
□ Instructional improvement
□ Staff development
□ None

4. Has the PDS program met your expectations?

□ Completely
□ Mostly
□ Somewhat
□ Not at all
□ Not sure

5. How would you define PDS? Please **choose one** that best matches your description.

□ Fiscal assistance for schools
□ Instructional collaboration
□ Lab school
□ Pre-service teacher training
□ University / school partnership
□ Other_____

6. What do you think are the strengths of the PDS partnership? **Check all that apply.**

□ Classroom assistance
□ Collegiality / Collaboration
□ Curriculum improvement
□ Financial assistance
□ Introduction of new ideas and teaching strategies
□ School restructuring
□ Teacher training / development
□ Other_____
□ None

7. What do you think are the weaknesses of the PDS partnership? **Check all that apply.**

□ Lack of collegiality or collaboration

APPENDIX D

Liaison Survey Cover Letter First Mailing

Dear PDS Liaison,

Enclosed you will find a survey inquiring about your activities as a past or present PDS liaison. As part of my dissertation I am examining relationships within ISU's PDS partnerships, and attempting to generate a qualitative description of the role of the university liaison. Your responses to the enclosed questionnaire will help to create an accurate description of both the types of activities which liaisons value and the types of activities which are being performed in the course of your work as a liaison.

Please take a few moments of your time to respond to these items. Your responses to this questionnaire will remain anonymous, please do not indicate your name or department, or whether you are a past or present PDS liaison. Your completed questionnaire will serve as your informed consent to participate in this survey.

You may return the questionnaire in the enclosed return envelope via campus mail. Please try to complete the survey by Friday April 7, 2000. Thank you in advance for your prompt and sincere responses.

Kevin Bolinger
ABD, CIMT
esbolin@befac.indstate.edu

APPENDIX E

Liaison Survey Cover Letter Second Mailing

Dear PDS Liaison,

Recently you were sent a survey inquiring about your activities as a past or present PDS liaison. Your responses to the enclosed questionnaire will help to create an accurate description of both the types of activities which liaisons value and the types of activities which are being performed in the course of your work as a liaison.

Please take a few moments of your time to respond to these items. Your responses to this questionnaire will remain anonymous, please do not indicate your name or department, or whether you are a past or present PDS liaison. Your completed questionnaire will serve as your informed consent to participate in this survey.

If you have not yet completed the brief survey please do so now. An additional survey and return envelope have been provided. If you have already returned your questionnaire, thank you and please disregard this mailing.

Kevin Bolinger
ABD, CIMT
esbolin@befac.indstate.edu

APPENDIX F

PDS Liaison Survey

1. Please rate the following activities by the amount of time and resources you have expended in this area as a PDS Liaison.

- **Preparation of Grants and Proposals**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Development or implementation of school site restructuring plan**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Planning and implementing collaborative inquiry projects**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Providing inservice training for school staff**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Providing mentorship to beginning teachers**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Coordinating program development with PDS and university personnel**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Reporting PDS site activities to other ISU faculty, departments or committees**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Teaching university teacher education classes at the PDS school site**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Communicating university policy, roles or structures to PDS site staff**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

- **Working with EFE students or student teachers at the PDS site**

  O Frequent Activity   O Occasional Activity   O Rare Activity   O Never

PDS Liaison Survey

2. Please rank order the following activities by your estimation of the importance each plays in the role of a PDS liaison. These should be ordered according to your own philosophy of how an effective liaison should operate. Place a number 1 by the highest priority activity , and a 10 by the lowest, with each activity receiving a distinct rank.

_____Preparation of Grants and Proposals

_____Development or implementation of school site restructuring plan

_____Planning and implementing collaborative inquiry projects

_____Providing inservice training for school staff

_____Providing mentorship to beginning teachers

_____Coordinating program development with PDS and university personnel

_____Reporting PDS site activities to other ISU faculty, departments or committees

_____Teaching university teacher education classes at the PDS school site

_____Communicating university policy, roles or structures to PDS site staff

_____Working with EFE students or student teachers at the PDS site

Thank you for your time. if you would like a copy of the results obtained from this survey please email a request to esbolin@befac.indstate.edu.