DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 623 EA 028 478

AUTHOR Bowen, Gail; Adkison, Judith
TITLE Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools: Supporting the Principal.
PUB DATE Aug 96
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Elementary Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Institutional Environment; Organizational Change; *Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; *Principals; *Professional Development Schools; Program Implementation

ABSTRACT

Professional-development schools are collaborations between universities and public schools to improve the nation's teaching force. Prospective teachers are assigned to K-12 schools for formal instruction, planned experiences in classrooms, and mentoring from master teachers. This paper presents findings of a qualitative study that described the role of the principal in the professional-development school (PDS) in seven elementary schools participating in the Texas Centers for Professional Development and Technology. Data were gathered through site visits conducted in 1994-95, a review of documents, and interviews with key participants in the schools. Findings indicate that the configuration, size, complexity, and staffing of the school had a significant effect on the PDS roles, and consequently, on the probability of institutionalization of the PDS model at the school. The study applied the Miles and Huberman (Miles 1983) model of institutionalization to predict which of the schools would institutionalize the PDS and which would abandon it as external funding was reduced. The paper also offers recommendations for increasing the probability of successful implementation and institutionalization: (1) Provide staff support for principals in schools with large numbers of interns and other students; (2) develop job descriptions and expectations for principals; (3) provide orientation and staff development; (4) offer training in other related areas, such as conflict resolution and communication skills; and (5) provide additional funds for educational technology and communication linkages. Five tables are included. (LMI)

Running head: INSTITUTIONALIZING THE PDS

Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools:

Supporting the Principal

Gail Bowen and Judith Adkison

University of North Texas

Abstract

While the professional development school (PDS) literature has not focused on PDS principals, research on the change process shows they are crucial to successful implementation and institutionalization of change (e.g. Fullan, 1991; Miles, 1983). The principal is in a position to provide the administrative pressure on teachers to participate, the supports teachers need to make it work, and active engagement to ward off external threats that affect PDS stability. This research was designed to describe and explain the role of the principal in the PDS. It was found that different PDS configurations had different impacts on the PDS principals and how they perceived their roles. The conclusions link the principals' role definitions to Miles' (1983) model of institutionalization to suggest which schools will institutionalize the PDS and which will abandon it as external funding is reduced.

Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools: Supporting the Principal

Introduction

This qualitative study was designed to describe and explain the role of the principal in professional development schools (PDS). It found that the configuration (i.e., the number of university students in the school, number of professors, the assignment of a site coordinator) and the size, complexity, and staffing of the school had a significant affect on the professional development school roles, and, consequently, on the probability of institutionalization of the professional development school model at the school. The Miles and Huberman (Miles, 1983) model of institutionalization was applied to predict which of the schools will institutionalize the professional development school and which will abandon it as external funding is reduced. This model also suggests actions that increase the probability of successful implementation and institutionalization.

Professional Development Schools

The professional development school movement is one element of a broad current of reform initiatives that followed the "Nation at Risk" report. Professional development schools are collaborations between universities and public schools to improve the nation's teaching force. The collaboratives replace traditional campus based teacher preparation programs with intensive clinical experiences for pre-service teacher training and provide opportunities for experienced teachers to develop their own knowledge and skills. Professional development schools are K-12 schools where prospective teachers are assigned for formal instruction, planned experiences in

classrooms, and mentoring from master teachers. Their college instructors also are expected to spend time in the school working with them and their cooperating teachers.

The professional development schools in this study were part of a state-wide initiative to improve teacher training. At the time of the study, the state had funded 17 Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT) through competitive grants. All of the professional development schools in this study were part of this initiative. Consequently, they operated with common goals, guidelines, and regulations. Though diverse in their individual program descriptions, the CPDTs are united by a focus on 5 components: collaboration, restructuring educator preparation, staff development, technology, and multi-cultural education (TEA, 1995). All CPDTs emphasize both the improvement of teaching and the improvement of student learning in the schools.

Theoretical Framework

There is considerable literature describing and advocating professional development schools and discussing new expectations for public school and college level faculty. This literature has tended to overlook the role of the principal in such schools. However, research on the change process shows that principals are crucial to successful implementation and institutionalization of change (e.g., Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Miles, 1983).

Two approaches to explaining the change process helped structure the data analysis. The stages of concerns model (Hall & Hord, 1984) identified a pattern of

teacher concerns as a school adopts and implements a change. Miles (1983) developed a model that identified threats and supports to institutionalization of innovations. This model emphasizes the role of the principal in institutionalizing building-level changes.

Hall and Hord (1984) explained that teachers working with educational changes have concerns created by the interaction of problems confronted, feelings of threat or satisfaction aroused by implementing the change, and impact of the change. They found that teacher concerns change over time, and a "quasi-developmental pattern" occurs during the change process. As teachers begin to learn about and implement a change, they want to learn more about it and are concerned about their own ability to work with the change. Further work with the innovation many lead to concerns with the tasks of using it in their classrooms, with its impact on their students, coordinating and cooperating with other teachers, and finally "exploring more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes to the innovation or replacement with a more powerful alternative" (Hall & Hord, 1984, p. 59-60). In this study, principals had different patterns of concerns about the professional development school.

Miles and Huberman conducted an extensive three-year study of school improvement efforts. Huberman (1983) reported that in almost a third of the sites, the fate of a new practice was almost entirely determined by "environmental turbulence," such as budget cuts, new state-level policies, personnel changes, and changes in the school board membership. Implementing change may require overcoming resistance, reallocating resources, and changing structures such as schedules and procedures.

Huberman reported that the results of school improvement efforts ranged from high success to failure.

This data provided the basis for a model of 20 variables associated with successful implementation and eventual institutionalization of an innovation (Miles, 1983). The variables included administrative action, teacher behavior, and external threats to the innovation. The central office or building level administrator is the key element in this model.

At the building level, the principal is in a position to provide both the administrative pressure on teachers to use an innovation and the supports teachers need to make it work. The principal's active engagement is needed to ward off external threats that affect staff stability, availability of resources, and other institutional priorities. High administrative commitment to the innovation is necessary, but not sufficient, to assure institutionalization. However, when administrative commitment leads to administrative pressure on teachers to participate and administrative supports (e.g., assistance, staff development opportunities) to help them do so effectively, teachers' efforts to work at the innovation increase. With effort and technical mastery come teacher commitment to the innovation. When administrative pressure comes in the form of mandating use, the percentage of teachers participating also increases--a factor that promotes institutionalization. Administrators committed to an innovation are also more likely to bring about organizational changes needed to support the change.

However, even with support, managerial and teacher success, institutionalization is not assured. The stability of program staff and leadership is

threatened as professionals move on to other positions. Changes in state or local funding, school board composition, or state and local priorities also threaten institutionalization.

The professional development school is an innovation that has a major impact on elementary schools that adopt it. College students, sometimes in large numbers, are in the building and in teachers' classrooms. Teachers assume new roles as they supervise and mentor prospective teachers. They may work with college faculty to redesign course content and curriculum, teach formal college-level classes, conduct research, and participate in new types of staff development. Teachers and their classes are observed and discussed. The school and the teachers may also be the focus of research conducted by external parties, university students and faculty, or teachers in the schools. Adopting and implementing the professional development school model adds to the complexity of an elementary school. The PDS also brings the professional stimulation of new professional development opportunities and the additional help from junior colleagues working in the school.

Methodology

This paper is based on a set of 7 case studies of elementary school principals in CPDT professional development schools. A case study approach using qualitative methodology was used because professional development schools are a relatively new phenomenon, the expectations for their principals are not clearly defined in the literature, and little information on the roles of principals in this new type of school is available.

Researchers use qualitative methodologies in some cases because, "They are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 15). Thus, qualitative methodology can supply new data with which to answer questions concerning professional development schools and point to new directions for further study.

A data collection process consisting of observations, interviews, and document analysis was used to form the data base of information from which to draw conclusions about the role of the principal in professional development schools. This strategy allowed for a broader, more in-depth view of the processes at work at the school sites rather than relying on just one method of data collection such as interviews.

The researcher conducted interviews with key participants in the professional development schools including principals, university based professional development school site coordinators and professors, teachers, and others as needed. The researcher reviewed documentation from the Texas Education Agency, CPDT directors, university personnel, district and site administrators, faculty, and site-based meetings during the 1994-5 school year to collect data. Extensive field notes and audio tape recordings of interviews and meetings documented the observations of the researcher. Documents such as meeting agendas, written communications, and other

memoranda regarding the principal's role in the professional development school were examined.

Seven elementary schools participating in the Texas Centers for Professional Development and Technology served as research sites. School sites were selected to represent the greatest diversity possible among schools. Factors such as grade level, size of school, location, and demographics were considered in the selection process. One school in its first year of operation as a professional development school was included. All others had been in the CPDT program for 3 years.

During the 1994-5 school year, the school sites were visited at least once, for 1 to 2 days at a time, with telephone, fax, and written communication between and after the site visits. The actual number of visits and total number of days depended on the proximity of the site and the complexity of the program. Observations were structured by the research questions and issues concerning the principal's role in implementing change in a professional development school. Detailed reports for each school were generated from data collected from observation, interviews, and documentation which was summarized in data displays such as graphs, charts, and matrices for further clarification.

This paper is primarily based on the interviews with the 7 principals. Interviews followed a semi-structured protocol of approximately 24 questions about the principals, their perceptions of their roles and responsibilities in the professional development school, and their understanding of the PDS mission, their interactions with university

staff, problems and concerns surrounding the professional development schools, and changes in their schools.

The Professional Development Schools and their Principals

The 7 elementary schools studied were part of 4 CPDT organizations. Table 1 provides an overview of the schools and the professional development school programs. All of the CPDTs were associated with a university categorized under the Carnegie system as either Comprehensive I or Doctoral I (Evangelauf, 1994) and certified from 200-500 teachers a year. All had someone designated as a site coordinator; however, some coordinators were university faculty, others were university staff not on the faculty, and others were teachers at the elementary school. All had 1-2 faculty who taught classes or supervised student teachers and residents. During the semester when data were collected, the number of university students in the schools ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 100 student teachers and interns.

Four schools were in rural communities, 2 in urban settings, and 1 was in a suburban school district. They varied in size and complexity. The smallest school was a 330 student, 24 teacher elementary school with grades 1-4, and the largest was a 948 student, 56 teacher, grade 5-6 school. Schools with more than 800 students had assistant principals.

The CPDT initiative emphasized preparation of teachers for the increasingly demographically diverse and low SES population of the state. The school in this study reflected that emphasis, with all but 1 having more than 50% students eligible for free lunch. All had sizeable percentages of minority enrollment, and 3 had more than

Table 1

Professional Development School Summary Table

	Nelson PDS	Mason PDS	Crawford PDS	Bryson PDS	Barnett PDS	Caldwell PDS	Gibson PDS
Grades	5-6	1-4	PK-5	PK-1	PK-6	K-4	5-6
Enrollment	948	330	875	767	612	339	849
Number of Teachers	56	24	51	46	30	23	47
Assistant Principals	1	0	1	.5	1[1]	0	1
Site coordinator	1	.5	1	1	0[2]	1[3]	1[4]
University Faculty	1	2	2	1	2	1	1
Other PDS Support	0	1	0	0	1[5]	0	0
Spring Interns	74	43	8	4	6	0	0
University Students in Spring Sem.	26 Student Teachers	9 Student Teachers	0 Residents	2 Residents	8 Residents	5 Residents	5 Residents
Community	Rural	Rural	Urban	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Rural

[1] The assistant principal was on maternity leave and was due to be replaced.

[2] The site was in transition at the time of the researcher's visit. This CPDT originally utilized a professor as the site coordinator, but due to university overload this plan changed. The CPDT eventually promoted a teacher to the position of site coordinator.

[3] This site utilized university employees other than professors as site coordinators.

[4] This site utilized a university employee who was not a professor, but was responsible for two sites.

[5] Due to the professor's overload, another university employee assisted the professor in working with the interns on a weekly basis.

25% limited English proficiency students. Table 2 shows the demographics of each school.

Table 2

School Demographics

CPDT	Alpha		Beta		Gamma	Delta	
School	Nelson	Mason	Crawford	Bryson	Barnett	Caldwell	Gibson
Grades	5-6	1-4	PK-5	PK-1	PK-6	K-4	5-6
Enrollment	948	330	875	767	612	339	849
Student %[1]							
Black	32.1	24.8	34.9	19.3	16.8	23.6	25.7
White	54.7	43.3	11.5	51.2	63.7	59.9	66.3
Hispanic	12.3	31.8	53.3	28.0	17.0	15.9	6.9
Other	0.8	0.0	0.3	1.4	2.5	0.6	1.1
% Limited English Proficiency	6.5	27.0	31.8	15.0	6.9	10.3	2.1
% Eligible Free Lunch	51.5	73.9	86.2	59.6	52.8	53.7	43.3

[1] Information was obtained from the Texas Academic Excellence Indicator System report for the 1993-4 school year.

Table 3 provides general information about the principals. They expressed commitment to the professional development school concept. Some principals had volunteered their schools as professional development school sites, while others had been assigned. All of them believed that their schools benefitted from participating.

However, the principals differed in how they saw their role and how they focused their efforts in implementing the professional development school model in their buildings.

Table 3

Principal Demographics

Name	Flowers	Adair	Starnes	Dreskin	Dutch	Martinez	Summers
School	Nelson	Mason	Crawford	Bryson	Barnett	Caldwell	Gibson
Gender	M	F	M	M	M	F	M
Ethnicity	White	White	White	White	White	Hispanic	Black
Education	Master's	Master's	Master's	Master's	Master's	Master's	Master's
Years Experience as Principal	14	8	4	17	5	4	5
Years Experience at School	4	8	4	8	3	3	3

In the interviews, principals described their professional development school duties, their interactions with university staff and students, and the problems and benefits of the PDS model. From these interviews, 6 categories of "concerns" were identified. (See Table 4.) The concept of concerns included how principals spent their time, the kinds of issues and problems they identified, and how they defined their jobs. The liaison/coordinator category included activities and issues associated with bridging the gap between the university, school, and district, and ensuring coordination between the university and the school. One principal described this role as a facilitator, clarifying university expectations for their teachers.

General management concerns were those associated with scheduling, assigning students to mentor teachers, and dealing with the university students in the school. Two categories were associated with instructional leadership--using the professional development school as a staff development vehicle for teachers, and concerns with how the professional development school affected achievement for the children in the school.

Some principals discussed actions and concerns related to their impact on the profession. They affected the profession and its future in two ways: First, as instructional leaders for the university students in their schools, taking an active role in designing their professional development; and second, as improving the profession by having an impact beyond their own schools. In this latter category, 2 principals involved themselves and their teachers in research and publication and attended and presented at national conferences on teacher education. As shown in Table 4, all principals were highly engaged in activities related to the liaison/coordinator role and the majority addressed general management of the school. There was progressively less concern with the development of teachers and student learning, and on the professional growth of the university students in the school. Only 2 discussed their activities and concerns in the area of improving the educational profession at large.

Stages of Principals' Concerns in Implementing Professional Development Schools

In considering these categories, it seemed that they represented a continuum similar to stages of development. Stage theories of adult development and professional development posit that, in the process of personal or professional growth,

Table 4

Bar Graph of PDS Principal Role Expectations

Principal/ School	Liaison/ Coordinator	General Management	Staff Development	Student Learning	Improve Profession --Student	Improve Profession --Other
Martinez/ Caldwell	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX
Flowers/ Nelson	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX
Summers/ Gibson	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	
Starnes/ Crawford	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX	
Dutch/ Barnett	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 	
Dreskin/ Bryson	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 	
Adair/ Mason	XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX XXXXXXXXXX	 	 XXXXXXXXXX	 	

KEY: 5 lines of X's=High level of concern, 4=Med-high, 3=Medium, 2=Med-low, 1=Low, 0=No mention of concern

people move through a sequence of stages. Each stage is a structured whole, representing an underlying organization of thought or understanding (Levine, 1989). Most educators are familiar with stages or cognitive and moral development through the writings of Piaget and Kohlberg. Students of educational change are familiar with the stages of concern in the Concerns Based Model of implementation (Hall & Hord, 1987). Teacher educators and staff developers have identified stages of concerns of teachers as they grow in their profession. Prior to entering the profession, pre-service teachers are at levels where their concerns are first unrelated to the profession, then move to self-related concerns about their ability to function as student teachers. Glickman et al. (1995) described a sequence of 3 stages of professional teacher concerns: the self-adequacy stage, where new teachers' primary concern is survival and making it through the day; the teacher tasks stage, where teachers are concerned with teaching tasks, discipline, developing routines, and improving their teaching materials and methods; and, the teaching impact stage, where concerns emphasize teachers' impact on students and student achievement. Similarly, as teachers confront and implement innovations, they move through a sequence of 7 stages of concerns, following the same model of concerns about self, task, and impact (Hall & Hord, 1987).

The concerns of the 7 principals in this study as they describe their roles, suggest that the principals' concerns about a new role also may be described in terms of patterns of concerns shown on Table 4. These stages appear to affect how they view the impact of participating in the professional development school on their own

organization. All principals described tasks related to coordination and management as part of their role. However, coordination and management dominated the attention of some leaving them less time for concerns about the impact on the world outside of school.

For example, a principal identified the major difference between her school and a non-PDS in terms of the large number of university students on campus and the computers purchased for her school through the grant. Her major concerns were time management, meshing university and school district schedules, revolving door professors, and lack of flexibility of some of the professors. She also expressed the most personal stress of any principal in the study. Other principals' concerns moved toward the PDS impact on their own students, the university students in their building, and the profession.

Several explanations for the differences in the stages of principal concerns about the PDS role were considered in the analysis. Years of experience as a principal and experience in a professional development school do not seem to affect the concerns about the PDS role. The motivations for involving their schools in a PDS did not explain differences in role definitions. However, the structure of the PDS and the amount of assistance available in the school to the principals do explain why some PDS principals focus on coordination and management in the school while others become concerned about teacher growth and professional impact.

For example, the principal whose role definition was most focused on coordination and management had a complex PDS and minimal assistance. With no

assistant principal, a site coordinator shared with another site, turnover among university personnel in her school, and over 50 university students a semester on her campus, she had many management responsibilities. In addition to feeling alone, she felt responsible for making the PDS work. While positive about the impact on her school, she did not have the time or energy to be concerned with much more than managing the program in her school.

In contrast, another principal had almost twice as many university students in his school, but he had an assistant principal, a full-time site coordinator, and a consistent site professor to work with him. Although he had more university students, he had more help with his load and was able to move beyond the immediate implementation tasks to those that included an impact on the university students and the profession.

A third principal's small campus had only 5 university students who began the fall as observers and remained to student teach in the spring. A site coordinator also was assigned to her building. While this principal spent time on coordination and management, she expanded her perspective to include the university and the profession. Where principals had adequate staff support for the PDS, or where the PDS had few students and created few coordination problems, principals were able to attend to the broader concerns of the impact of the innovation, working with the individual students to enhance their professional growth, and helping to improve the teaching profession itself. Principals overwhelmed with coordination and management remained focused on these concerns.

The more coordination and management demands the PDS placed on the principals and the lower the level of assistance (whether assistant principal or site coordinator) available to help carry out these tasks, the less likely the principal was to take the steps needed to ward off threats to institutionalization. Large schools, large numbers of university students, and the absence of an assistant principal made it difficult for principals and contributed to low support for the innovation.

Potential for Institutionalization

If professional development schools are to become the dominant teacher preparation model, as many reformers advocate, the individual school sites must be willing to serve as clinical settings over a long period of time. That is, the model must be institutionalized--become a part of the school and its regular operations--at the school sites. The model developed from Miles' and Huberman's research (Miles, 1983) explains why some schools were implementing the PDS model more easily and helps to predict which PDSs will be institutionalized. This model posits that the local administrator is crucial to the successful implementation and institutionalization of an innovation. That administrator maintains pressure on teachers to use the innovation, provides supports to help them use it successfully, and makes changes in the organizational structure to accommodate the innovation. These supports are especially necessary as threats such as environmental turbulence and staff turnover exist.

The model would lead to a prediction that where the principal takes the supportive steps to improve the PDS and wards off threats to its institutionalization, the chances of the PDS becoming institutionalized are good. At schools with the least

support and the highest level of threat the PDS model probably will not be institutionalized. Table 5 displays the 7 schools in a matrix defined by level of principal support and threats to institutionalization.

Table 5

Levels of Support and Threat for PDS Sites

	LOW THREAT	MODERATE THREAT	HIGH THREAT
HIGH SUPPORT	* Caldwell PDS Ms. Martinez	* Nelson PDS Mr. Flowers	
MODERATE SUPPORT		* Crawford PDS Mr. Starnes	*Mason PDS Ms. Adair
		* Bryson PDS Mr. Dreskin	
		* Gibson PDS Mr. Summers	
LOW SUPPORT			* Barnett PDS Mr. Dutch

The Barnett PDS had low support and a high level of threat to institutionalization. This 612 student, Pre K-6 school had an assistant principal; however, she was on maternity leave and had not been replaced. The PDS program put 6 interns and 8 residents in the school spring semester. The university program required that they rotate among classrooms, increasing coordination problems for teachers and the principal. One intern could have as many as 4 mentors. Mr. Dutch

and the teachers tried to change this arrangement to reduce the number of management concerns, but the university would not modify the student schedules.

The planned assistance from the university professor site coordinator fell through when he experienced a teaching overload and declined to continue as site coordinator. The school functioned for a period of time with no site coordinator, thus putting more pressure on the principal and teachers to coordinate the program. Mr. Dutch spent time and effort mediating conflicts between mentor teachers and university students, and mentor teachers and university professors. The PDS increased the difficulty of his job.

Similarly, the mentor teachers also worked harder and experienced burnout from having an intern and resident per mentor every semester. At times the mentor teachers did not want to take on this additional responsibility and requested time off from participation in the program. As a result, the school as a whole decided to reduce the number of interns assigned to their school instead of increasing the amount of university students to full capacity.

Neither the university nor the school took action required to transform initial commitment to the PDS model into successful implementation. They eventually appointed a Barnett teacher as a site coordinator, funded through the state grant. However, at the time of this study, neither the university nor the school had written the innovation's requirements into job descriptions, made new budget lines, or made sure that needed materials and equipment would continue to be available in the future. The state provided PDS funding for a limited period of time, expecting the local

partnership to take on the financial support. The perceived burden of the PDS on teachers and administrators makes long term survival unlikely.

University expectations for faculty created another threat. As explained above, the career demands for university personnel added to environmental turbulence for the program. A site professor experienced a teaching overload and refused to be site coordinator. He explained that the administration at his university expected him to meet the requirements of tenure track professors as well as teach in the field-based PDS program. He commented that his other university responsibilities, which included publishing and committee membership that could lead to his promotion, took precedence over his site coordinator duties and precluded involvement beyond teaching at the PDS site. Without a change in university expectations, the site is likely to experience continued turbulence as faculty rotate through the school.

In contrast, Caldwell PDS enjoyed strong support from the principal and low threat to institutionalization. This K-4 school was the second smallest in the study. The principal was assisted by both a site coordinator and a university professor. Only 5 university students were assigned to the school as residents. Ms. Martinez, Caldwell's principal, was 1 of 2 principals with the most fully developed view of her role as a PDS principal and the most concern with how she and her professional development school could improve the teaching profession.

At the time of the study, the Caldwell PDS had been implemented successfully, and the principal and teachers had begun to modify it. For example, Ms. Martinez and her staff had revised the governance structure to give the instructional leadership team

the major decision making power in PDS issues. No major threats to institutionalization were identified. The small number of residents in the school could be coordinated even if the university funding were cut.

Similarly, the Miles and Huberman model can be used to predict the probability of institutionalization at the other 5 PDS sites. Table 5 compares the level of support with the level of threat at the different schools. Like Caldwell, Nelson is likely to sustain the PDS, while the program is more tenuous at Barnett and Mason.

The example of the Barnett site suggests that specific actions could be taken to reduce the threats to institutionalization of the PDS. The principal and teachers need assistance to help resolve internal problems and teacher burnout. If more teachers were added to the group of mentor teachers, the burnout existing among mentor teachers would decrease. Supports, training, and resources must be provided to new mentors from university resources to maintain the PDS. If the PDS is to be institutionalized in the school, decision makers in the school and in the university must make the needed organizational changes such as including PDS requirements in job descriptions of professors and mentor teachers; adding new budget lines; and insuring that continuous training, resources, and equipment are available in the future.

Recommendations and Policy Implication

This research suggests that state policy makers and universities and schools creating PDSs can take steps to increase the likelihood of successful implementation and institutionalization of the PDS model. When state and teacher certification policies that require pre-service teachers to participate in PDSs are enacted, and local public

school and university policies and procedures to implement the PDSs are developed, planners should assure that the number of university students do not overwhelm the school, that personnel resources are provided to support the principals, and that principals receive training specific to PDSs.

Specific recommendations can be made from this study and applied to future efforts by schools and universities collaboratives implementing new programs to transform schools for the future. Developers of PDSs do not always consider the role of the principal, yet principals are crucial to successful change. This study suggests that supports for principals could increase the likelihood that the PDS will be institutionalized in their schools. PDS developers can support principals by:

* Providing staff support for the principals in schools with large numbers of interns and other students. Additional staff with specialized administrative or supervisory training such as an assistant principal or a site coordinator, and a consistent university faculty presence in the school would reduce the burden on the principal.
* Developing written job descriptions and expectations for principals in the PDS;
* Providing orientation and staff development specifically for PDS principals. Development opportunities might include visiting other successful sites, attending principal conferences and workshops, and networking with other PDS participants;
* Affording other training such as conflict resolution skills, effective liaison skills, and communication skills to share the vision to promote teacher buy-in;

* Providing other resources such as additional funds for computer software, hardware, and technology training for every principal to aid them in their job, E-mail linkages between the site and universities and to Internet would vastly improve communication and availability of information.

University-school collaboratives can takes steps to reduce the pressure on the principal and the consequent threat to institutionalization. Collaboration and institutionalization of the PDS in a school can be improved by selecting qualified students to participate as interns and by vision and consensus building among school, university, and other CPDT partners. Selection of the most qualified university students is critical. Students must be able to mesh with the school environment in the best interests of the children. Since university students are treated as faculty in the school and are involved with children, interns should go through the same screening as regular faculty. District and CPDT policy must reflect that requirement.

The PDS collaborative should provide activities for vision and consensus building about specific procedures among principals, teachers, and other participants. Successful consensus regarding goals and procedures could reduce coordination demands on the principals.

References

Evangelauf, J. (1994). A new 'Carnegie classification.' The Chronicle of Higher Education, 40(31), A17, 24-5.

Fullan, M.G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (1995). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Huberman, A.M. (1983, November). School improvement strategies that work: some scenarios. Educational Leadership, 41(3), 23-27.

Levine, S.L. (1989). Promoting adult growth in schools. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Miles, M.B. (1983). Unraveling the mystery of institutionalization. Educational Leadership, 41(3), 14-19.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Texas Education Agency. (1995). Centers for Professional Development and Technology. [Brochure]. Austin, TX: Author.

EA028478

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Institutionalizing Professional Development Schools: Supporting the Principal

Author(s): Dr. Gail A. Bowen and Dr. Judith Adkison

Corporate Source: University of North Texas

Publication Date: August, 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

[X]

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

[ ]

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at **Level 1**.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature: Gail Bowen

Printed Name/Position/Title: Dr. Gail A. Bowen

Organization/Address: 4634 Dody
Corpus Christi, TX 78411

Telephone: (512)853-4166

FAX: (512)853-4166

E-Mail Address:

Date: 6/23/97

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

N/A

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

N/A

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
1787 Agate Street
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-5207

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2d Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com