Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools:

Chapters 1 and 2

Jana Hunzicker

Bradley University

October 15, 2017

Author Note

Jana Lynn Hunzicker https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9925-6388

The two manuscripts provided in this document were originally published in the book *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools* (2018) as chapter 1 and chapter 2. For each chapter, a full citation is provided in the references. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Jana Hunzicker, Bradley University, 1501 W. Bradley Avenue, Westlake Hall 208, Peoria, IL 61625. Email: jhunzicker@bradley.edu

Abstract

Professional development schools (PDSs) are a specific type of school-university partnership designed to support teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student learning. Due to active teacher engagement in PDS work over the past three decades, teacher leader practice and development has emerged as a serendipitous outcome of PDS partnerships. Originally published in the book *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools*, the first chapter provides an overview of professional development schools before offering a brief history of PDS in the United States. Chapter 2 defines teacher leadership in PDSs, introduces distributed leadership theory, and provides a brief history of teacher leadership in the United States before asserting several characteristics that render PDSs ideal settings for studying teacher leadership.

Keywords: Professional development schools (PDS), history of professional development schools, history of teacher leadership, laboratory schools, school-university partnerships, teacher leadership

Professional Development Schools:

An Overview and Brief History

Jana Hunzicker

Bradley University

October 15, 2017

Abstract

Professional development schools (PDSs) are a specific type of school-university partnership designed to support teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student learning. Due to active teacher engagement in PDS work over the past three decades, teacher leader practice and development has emerged as a serendipitous outcome of PDS partnerships. Emphasizing teacher leadership throughout, this chapter provides an overview of professional development schools, including a definition and core purposes, benefits of continuous learning for all PDS stakeholders, and the complexities of PDS work before offering a brief history of PDS in the United States.

Keywords: Professional development schools (PDS), history of professional development schools, school-university partnerships, history of education in the United States, laboratory schools

Professional Development Schools: An Overview and Brief History

Professional development schools (PDSs), a specific type of school-university partnership, were established in the 1990s to bolster the preparation of pre-service teachers by placing them in authentic classroom settings where they could learn with and from experienced classroom teachers (Rutter, 2006; Teitel, 1997). To support classroom teachers charged with mentorship and supervision, partnering colleges and universities provided professional development and other forms of support aimed at enhancing the teaching and leadership of experienced teachers (Teitel, 1997). Shaped primarily to address school reform and increase teacher professionalization (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990), the parallel work of John Goodlad and the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) expanded the PDS vision to include teacher leadership (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011).

As it turned out, the Holmes Group's (1986, 1990) core PDS purposes of teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student learning have defined the PDS mission nationwide for the past three decades. Moreover, active teacher engagement in PDS work has caused teacher leader practice and development to emerge as a serendipitous outcome of PDS partnerships (Cosenza, 2013; Teitel, 2004). Emphasizing teacher leadership throughout, this chapter provides an overview of professional development schools, including a definition and core purposes, benefits of continuous learning for all PDS stakeholders, and the complexities of PDS work before offering a brief history of PDS in the United States.

Definition and Core Purposes of Professional Development Schools

Teitel (2004) described PDSs as "a cornerstone of serious attempts to simultaneously improve teacher education and public schools" (p. 401). Carpenter and Sherretz (2012) wrote, "PDS partnerships support professional and student learning through the use of an inquiry-

oriented approach to teaching" (p. 89). While school-university partnerships admirably focus on teacher preparation and other "special projects or school directed community or business partnerships that only peripherally connect to the PDS" (Rutter, 2006, p. 11), PDSs do even more. The "widely accepted cornerstones of the PDS initiative" (Field, 2014, p. 133) that distinguish PDSs from other school-university partnerships are teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student learning (Ferrara, 2014; Neapolitan & Levine, 2011; Teitel, 2004). In the 2008 position paper titled "What it Means to be a Professional Development School," the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) articulated the definition and core purposes of PDSs as follows:

> Unique and particularly intense school–university collaborations, PDSs were designed to accomplish a four-fold agenda: preparing future educators, providing current educators with ongoing professional development, encouraging joint school–university faculty investigation of education-related issues, and promoting the learning of P–12 students (p. 1).

From a broader perspective, PDSs exist to promote innovation and to create sustainable practices in the service of teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student learning (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011). Toward these ends, collaborative partnership between school and university is essential. Ferrara (2014) explained:

> Understanding the teaching/learning cycle and the critical impact that teachers have on student success has been the mission of PDSs for almost two decades. This mission has helped professionals serving preK-12 students, as well as those preparing teacher candidates, recognize that working in isolation is no longer a viable solution to the complex problems of student learning and teacher quality" (p. 12).

Mutual sharing of human, informational, and fiscal resources also promotes innovation and supports the sustainability of PDS partnerships. Berkeley (2006) wrote, "The primary intent is for school partners and university partners to become resources of first resort to one another, contacting one another for a variety of reasons" (p. 157).

Continuous Learning of All PDS Stakeholders

Through collaboration and sharing, PDSs offer mutual benefits to school and university. The greatest benefit is the opportunity to support continuous learning of all PDS stakeholders. Ferrara (2014) stated, "PDSs create environments where preservice teachers, practicing teachers, college faculty, and preK-12 students come together under one roof to engage the process of learning" (p. 11). Through the ongoing process of learning via practice, professional development, and inquiry, school-university partners create a level playing field where reciprocal learning is valued (Miller, 2015; NAPDS, 2008). Hartzler-Miller (2006) wrote, "PDSs create the conditions for de-legitimizing traditional power structures by bringing university faculty into K-12 classrooms and teachers onto college campus [sic] as serious professionals, consultants, co-researchers, instructors, and leaders in their field" (p. 171). Moreover, responsibility for learning is shared, creating opportunities for teachers to emerge as leaders. Carpenter and Sherretz (2012) elaborated:

> Accountability for learning in PDS is no longer the sole responsibility of the principal. In a learning community, a teacher's role expands from one's classroom to the entire school…such a context empowers teachers; specifically, teachers begin to take on more responsibility to mentor or coach each other and advocate for their profession and students (p. 98).

From a university perspective, PDS work is "a place in academia that 'keeps it real'" (Hartzler-Miller, 2006, p. 165). In PDS partnerships, P-12 teachers benefit from the theoretical knowledge provided by university faculty, and university faculty benefit from the practitioner knowledge of P-12 teachers.

Complexities of PDS Work

Recent concern about quality teacher preparation and increased accountability for teacher certification and licensure has created a renewed interest in PDSs (Howey, 2011). Yet even in ideal circumstances, PDS work is challenging. Berkeley (2006) described the "added-on complexities" of PDS leadership as "the rigorous demands of those at levels even higher than themselves – institutional leaders, community leaders, political leaders, and citizen leaders" (p. 151). One such complexity is perpetual tension between innovation and standards. PDS work focused on innovation tends to be non-hierarchical, voluntary, internally-controlled, and responsive to local conditions (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011). Such conditions foster creativity but may lack substance and/or resources. On the other hand, PDS work focused on standards or other external parameters, such as a grant, may be limited to specific initiatives, groups, or activities or distract PDSs from their mission (Miller, 2015). Teitel (2004) elaborated:

> When PDS becomes "just another thing" required by the people higher up, the opportunities for PDSs to transform and improve schools and teacher education institutions are lost. Leadership and participants at all levels – at the PDS, state or municipal levels – need to consciously address ways to retain the underlying vision and vitality of PDS (p. 404).

A second complexity is the provisional status of many PDSs, which often results from limited institutional support. Neapolitan and Levine (2011) explained:

> With few exceptions, the PDS has…not been able to make the changes in the basic structure, financing, roles, and relationships of the partners involved, and therefore have not been institutionalized…Primarily driven by universities, they have been unevenly implemented. Few districts, again with some exceptions, have made the basic commitment necessary to sustaining them (p. 320).

Institutional supports such as time, funding, and recognition for participation in PDS efforts are necessary to sustain PDSs indefinitely (Ferrara, 2014; Field, 2014). In addition, state funding, governance, and accountability systems are needed to sustain widespread PDS work (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011).

A third complexity faced by today's PDSs is low advocacy. Field (2014) identified several "things that PDS practitioners currently are not doing very well" (p. 138), including the need to clarify the mission of PDS work, pursuing the PDS mission in day-to-day efforts, and advocating for PDSs "with measurable data demonstrating the impact of PDS collaborations" (pp. 138-139). Yet the empirical research base on PDSs remains thin. Ferrara (2014) stated:

> Historically, PDSs examine those factors that affect student learning, such as teacher effectiveness, implementation of research-based practices, or ways in which schools transform as a result of partnership work. However, a clear link between these inputs and student achievement has not been made in most PDS settings" (p. 21).

Hartzler-Miller (2006) concurred, "Without solid conceptual frameworks for interpreting, explaining, and visioning PDS work, our PDS partnerships are like houses made of straw, vulnerable to constant shifts in political winds" (p. 165).

A fourth and final complexity of PDS work is staying true to the four-fold PDS mission. Miller (2015) identified mission creep as "the biggest threat to school-university partnerships"

(p. 28) since it hinders the conditions that support teacher leadership. Because successful PDS work requires buy in from all stakeholders (Field, 2014), teacher leadership is integral to the success of PDSs. Moreover, as individual stakeholders come and go, the PDS mission is more likely to remain in focus when a significant number of teacher leaders are engaged in PDS work. Clark (1999) wrote, "A partnership that has as its purpose the creation of a partnership – rather than the accomplishment of some ultimate goal – is inevitably doomed to early failure. Continuous, critical examination of the reasons for a partnership is the only prevention for this possible malady" (p. 168). If successful PDS partnerships are to be sustained over time, complexities such as these must be addressed.

A Brief History of Professional Development Schools

The notion of school-university partnerships dates back to the 1820s, when model schools were first used by state teacher colleges as practice settings for future teachers (Hausfather, 2000). By the late 1800s, model schools were common across the United States; and after John Dewey opened the first laboratory school in 1896, model schools expanded their mission to include Dewey's concept of "putting theory into practice in an experimental setting" (Hausfather, 2000, p. 32). Sustained through continuing partnerships with teacher colleges, model schools became widely known as laboratory schools in the early 1900s (Hausfather, 2000). "Consciously modeled after the teaching hospital, laboratory schools emphasized systematic research, joint faculty appointments with the university, and careful attention to preservice teacher education" (Hausfather, 2000, p. 32). The number of laboratory schools nationwide peaked in 1964 before steadily declining into the 1980s (Hausfather, 2000). Hausfather (2000) expounded:

> As the number of students enrolling in teacher education programs increased, student teaching moved to the plentiful public school classrooms in communities surrounding colleges and universities. Teacher education professors spent more time in these public school placements, creating a widening gap between the college education faculty and the laboratory school (pp. 34).

Thus, laboratory schools set the early stage for a new model of school-university partnership: the professional development school. But more events were to unravel before PDSs made their debut.

From Sputnik to "A Nation Prepared"

In 1957, the world's first artificial Earth satellite, Sputnik, was launched by the Soviet Union causing the curriculum of American schools – and those who taught it – to be doubted by many. Rutter (2006) explained:

> Schools were blamed because we had not produced the requisite scientists and engineers to win that first step in the space race. Suddenly math and science were front and center in our curriculum, and professionals in those fields were brought in to design relevant "teacher-proof" curriculum to ensure we would not fall further behind (p. 289).

In the 1960s and 1970s, as school curricula across the United States was being reformed in response to Sputnik, educators began to recognize a lack of collaboration between the nation's teacher preparation programs and P-12 schools (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011). Then, in 1983, the notorious report "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform" by the National Commission on Excellence in Education called into serious question the quality of instruction taking place in our P-12 schools and communicated misgivings about the competence of America's teaching force (Rutter, 2011).

In response to "A Nation at Risk," several reports offered recommendations for reform. In 1985, the Ford Foundation's Academy for Education Development's "Teacher Development in Schools" report called for ongoing professional development and differentiated roles and responsibilities for teachers (Rutter, 2011). In 1986, the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession's "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century" report promoted higher professional standards, mastery certification, increased accountability, and greater decision-making authority for teachers (Rutter, 2011). "A Nation Prepared" also envisioned the creation of university teaching centers and clinical schools to support teacher education programs, signaling the nation's readiness for PDSs (Rutter, 2011). Indeed, the term *professional development school* was coined by the Holmes Group the same year (Teitel, 2004).

Launch of the PDS Movement

In 1986, "Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group" was the first response to "A Nation at Risk" that connected teacher professionalization to the desired outcome of student learning and achievement through its vision of professional learning communities and leadership opportunities for teachers (Rutter, 2011). The report outlined five goals:

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more solid;
2. To recognize differences in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work;
3. To create standards of entry to the profession – examinations and educational requirements – that are professionally relevant and intellectually defensible;
4. To connect our own institutions to schools; and
5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 4).

Like the Carnegie Task Force, the Holmes Group envisioned collaboration between schools and universities to support teacher preparation but expanded the vision of school-university partnerships to include inquiry-based research and professional learning (Rutter, 2011).

In 1990, the Holmes Group (later re-named the Holmes Partnership) released a second report, "Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools," which further articulated the group's vision for PDSs based on six principles: 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; and 6) inventing a new institution (Holmes, 1990, p. 7). Together, "Tomorrow's Teachers" and Tomorrow's Schools" initiated what came to be known as the PDS movement. Neapolitan and Levine (2011) explained:

> The Holmes Partnership bears distinction as the organization that defined the PDS as a school-university partnership for the specific purpose of training future teachers and supporting the ongoing professional development of experienced educators within collaboratively designed clinical settings focused on the needs of P-12 students (p. 315).

By the time "Tomorrow's Schools" was published, the PDS movement had already begun. "In a parallel major reform initiative, John Goodlad and his colleagues advocated centers of pedagogy and formed the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER)" (Howey, 2011, p. 326). The NNER was founded in 1990 to create a school-university partnership structure that would strengthen teacher preparation, promote teacher professionalism, and ultimately, increase student learning and achievement (Rutter, 2011). Based on the premise that "professional education and the renewal of schools must work in tandem to effect systemic

change in the education system at large" (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011, p. 307), the NNER articulated four areas of school-university collaboration very similar to the four-fold PDS mission: teacher preparation, professional development, curriculum development, and research/inquiry. The NNER emphasized professional development focused "on leadership development at every level of the career, from teacher candidates to school and university faculty, to school, district, and university administrators" (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011, p. 317). The NNER's vision for P-20 leadership development was an important first step toward the expansion of teacher leadership in American schools nationwide.

In a detailed history of the early PDS movement, Rutter (2011) identified teacher professionalism and school reform as two consistently-offered recommendations in the reports that followed "A Nation at Risk;" Teaching should be professionalized similar to medicine and law, and schools should be restructured "to accommodate the new roles and status of teaching professionals" (p. 303). Around the same time, Howey (2011) wrote, "The emphasis was on moving from teachers as members of a guild to teachers as professionals, prepared in a parallel manner to other professionals, and especially the clinical type of preparation that occurs in teaching hospitals" (p. 327). By 1990, this notion of PDSs had been embraced by many education scholars and practitioners across the United States (Carpenter & Sherretz, 2012; Neapolitan & Levine, 2011; Rutter, 2011).

The Early Years of PDS

The first PDSs were loosely defined. Teitel (2004) recalled, "In their first decade – the late 1980s and early 1990s – much of the focus of PDSs' energies was on starting up the partnerships and making them work" (p. 407). Although PDS partnerships were supported by professional organizations such as the National Education Association (NEA) and the American

Federation of Teachers (AFT) (Carpenter & Sherretz, 2012), developing strong and sustainable partnerships required effort and perseverance. Teitel (2004) elaborated:

> Early PDSs struggled for support, resources and recognition, and at the same time functioned with high levels of autonomy, often outside of the scrutiny, and sometimes not even on the radar screen of school districts or larger university teacher education programs" (p. 403).

Despite these start-up challenges, PDS enthusiasm and energy remained high as the Holmes Group and the NNER worked to keep their visions alive.

In 1995, the Holmes Group released a third report, "Tomorrow's Schools of Education: A Report of the Holmes Group," which devoted an entire chapter to articulating the importance of PDSs as integral to P-12 and school of education reform. "Tomorrow's Schools" outlined seven goals:

1. To make education schools accountable to the profession and to the public for the trustworthy performance of their graduates at beginning and advanced levels of practice;
2. To make research, development, and demonstration of quality learning in real schools and communities a primary mission of education schools;
3. To connect professional schools of education with professionals directly responsible for elementary and secondary education at local, state, regional, and national levels to coalesce around higher standards;
4. To recognize interdependence and commonality of purpose in preparing educators for various roles in schools, roles that call for teamwork and common understanding of learner-centered education in the 21st century;

5. To provide leadership in making education schools better places for professional study and learning;
6. To center our work on professional knowledge and skill for educators who serve children and youth; and
7. To contribute to the development of state and local policies that give all youngsters the opportunity to learn from highly qualified educators (Holmes Group, 1995, pp. 12-15).

The detailed vision of PDSs and the roles of university partners described in "Tomorrow's Schools of Education" provided much-needed definition for aspiring and newly formed PDS partnerships. Soon, the promise of PDS had grown prominent enough to evoke financial incentives from the federal government. For example, in 1998 the Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant program was launched by the United States Department of Education, providing competitive matching fund grants to support partnerships between teacher preparation programs and high need schools for the purpose of improving the clinical preparation of teachers (McCann, n.d.).

The Creation of PDS Standards, Structures, and Networks

During the 2000s, the PDS movement continued to flourish. In March 2000, the Holmes Partnership and the University of South Carolina's College of Education launched the PDS National Conference in Columbia, South Carolina (Field, 2014), an important first step in creating a nationwide PDS network "focused solely on issues related to PDSs" (Ferrara, 2014, p. 15). Around the same time, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) joined with PDS practitioners and researchers from across the United States to develop "a set of guidelines that provided a theoretical framework, offered technical support, and operationalized practices" (Ferrara, 2014, p. 13). Published in 2001, the NCATE PDS standards

articulated PDSs as "innovative institutions formed through partnerships between professional education programs and P-12 schools" (para. 1) that prepare new teachers, support faculty development, improve instructional practice, and enhance student achievement. The NCATE PDS standards outline five defining characteristics of PDSs: I. Learning Community; II. Accountability and Quality Assurance; III. Collaboration; IV. Equity and Diversity; and V. Structures, Resources, and Roles (NCATE, 2001, para. 2).

The NCATE PDS standards were "extremely influential in shaping and solidifying the PDS movement" (Teitel, 2004, p. 406) because they "brought together the teacher quality agenda of the 1990s and the overarching vision of effecting change in P-12 education through school-university partnerships" (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011, p. 316). Although they were not (and still are not) required for accreditation of teacher preparation programs, the NCATE PDS standards provided much-needed structure for colleges and universities engaged in or thinking about initiating PDS relationships. Following publication of the NCATE PDS standards, individuals, institutions, and some states operationalized them through policy and practice. One example is Teitel's (2003) PDS Standards Student Learning Pyramid (p. xviii). Moreover, states that have required PDS involvement as part of the teacher preparation process include Maryland, Louisiana, Florida, and West Virginia (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011; Teitel, 2004).

In 2005, as interest in PDS work continued to grow, the National Association for Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) was founded (Field, 2014). Ferrara (2014) described the NAPDS as "the premier professional organization for all things PDS," elaborating that "its website, newsletter, peer-reviewed journal, and an annual national conference are the lifeline for PDS educators" (p. 15). The publication of the NCATE PDS standards in 2001 and the founding of the NAPDS in 2005 signaled that PDSs had reached a level of common practice

in teacher preparation. In 2006, Rutter wrote, “The PDS movement has grown beyond being just a reform movement. It is now nearly the norm, the way many of us commonly view teaching and learning” (p. 12).

Despite standards and a national professional network, PDSs remained widely interpreted in the mid-2000s. Field (2014) explained, “The term PDS had come to be used in a variety of ways and, in particular, seemed to be used routinely to describe any school-university relationship that engaged in the preparation of new teachers” (p. 132). So in 2008, the NAPDS articulated “nine required essentials of a PDS” (p. 2) to distinguish PDSs from other school-university partnerships (see Figure 1).

1. A comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any partner and that furthers the education profession and its responsibility to advance equity within schools and, by potential extension, the broader community;
2. A school-university culture committed to the preparation of future educators that embraces their active engagement in the school community;
3. Ongoing and reciprocal professional development for all participants guided by need;
4. A shared commitment to innovative and reflective practice by all participants;
5. Engagement in and public sharing of the results of deliberate investigations of practice by respective participants;
6. An articulation agreement developed by the respective participants delineating the roles and responsibilities of all involved;
7. A structure that allows all participants a forum for ongoing governance, reflection, and collaboration;

8. Work by college/university faculty and P-12 faculty in formal roles across institutional settings; and
9. Dedicated and shared resources and formal rewards and recognition structures.

Figure 1: Nine Essentials of a Professional Development School (NAPDS, 2008, pp. 2-3)

The NAPDS Nine Essentials were written to "set the philosophy for the PDS" and "provide direct guidance on some of the logistics and structures of the PDS relationship" (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011, p. 310) while still leaving room for interpretation and customization. Field (2014) stated:

> The NAPDS made the case that while all PDS relationships must have collaborative missions, not all PDS missions must be the same…Similarly, while all PDS relationships must have formal written agreements in place, the content of those agreements will vary considerably from place to place, as will the roles created to support each PDS, the reward structures designed to recognize PDS work, the ways in which the "sharing of resources" is implemented from site to site, and a whole host of subtle nuances that acknowledge the uniqueness and individuality of each PDS relationship (p. 134).

The PDS standards, structures, and networks created in the 2000s brought together all of the pieces needed for PDSs to achieve the original vision of the Holmes Group. Moreover, these standards, structures, and networks primed PDSs to engage deeply in pursuit of the four core areas of PDS work: teacher preparation, professional development, research and inquiry, and student learning (NAPDS, 2008).

Professional Development Schools Today

Today, as PDSs continue to flourish across the United States, the call to remain strong is louder than ever. In 2010, NCATE's Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation

and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning recognized PDSs as exemplary models for teacher preparation. In support of PDSs and other school-university partnerships, the report argued that:

> …teacher education programs must work in close partnership with school districts to redesign teacher preparation to better serve prospective teachers and the students they teach. Partnerships should include shared decision making and oversight on candidate selection and completion by school districts and teacher education programs (NCATE, 2010, p. ii).

Significantly, NCATE's (2010) Blue Ribbon Report envisioned teacher leadership outcomes such as "advancing shared responsibility for teacher preparation; supporting the development of complex teaching skills; and ensuring that all teachers will know how to work closely with colleagues, students, and community" (p. ii). The statement concluded, "[Clinical preparation partnerships] will be a crucial step towards empowering teachers to meet the urgent needs of schools and the challenges of 21st century classrooms" (p. ii). Neapolitan and Levine (2011) wrote that the report is "testimony to the significance of PDS work done over the last two decades" (p. 323).

In 2012, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) reinforced the work of the Blue Ribbon Panel by publishing a position statement on the clinical preparation of teachers that advocated for school-university partnerships; full year student teaching; rigorous, high quality performance assessments for pre-service and practicing teachers; consistency and collaboration across states in regard to certification, licensure, and hiring; teacher residency programs; and incentives for "schools to serve as clinical settings for teacher candidates by subsidizing mentor teachers, substitutes for teacher-candidate pull out sessions,

and postgraduate residents" (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], 2012, p. 2). The position taken by AACTE was intended to ensure that new teachers are "ready to teach the moment they set foot into a classroom" (Abdul-Alim, 2014, para. 1).

In 2013, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) replaced NCATE as the national body for accrediting teacher preparation programs and continues to recognize and promote PDSs and other school-university partnerships as integral to teacher preparation. CAEP Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice (2013) states that "…effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to [teacher] preparation so that candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to demonstrate positive impact on all P-12 students' learning and development" (para. 1). The language of CAEP Standard 2 supports school-university partnerships by stating that partners will "co-construct mutually beneficial P-12 school and community arrangements…" (para. 2.1). The standard supports teacher leadership by stating that partners will "co-select, prepare, evaluate, support, and retain high-quality clinical educators, both provider- and school-based, who demonstrate a positive impact on candidates' development and P-12 student learning and development" (para. 2.2).

Since 2010, the Blue Ribbon Panel, the AACTE, and CAEP have all recognized the importance of pairing school-university partnerships and teacher leadership roles and responsibilities in order to realize their visions. Moreover, professional and financial support for this important work remains steady. The NNER (2017) and the NAPDS (2017) continue to provide information, networking, and consulting for P-12 and higher education and federal grant programs continue to emphasize the importance of school-university partnerships. In 2008, the Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant program was changed to Teacher Quality

Partnership (TQP) with continued emphasis on "the quality of current and future teachers through better preparation, recruitment, and professional development" (McCann, n.d., para. 2). The most recent TQP call for proposals continues to emphasize the importance of school-university partnerships for purposes of clinical preparation, emphasizing in particular federal support for model teaching residency programs and/or year-long student teaching experiences within the context of school-university partnerships (AACTE, 2012; United States Department of Education, 2016).

Conclusion

Emphasizing teacher leadership throughout, this chapter provided an overview of professional development schools, including a definition and core purposes, benefits of continuous learning for all PDS stakeholders, the complexities of PDS work, and a brief history of PDS in the United States. With an understanding of PDS established, chapter two defines teacher leadership in PDSs and other school-university partnerships, introduces distributed leadership theory, and provides a brief history of teacher leadership in the United States before asserting several characteristics that render PDSs and other school-university partnerships ideal settings for studying teacher leadership.

References

Abdul-Alim, J. (2014, March 3). Experts: New teachers can't hide behind steep learning curve. *Diverse Issues in Education.* Retrieved from http://diverseeducation.com/article/61018/

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (2012). *Where we stand: Clinical preparation of teachers.* Retrieved from https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=482&ref=rl

Berkeley, T. R. (2006). Interweaving, interwoven: Perspective on PDS leadership from the university with the school. In J. E. Neapolitan & T. R. Berkeley (Eds.), *Where do we go from here? Issues in the sustainability of professional development school partnerships* (pp. 149-164). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Carpenter, B. D., & Sherretz, C. E. (2012). Professional development school partnerships: An instrument for teacher leadership. *School-University Partnerships, 5*(1), 89-101.

Clark, R. W. (1999). School-university partnerships and professional development schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*(3&4), 164-177.

Cosenza, M. N. (2013). Teacher leadership development in PDSs: Perceptions of 22 veteran teachers. *School-University Partnerships, 6*(1), 47-58.

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2013). *CAEP standards.* Retrieved from http://caepnet.org/standards/standards/standard2/

Ferrara, J. (2014). Historical context of the PDS movement. In J. Ferrara (Ed.). *Professional development schools: Creative solutions for educators* (pp. 9-26). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Field, B. E. (2014). A national perspective on the current state of PDSs. In J. Ferrara (Ed.). *Professional development schools: Creative solutions for educators* (pp. 129-142). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hartzler-Miller, C. (2006). Response on future directions: Leadership. In J. E. Neapolitan & T. R. Berkeley (Eds.), *Where do we go from here? Issues in the sustainability of professional development school partnerships* (pp. 165-176). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Hausfather, S. (2000). Laboratory schools to professional-development schools: The fall and rise of field experiences in teacher education. *The Educational Forum*, *65*(1), 31-39. Retrieved from https://blogs.maryville.edu/shausfather/vita/lab-schools-to-pds/

Holmes Group (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

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

Howey, K. R. (2011). Response to section I: What's needed now. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 110(2), 325-336.

Hunzicker, J. (2018). Professional development schools: An Overview and brief history. In J. Hunzicker (Ed.). *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools* (pp. 1-17). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.

McCann, C. (n.d.). Teacher Quality Partnership Grants. Retrieved from http://www.edcentral.org/edcyclopedia/teacher-quality-partnership-grants/

Miller, L. (2015). School-university partnerships and teacher leadership: Doing it right. *Educational Forum, 79*(1), 24-29.

National Association for Professional Development Schools (2008). *What it means to be a professional development school.* Retrieved from http://napds.org/9%20Essentials/statement.pdf

National Association for Professional Development Schools (2017). *Home.* http://napds.org/

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001). *Standards for professional development schools.* Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/ProfessionalDevelopmentSchools/tabid/497/Default.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2010). *Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers (*Report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnerships for Improved Student Learning). Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=zzeiB1OoqPk%3D&tabid=7

National Network for Educational Renewal (2017). *Mission statement.* Retrieved from http://www.nnerpartnerships.org/about-us/mission-statement/

Neapolitan, J. E., Levine, M. (2011). Approaches to professional development schools. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* 110(2), 306-324.

Rutter, A. (2011). Purpose and vision of professional development schools. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education,* 110(2), 289-305.

Rutter, A. (2006). The evolution of the PDS research landscape. In J. E. Neapolitan & T. R. Berkeley (Eds.), *Where do we go from here? Issues in the sustainability of professional development school partnerships* (pp. 3-16). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Teitel, L. (2004). Two decades of professional development school development in the United States. What have we learned? Where do we go from here? *Journal of In-service Education, 30*(3), 401-416.

Teitel, L. (2003). *The professional development schools handbook: Starting, sustaining, and assessing partnerships that improve student learning.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Teitel, L. (1997). Professional development schools and the transformation of teacher leadership. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*(1), 9-22.

United States Department of Education (2016, May 23). Programs: Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Program. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/index.html

Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools:

A Definition, Brief History, and Call for Further Study

Jana Hunzicker

Bradley University

October 15, 2017

‘

Abstract

In today's educational climate of data, differentiation, and accountability, teacher leadership is essential; and professional development schools (PDSs) offer distinctive settings for teacher leader practice and development. Building on chapter one, this chapter defines teacher leadership in PDSs, introduces distributed leadership theory, and provides a brief history of teacher leadership in the United States before asserting several characteristics that render PDSs ideal settings for studying teacher leadership. Instead of asking why we should study teacher leadership in PDSs and other school-university partnerships, a better question might be, why wouldn't we?

Keywords: Professional development schools (PDS), teacher leadership, history of teacher leadership in the United States, history of education in the United States, school-university partnerships

Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools:

A Definition, Brief History, and Call for Further Study

In today's educational climate of data, differentiation, and accountability, teacher leadership is essential (Curtis, 2013; Hargreaves, 2014; Superville, 2015). At the classroom and school levels, teacher leaders model exemplary teaching (Cosenza, 2013; Portner, 2008), promote effective instruction (Campbell & Malkus, 2011; Carlough, 2016), and facilitate school improvement efforts (Gordon, 2004; Teach Plus, 2014). At the district, state, and national levels, teacher leaders share best practices (Fairman & Mackenzie, 2012), influence educational policy (Soglin, Hunt, & Reilly, 2016), and advocate for the teaching profession (Coggins & McGovern, 2014). Teacher leaders are a powerful force in today's schools because teachers are respected as instructional experts (Carver, 2016; Danielson, 2006). Teachers know students well and are committed to student learning (Cannata, McCrory, Sykes, Anagnostopoulos, & Frank, 2010), and their tendency to lead collaboratively creates a sense of shared responsibility that supports student learning and builds instructional capacity schoolwide (Mangin & Stoelinga, 2008; Smulyan, 2016; Vernon-Dotson & Floyd, 2012).

Professional development schools (PDSs) offer distinctive settings for teacher leader practice and development (Carpenter & Sherretz, 2012; Miller, 2015; Teitel, 1997), especially around the core PDS purposes of teacher preparation, professional development, inquiry and research, and student learning (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990). In PDSs and other school-university partnerships (hereafter referred to simply as PDSs), opportunities abound for teachers to assume leadership roles such as mentor, committee chair, professional developer, instructional coach, and action researcher (Teitel, 1997; Ferrara, 2014). Cosenza (2010) found that PDS opportunities for teachers to engage in collaboration and mentoring outside their classrooms supported their

emergence as teacher leaders and increased teacher leader capacity schoolwide. PDS settings also provide an ideal context for teacher leader preparation. Snow-Gerono, Dana, and Silva (2001) found that first-year teachers who had completed year-long internships in a PDS setting were more focused on student learning and more likely to demonstrate emerging teacher leader behaviors, such as offering support to colleagues, than first-year teachers who were not PDS-prepared.

Burns, Yendol-Hoppey, Nolan, and Badiali (2013) wrote, “The possibility for real change occurs when universities learn from the field, and the field learns from universities” (p. 26). Given that PDSs provide a fertile environment for practicing and developing teacher leaders, a closer look at teacher leadership in these settings is necessary. Building on chapter one, this chapter defines teacher leadership in PDS, introduces distributed leadership theory, and provides a brief history of teacher leadership in the United States before asserting several characteristics that render PDSs and other school-university partnerships ideal settings for studying teacher leadership.

Definitions and Descriptions of Teacher Leadership

Over the past 40 years, numerous definitions and descriptions of teacher leadership have been asserted, but no single definition has become commonly accepted (Cosenza, 2015). Due to the conceptual diversity surrounding teacher leadership, Wenner and Campbell (2016) suggested that scholars explicitly define teacher leadership within their particular context of study. In response, this section considers several definitions and descriptions of teacher leadership before articulating a definition of teacher leadership in PDSs.

Formal, Informal, and Hybrid Teacher Leadership

Conceptions of teacher leadership are grounded in instructional leadership. From an instructional perspective, teacher leadership can be classified into three broad models: 1) the *teacher leadership model*, which formalizes instructional leadership roles and responsibilities with recognition and compensation such as titles, release time, and stipends; 2) the *multiple leadership roles model*, which informally distributes instructional leadership roles and responsibilities across many teachers although each teacher leader's official title and position remains classroom teacher; and 3) the *every teacher a leader model*, which informally involves all teachers in collaborative efforts toward instructional improvement and school reform without assigning specific roles and responsibilities (Gordon, 2004). These broad instructional models of teacher leadership also have been conceptualized as formal and informal teacher leadership. Usually holding an official title, formal teacher leaders work full time outside their classrooms to support changes in teaching practice and to coordinate school- and district-wide reform efforts (Lord, Cress, & Miller, 2008; Manno & Firestone, 2008). Informal teacher leaders teach full time and accept school- and district-wide leadership responsibilities in addition to their classroom teaching duties (Danielson, 2006; Watt, Huerta, & Mills, 2009).

Between formal and informal teacher leadership, Margolis and Huggins (2012) used the term *hybrid teacher leader* to describe teachers "whose official schedule includes both teaching K-12 students and leading teachers in some capacity, most often as a 'coach'" (p. 954). Like informal teacher leaders, hybrid teacher leaders engage in responsibilities such as providing professional development, facilitating collaboration, creating common assessments, observing and modeling teaching, writing curriculum, and sharing lesson plans and resources (Barnwell, 2015; Margolis & Huggins, 2012). Zeichner (2010) extends the concept of hybrid teacher

leadership to "bring[ing] together school and university-based teacher educators and practitioner and academic knowledge in new ways to enhance the learning of prospective teachers" (p. 486).

In recent years, informal and hybrid teacher leadership have emerged as prevailing teacher leadership models (Wenner & Campbell, 2016). Vernon-Dotson and Floyd (2012) described informal/hybrid teacher leaders as "teachers who go above and beyond their job description of teaching in their isolated classroom …to take action on school-wide issues and model teacher leadership for their colleagues" (p. 40). Margolis and Huggins (2012) stated, "Teachers in these roles provide the increasingly crucial function of supplying frontline support to teachers while maintaining the integrity of school, district, and state efforts to align curriculum and instruction" (p. 955). Cosenza (2013) wrote, "This type of emergent leadership characterizes the highest level of professionalism in education" (p. 48).

Deep Commitment to Students

Whether formal, informal, or hybrid, teacher leadership is characterized by teachers working together on behalf of students. Silva, Gimbert, and Nolan (2000) described teacher leadership as "ultimately based on doing what is right by children" (p. 799). Lieberman and Friedrich (2007) articulated it as "working collaboratively" and "making a commitment to students" (p. 44). Katzenmeyer and Moller (2009) wrote that teacher leaders "identify with and contribute to a community of teacher learners and leaders" (p. 6). Due to their deep commitment to students, teacher leaders are well positioned to influence student learning and achievement schoolwide through roles such as mentor, instructional coach, role model, and committee member. Vernon-Dotson and Floyd (2012) explained, "…teachers are the closest to school problems, experts on school issues, and a valuable resource in problem solving and decision making regarding what is best for students, teaching, and learning" (p. 39). Carver (2016)

asserted, “With their close connection to the classroom, teacher leaders have natural credibility with their peers” (p. 160).

Teacher Leaders as Boundary Spanners

Because teacher leaders collaborate beyond their classrooms to affect schoolwide change, they have been referred to as boundary spanners (Miller, 2015; Teitel, 1997; Zeichner, 2010). Clark (1999) elaborated, “Although a single, charismatic individual may have considerable influence on a partnership, the presence of one leader, no matter how effective, is insufficient in the long run. Leaders are required in various roles in higher education and the schools” (p. 169). Burns and Badiali (2015) documented a PDS model in which teachers who had successfully served as classroom-level student teacher mentors could apply to serve in the boundary-spanning role of novice supervisor for several student teachers. Zeichner (2010) described a boundary-spanning *teacher in residence* program in which experienced urban teachers worked, taught, and served in all aspects of their partner university’s teacher education program and participated in ongoing teacher leadership seminars for two years before returning to their classroom teaching positions in the public school system. Teacher leaders in PDSs and other school-university partnerships also have opportunities to influence PDS stakeholders across institutions. One study found that 73% of teachers who participated in collaborative leadership projects with a partner university went on to assume school- or district-level teacher leadership roles (Vernon-Dotson & Floyd, 2012).

Teacher Leadership as a Process, Strategy, and Stance

In their seminal review of teacher leadership studies conducted between 1980 and 2004, York-Barr and Duke (2004) defined teacher leadership as “the process by which teachers, individually or collectively, influence their colleagues, principals, and other members of school

communities to improve teaching and learning practices with the aim of increased student learning and achievement" (pp. 287-288). Soglin and colleagues (2016) described teacher leadership as "a powerful strategy to promote collaborative efforts and effective teaching practices that lead to improved decision-making through distributed leadership at the school, district, and state levels" (p. 2). Others describe teacher leadership as a stance, or worldview (Poekert, Alexandrou, & Shannon, 2016; Smulyan, 2016). Smulyan (2016) found that, regardless of leadership role or position, teacher leaders share three common assumptions: 1) Teaching is a profession, 2) Teaching is a political act, and 3) Teaching is a collaborative process.

Taken together, teacher leadership can be viewed as a process, a strategy, *and* a stance. Teacher leadership is a process because teachers' individual and collective efforts impact teaching and learning gradually, over time (Carver, 2016; Hunzicker, 2012). Teacher leadership is a strategy because impacting teaching and learning requires knowledge and skill, careful planning, and intentional decision-making (Danielson, 2006; Soglin et al., 2016). Teacher leadership is a stance because it is motivated by deep commitment to students and to the teaching profession (Coggins & McGovern, 2014; Huang, 2016), and acted upon through vision and perseverance (Frost, 2012; Smulyan, 2016).

Teacher Leadership in PDSs and Other School-University Partnerships

Frost (2012) conceptualized teacher leadership as "the *process* whereby a teacher can clarify [his or her] *values*, develop a personal vision of improved practice, and then act *strategically* to set in motion a *process* where colleagues are drawn into activities such as self-evaluation and innovation" (p. 211, italics added for emphasis). In this way, teacher leadership in PDSs can be defined as a strategic, process-oriented stance motivated by deep concern for students and activated through formal, informal, and hybrid leadership roles that span the

boundaries of school, university, and community. With a definition established, teacher leadership in PDSs and other school-university partnerships can be further elucidated with a closer look at distributed leadership theory.

Distributed Leadership Theory

In 2004, York-Barr and Duke wrote, "The concept of teacher leadership suggests that teachers rightly and importantly hold a central position in the ways schools operate and in the core functions of teaching and learning" (p. 255). Two years later, Fulmer and Basile (2006) observed, "In schools today… it is becoming evident that leadership is not the function of one individual, but rather it is distributed across the school with a variety of players giving and taking across the organization" (p. 128). Indeed, between 1980 and 2004, theoretical frameworks frequently used to study teacher leadership included participative leadership (Leithwood & Duke, 1999), organizational leadership (Ogawa & Bossert, 1995), parallel leadership (Crowther, Kaagen, Ferguson, & Hahn, 2002), and distributed leadership (Spillane. Halverson, & Diamond, 2001, 2004). Between 2004 and 2013, distributed leadership theory stood out as the theory used most often to frame teacher leadership studies (Wenner & Campbell, 2016). Because distributed leadership theory has been used extensively in recent years to study teacher leadership, it is described in some detail here as one approach to understanding teacher leadership in PDSs.

First conceptualized by Engestrom (1999) and later by Spillane and colleagues (2001), distributed leadership theory rests on "the notion that leadership is often exercised informally, rather than embodied in an assigned role" (Hartzler-Miller, 2006, p. 170). Similar to other inclusive leadership theories, distributed leadership theory recognizes the plentiful but often subtle contributions of teacher leaders in service to students, schools, and the teaching profession. York-Barr and Duke (2004) explained, "These models presume that leadership must

emerge from many individuals within an organization and is not simply vested in a handful of formally recognized leaders" (p. 288).

According to distributed leadership theory, leadership is socially distributed when leadership tasks are stretched across leaders and followers (Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004). Leadership can be stretched across time, activity, or perspective. For example:

- Grade-level teams of teachers analyze state test scores in preparation for a schoolwide meeting to establish instructional priorities (time).
- A mentor teacher regularly observes a first-year teacher and the two meet afterward to debrief the observation (activity).
- A teacher chairs a district-wide committee made up of one teacher representative from each school (perspective).

Distributed leadership also can be stretched over situations, including organizational structures such as meeting times and deadlines; language-based tools such as meeting agendas and school improvement plans; and demographic considerations such as race, class, and gender (Spillane et al., 2004). Because distributed leadership involves dynamic interaction between leaders, followers, and situations toward a specific goal or around a specific task, leadership becomes a product of all participants' knowledge, beliefs, and behaviors "in and through particular social, cultural, and material contexts" (Spillane et al., 2004, p. 10).

Distributed leadership theory also considers how leadership is stretched from leaders with positional authority (e.g., principals, formal teacher leaders) to informal leaders (e.g., informal and hybrid teacher leaders) to followers (e.g., colleagues, parents, students, etc.) (Spillane et al., 2004). This focus on so many different actors makes it possible for leaders to influence as well as to be influenced by social and situational factors (Spillane et al., 2004). For example, a new

teacher who is asked to demonstrate an innovative teaching strategy for more experienced colleagues may feel intimidated, even when she knows the strategy well. This teacher is influenced by social and situational factors. A different teacher may occasionally share teaching materials with grade level colleagues, which eventually leads to the grade-level team co-planning together. This teacher is influential over social and situational factors. In this way, the impact of distributed leadership is usually significant because "a group of leaders working together to enact a particular task leads to the evolution of a leadership practice that is potentially more than the sum of each individual's practice" (Spillane et al., 2004, pp. 18-19), a concept Covey (1989) referred to as synergy.

Spillane and colleagues (2004) summarized, "Without a rich understanding of how leaders go about their work, and why leaders do and think what they do, it is difficult to help school leaders think about and revise their practice" (p. 8). Distributed leadership theory is particularly useful to the study of teacher leadership because it is equipped to explore both the subtleties and the complexities of teacher leadership, including formal, informal, and hybrid teacher leadership, teacher leaders as boundary-spanners; and teacher leadership as a process, strategy, and stance. Moreover, PDSs exemplify one context in which distributed leadership may occur.

A Brief History of Teacher Leadership

Modern conceptions of teacher leadership arose from the instructional leadership movement, which emerged in the 1980s in response to two influential reports: "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform" by the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1983 (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982) and "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century" by the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession

in 1986 (Frost, 2012). Like the PDS reform movement, teacher leadership came to the forefront as part of the nationwide effort to increase teacher professionalism (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Calling for "a reinvigoration of the teaching profession in the USA…teacher leadership was seen to be the key lever for this invigoration" (Frost, 2012, p. 209).

In the early 1980s, teacher leadership was conceptualized primarily within small-scale projects and specific contexts (Little, 2003, as cited in Wenner & Campbell, 2016). By the late 1980s, in response to "A Nation at Risk," teacher leadership roles and responsibilities shifted to schoolwide reform (Wenner & Campbell, 2016). Influenced by the National Network for Educational Renewal's (NNER) vision for teacher leadership development at all career stages (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011), reform efforts in the late 1980s and early 1990s actively engaged teachers in activities to increase teacher quality and to improve teaching conditions, including performance-based compensation systems, career ladders, teacher mentoring programs, site-based decision making, and *professional development schools* (emphasis added) (York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

Pragmatic reasons for actively engaging teachers in school reform efforts included "additional person power," "consideration of employee perspectives," and "greater ownership and commitment to organizational goals" (York-Barr & Duke, 2004, p. 258). Moreover, teacher expertise became recognized as a valuable asset during this time. Lieberman (2013) explained:

> During the 1980s and 1990s, it was becoming clear that teachers who assumed leadership roles had to deal not only with the role they were playing but also the organizational and cultural influences of their work. The focus was on individuals with the idea that teachers could be empowered by taking leadership, which would move teaching and teachers toward a 'real' profession (p. 169).

In 1987, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) was convened in response to "A Nation Prepared" to develop a national, voluntary teacher certification system based on "high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do" (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [NBPTS], 2017, para. 1). In 1995, the first National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs) were certified, opening the door for many new leadership opportunities for NBCTs.

By the early 1990s, school restructuring efforts such as Theodore Sizer's Essential Schools movement engaged teachers across the United States in re-visioning teaching and learning in middle and high schools (Fox, 2009). In a 1992 article titled "The Move toward Transformational Leadership," Leithwood wrote, "At the reins of today's new schools will be not one but many leaders who believe in creating the conditions that enable staffs to find their own directions" (p. 8). Benefits of teacher leadership documented between 1980 and 2004 included attracting and retaining talented teachers, motivating and rewarding established teachers, ensuring meaningful and ongoing professional development, improving teacher morale, and increasing student learning and achievement (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, the late 1990s brought widespread concern that America's schools were not adequately preparing students in comparison to educational systems in other nations (Klein, 2015).

In 2002, the "No Child Left Behind Act" was signed into law under President George W. Bush. With "No Child Left Behind" came significant accountability measures for both students and teachers. Klein (2015) explained:

> ["No Child Left Behind"] significantly increased the federal role in holding schools responsible for the academic progress of all students. And it put a special focus on ensuring that states and schools boost the performance of certain groups of students, such

> as English-language learners, students in special education, and poor and minority children, whose achievement, on average, trails their peers. States did not have to comply with the new requirements, but if they didn't, they risked losing federal Title I money (What is NCLB?, para. 1).

"No Child Left Behind" also required states to ensure that all teachers were "highly qualified," defined as holding a bachelor's degree in their assigned content area(s) and state certification, especially in hard-to-staff, high need schools (Klein, 2015).

In terms of teacher leadership, the "No Child Left Behind" legislation expanded schools' efforts to actively engage teachers in school reform. Margolis and Huggins (2012) stated:

> Pre-No Child Left Behind, many teachers were released from teaching time (or received extra pay) to perform duties to help the school. However, these activities were primarily administrative…Efforts that were made to utilize teachers as instructional leaders remained informal and often suffered from a lack of sanctioned space within the school system (pp. 956-957).

Following "No Child Left Behind," the focus of teacher leadership shifted to school accountability. In response, schools quickly mobilized teacher leaders to engage in a variety of instructional leadership roles and responsibilities aimed at increasing student achievement (Margolis & Huggins, 2012).

York-Barr and Duke (2004) observed that between 1980 and 2004, the notion of teacher leadership evolved from formal teacher leadership roles (e.g., department chair, union representative) to instructional leaders (e.g., mentor, curriculum developer, workshop leader) to schoolwide reform participants (e.g., leadership team representative, data analysis coach), reflecting "an increased understanding that promoting instructional improvement requires an

organizational culture that supports collaboration and continuous learning and that recognizes teachers as primary creators and re-creators of school culture" (p. 260). Parallel to the PDS movement, the nationwide trend to actively engage teachers in school reform efforts began shifting the culture of America's schools to collaborative environments where teaching, learning, and inquiry on behalf of student learning became the norm.

Teacher Leadership Today

Teacher leadership today "has become an increasingly popular topic among educational policymakers and influential educational organizations as an important component of school reform" (Wenner & Campbell, 2016, p. 2). Since the mid-2000s, teacher leadership in the United States has increased in stature due to a variety of large-scale initiatives. In 2008, a group of concerned educators from across the country convened "to examine the current research and thinking about the critical leadership roles that teachers play in contributing to student and school success" (Teacher Leader Model Standards [TLMS], 2012, Preface, para. 2). Out of this effort, the Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium was formed, and in 2012 the first nationally-recognized standards for teacher leadership were published (see Figure 1).

Domain I: Fostering a collaborative culture to support educator development/student learning.
Domain II: Accessing and using research to improve practice and student learning.
Domain III: Promoting professional learning for continuous improvement.
Domain IV: Facilitating improvements in instruction and student learning.
Domain V: Promoting the use of assessments and data for school and district improvement.
Domain VI: Improving outreach and collaboration with families and community.
Domain VII: Advocating for student learning and the profession.

Figure 1: Teacher Leader Model Standards Seven Domains (TLMS, 2012)

The Teacher Leader Model Standards (TLMS) consist of seven domains designed to "codify, promote, and support teacher leadership as a vehicle for transforming schools to meet the needs

of 21st-century learners" (2012, Standards Overview, para. 1). Within each domain, four to eight functions further elaborate the purposes and processes of teacher leadership.

In January 2014, the National Education Association (NEA), the Center for Teaching Quality (CTQ), and the NBPTS launched the national Teacher Leadership Initiative "to define the foundational competencies of teacher leadership, [develop] relevant experiences and supports to help teachers cultivate those competencies, and [mobilize] teachers to be leaders within their profession" (Wenner & Campbell, 2016, p. 2). Out of this initiative, eight overarching and 12 pathway-specific Teacher Leadership Competencies (TLCs) were articulated "to inspire teachers to realize their potential and help their colleagues do the same" (p. 9) (Center for Teaching Quality [CTQ], National Board for Professional Teaching Standards [NBPTS], & National Education Association [NEA], 2014, p. 3) (see Figure 2).

Overarching Competencies

- Reflective practice
- Personal effectiveness
- Interpersonal effectiveness
- Communication
- Continuing learning and Education
- Group processes
- Adult learning
- Technological facility

Instructional Leadership

- Coaching/mentoring
- Facilitating collaborative relationships
- Community awareness, engagement, and advocacy

Policy Leadership

- Policy implementation
- Policy advocacy
- Policy making
- Policy engagement and relationships

Association Leadership

- Organizational effectiveness: Leading with vision
- Organizational effectiveness: Leading with skill
- Organizing and advocacy

- Building capacity of others
- Learning community and workplace culture

Figure 2: Teacher Leadership Competencies (CTQ et al., 2014)

In March 2014, the United States Department of Education and the NBPTS jointly launched Teach to Lead, a nationwide professional development, networking, and grant program designed "to advance student outcomes by expanding opportunities for teacher leadership, particularly those that allow teachers to stay in the classroom" (United States Department of Education, 2015, para. 1). Recent Teach to Lead projects include building school-university-community partnerships to create a community school with a healthcare clinic in Michigan and developing a year-long induction and mentoring program to retain new teachers in Rhode Island (United States Department of Education, 2015).

In May 2016, the United States Department of Education, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), and the NBPTS jointly launched the Teacher Impact Grants (TIG) program "to develop, expand and evaluate promising practices and programs that can transform the academic trajectory of students" (United States Department of Education, 2016, para. 1). In a press release announcing the new grants, an ASCD spokesperson stated, "These Teacher Impact Grants will provide teacher leaders across the nation opportunities to develop, expand and evaluate innovative and ambitious projects focused on making their schools and classrooms more effective communities of learning" (para. 3).

Federal and privately-funded programs such as these demonstrate the United States' continuing interest in school reform, with America's teacher leaders at the forefront. Not as high-profile, but no less significant are teacher leadership efforts and initiatives at the school and district levels, particularly in PDSs.

Why Study Teacher Leadership in PDSs?

In 2004, Spillane and colleagues (2004) reasoned, "If expertise is distributed, then the school rather than the individual leader may be the most appropriate unit for thinking about the development of leadership expertise" (p. 29). Around the same time, York-Barr and Duke (2004) wrote, "…informal means of leadership are becoming more recognized in contexts such as professional development schools" (p. 287). Indeed, several characteristics render PDSs ideal settings for studying teacher leadership.

First, PDSs distinctively prioritize teacher learning and leadership. In support of teacher learning, Clark (1999) wrote that PDSs offer "strong leadership endowed with the ability to see through fads and simplistic solutions" (p. 169). Ferrara (2014) noted that PDSs provide "opportunities for stakeholders' reflection, mechanisms for collaboration, enriched school culture, opportunities for inquiry, creation of professional learning laboratories, participation in professional development activities, and improved practice" (p. 17). Regarding teacher leadership, Teitel (1997) explained that PDS work distinctively requires teachers to assume leadership roles related to teacher preparation, inquiry and professional development, diverse student populations, and collaborative decision-making . Miller (2015) identified three characteristics of school-university partnerships that are supportive of teacher leadership: 1) the connection between leadership, learning, and learning to lead; 2) firm values and established practices that "provide a moral compass for emerging teacher leaders;" and 3) "spaces for teachers to try on new leadership roles and experiment with new ideas" (p. 29).

Second, PDSs model innovation and best instructional practices. Snow-Gerono and colleagues (2001) described PDSs as "existing exemplars of practice" (p. 35). Lecos, Cassella, Evans, Leahy, Liess, and Lucas (2000) found that opportunities to serve as PDS mentor teachers

and site coordinators resulted in teacher feelings of empowerment, pride, and career satisfaction, as well as increased confidence and professional growth. Miller (2015) articulated that effective school-university partnerships support teacher leadership by:

- Eliminating hierarchies, giving equal voice to all members, and establishing reciprocal relationships
- Reading texts together, developing theories from practice, and using theory to inform practice
- Creating collaborative agendas and flexible structures for collegial learning, responding to teacher needs and interests as opposed to policy and administrative directives, and creating a common language for learning
- Providing spaces to play with ideas, trying out and reflecting on new practices, and providing and receiving feedback
- Crossing institutional boundaries between schools and universities to provide spaces for authentic teacher leadership (pp. 24-25).

Ferrara (2014) explained, "… analyzing their practice, attending conferences, conducting research, mentoring student teachers, or developing curricula as part of their PDS involvement… not only improve[s] teacher competence but, perhaps more important, improve[s] the school" (p. 23).

Third, PDSs support the pursuit and dissemination of educational research and other scholarly work. Carpenter and Sherretz (2012) described PDSs as places of inquiry and innovation where "PDS partners develop new approaches for examining and improving…practices through integrating partners' expertise and knowledge" (p. 91). Gillenwaters (2009) stated, "Co-constructed relationships among communities, schools, and

universities have the potential…to contribute to a new cultural model capable of transforming K-12 urban schools" (p. 12). Teitel (1997) articulated "several compelling reasons to study leadership in PDSs" based on the conviction that PDSs are established "learning laboratories," they are "fertile areas for emerging leadership," and they "require leaders to function in multidimensional inter-organizational settings…where the traditional boundaries around a school are blurred" (p. 10).

To summarize, PDSs prioritize teacher learning and leadership, model innovation and best instructional practices, and support the pursuit and dissemination of educational research and other scholarly work. Instead of asking why we should study teacher leadership in PDSs and other school-university partnerships, a better question might be, why wouldn't we?

References

Barnwell, P. (2015, February 18). Why schools need more 'hybrid' teaching roles. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2015/02/18/why-schools-need-more-hybrid-teaching-roles.html?r=751929773

Burns, R W., & Badiali, B. J. (2015). When supervision is conflated with evaluation: Teacher candidates' perceptions of their novice supervisor. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(4), 418-437.

Burns, R. W., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Nolan, J. F., & Badiali, B. J. (2013). Let's learn together. *Phi Delta Kappan, 94*(7), 26.

Campbell, P. F., & Malkus, N. N. (2011). The impact of elementary mathematics coaches on student achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 111*(3), 430-454.

Cannata, M., McCrory, R., Sykes, G., Anagnostopoulos, D., & Frank, K. A. (2010). Exploring the influence of National Board certified teachers in their schools and beyond. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(4), 463-490.

Carlough, S. (2016). Making space for the struggle: Teacher leadership as mentoring. *Schools: Studies in Education, 13*(1), 29-45.

Carpenter, B. D., & Sherretz, C. E. (2012). Professional development school partnerships: An instrument for teacher leadership. *School-University Partnerships, 5*(1), 89-101.

Carver, C. L. Transforming identities: The transition from teacher to leader during teacher leader preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 11*(2), 158-180.

Center for Teaching Quality, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, & National Education Association (2014). The Teacher Leadership Competencies. Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/sites/default/files/teacher_leadership_competencies_final.pdf

Clark, R. W. (1999). School-university partnerships and professional development schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*(3&4), 164-177.

Coggins, C., & McGovern, K. (2014). Five goals for teacher leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 95*(7), 15-21.

Cosenza, M. N. (2015). Defining teacher leadership: Affirming the Teacher Leader Model Standards. *Issues in Teacher Education, 24*(2), 79-99.

Cosenza, M. N. (2013). Teacher leadership development in PDSs: Perceptions of 22 veteran teachers. *School-University Partnerships, 6*(1), 47-58.

Cosenza, M. N. (2010). *The impact of professional development schools on teacher leadership.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (ED521937)

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Powerful lessons in personal change.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Crowther, F., Kaagen, S. S., Ferguson, M., & Hann, L. (2002). *Developing teacher leaders: How teacher leadership enhances school success.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Curtis, R. (2013). *Finding a new way: Leveraging teacher leadership to meet unprecedented demands.* Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED541444.pdf

Danielson, C. (2006). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Engestrom, Y. (1999) Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Y. Engestrom, R. Miettinen, & R. L. Punamaki (eds.) *Perspectives on activity theory,* Cambridge: MA: Cambridge University Press.

Fairman, J. C., & Mackenzie, S. V. (2012). Spheres of teacher leadership action for learning. *Professional Development in Education, 32*(2), 229-246.

Ferrara, J. (2014). Historical context of the PDS movement. In J. Ferrara (Ed.). *Professional development schools: Creative solutions for educators* (pp. 9-26). Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fox, M. (2009, October 22). Theodore R. Sizer, leading education-reform advocate, dies at 77. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/23/education/23sizer.html

Frost, D. (2012). From professional development to system change: Teacher leadership and innovation. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(2), 205-227.

Fulmer, C. L. & Basile, C. G. (2006). Investigating distributed leadership in professional development schools: Implications for principals, schools, and school districts. In J. E. Neapolitan & T. R. Berkeley (Eds.), *Where do we go from here? Issues in the sustainability of professional development school partnerships* (pp. 127-148). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Gillenwaters, J. N. (2009). *Co-constructing community, school, university partnerships for urban school transformation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, LLC. (ED532847)

Gordon, S. P. (2004). Professional development for school improvement: Empowering learning communities. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217-248.

Hargreaves, A. (2014). Foreword: Six sources of change in professional development. In L. E. Martin, S. Kragler, D. J. Quatroche, & K. L. Bauserman (Eds.), *Handbook of professional development in education: Successful models and practices, preK-12* (pp. x-xix). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Hartzler-Miller, C. (2006). Response on future directions: Leadership. In J. E. Neapolitan & T. R. Berkeley (Eds.), *Where do we go from here? Issues in the sustainability of professional development school partnerships* (pp. 165-176). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

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

Huang, T. (2016). Linking the private and public: teacher leadership and teacher education in the reflexive modernity. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(2), 222-237.

Hunzicker, J. (2018). Teacher leadership in professional development schools: A definition, brief history, and call for further study. In J. Hunzicker (Ed.). *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools* (pp. 19-37). Bingley, UK: Emerald Publishing.

Hunzicker, J. (2012). Professional development and job-embedded collaboration: How teachers learn to exercise leadership. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(2), 267-290.

Katzenmeyer, M. H., & Moller, G. V. (2009). *Awakening the Sleeping Giant: Helping Teachers Develop as Leaders* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Klein, A. (2015, April 10). No Child Left Behind: An overview. *Education Week.* Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/no-child-left-behind-overview-definition-summary.html

Lecos, M. A., Evans, C., Leahy, C., Liess, E., & Lucas, T. (2000). Empowering teacher leadership in professional development schools. *Teaching and Change, 8*(1), 98-113.

Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 8-12. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_199202_leithwood.pdf

Leithwood, K., & Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In K. S. Louis & J. Murphy (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed.)* (pp. 45-72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leithwood, K., & Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research, 52*(3), 309-339.

Lieberman, A. (2013). Teacher leadership: An introduction. *The New Educator, 9*, 169-172.

Lieberman, A., & Friedrich, L. (2007). Teachers, writers, leaders. *Educational Leadership, 65*(1), 42-47.

Lord, B., Cress, K., & Miller, B. (2008). Teacher leadership in support of large-scale mathematics and science education reform. In M.M. Mangin & S.R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 55-76). New York: Teachers College Press.

Mangin, M. M., & Stoelinga, S. R. (2008). Teacher leadership: What it is and why it matters. In M. M. Mangin & S. R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 1-9). New York: Teachers College Press.

Manno, C. M., & Firestone, W. A. (2008). How teacher leaders with different subject knowledge interact with teachers. In M.M. Mangin & S.R. Stoelinga (Eds.), *Effective teacher leadership: Using research to inform and reform* (pp. 36-54). New York: Teachers College Press.

Margolis, J., & Huggins, K. S. (2012). Distributed but undefined: New teacher leader roles to change schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 22*, 953-981.

Miller, L. (2015). School-university partnerships and teacher leadership: Doing it right. *Educational Forum, 79*(1), 24-29.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2017). *Mission and History.* Retrieved from http://www.nbpts.org/mission-history

Neapolitan, J. E., Levine, M. (2011). Approaches to professional development schools. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 110(2), 306-324.

Ogawa, R. T., & Bossert, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*, 224-243.

Poekert, P., Alexandrou, A., & Shannon, D. (2016). How teachers become leaders: An internationally validated theoretical model of teacher leadership development. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 21*(4), 307-329.

Portner, H. (2008, October 1). Are you an informal teacher-leader? Retrieved from http://www.teachers.net/gazette/OCT08/portner/

Silva, D. Y., Gimbert, B., & Nolan, J. (2000). Sliding the doors: Locking and unlocking possibilities for teacher leadership. *Teachers College Record, 102*(4), 779-804.

Smulyan, L. (2016). Stepping into their power: The development of a teacher leadership stance. *Schools: Studies in Education, 13*(1), 8-28.

Snow-Gerono, J. L., Dana, N. F., Silva, D. Y. (2001). Where are they now? Former PDS interns emerge as first-year teacher leaders. *Professional Educator, 24*(1), 35-48.

Soglin, A., Hunt, E., & Reilly, P. (2016). *Illinois P-20 Council teacher leadership report: P-20 Teacher and Leadership Effectiveness Committee.* Retrieved from the Illinois State University Center for the Study of Education Policy website: https://education.illinoisstate.edu/csep/Wallace%20TL%20Report%20Layout%20FINAL.pdf

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: a distributed perspective, *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(1), 3-34.

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher, 30*(3), 23-28.

Superville, D. R., (2015, January 21). School districts turn to teachers to lead: Rising demands push principals to tap teacher talent. *Education Week.* Retrieved from: http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/01/21/school-districts-turn-to-teachers-to-lead.html#

Teach Plus (2014). Turnaround teacher teams (T3) initiative. Retrieved from: http://www.teachplus.org/programs/t3-initiative

Teacher Leader Model Standards (2012). Home. Retrieved from http://teacherleaderstandards.org/index.php

Teitel, L. (1997). Professional development schools and the transformation of teacher leadership. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*(1), 9-22.

Vernon-Dotson, L. J., & Floyd, L. O. (2012). Building leadership capacity via school partnerships and teacher teams. *The Clearing House, 85*, 38-49.

Watt, K. M., Huerta, J., & Mills, S. J. (2009). Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) professional development as a predictor of teacher leadership in the United States. *Professional Development in Education, 36*(4), 1-16.

Wenner, J. A., & Campbell, T. (2016). The theoretical and empirical basis of teacher leadership: A Review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(2), 1-38.DOI: 10.3102/0034654316653478

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(3), 255-316.

United States Department of Education (2015, July 27). *Fact sheet: Teach to Lead* [Archived information]. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/fact-sheet-teach-lead

United States Department of Education (2016, May 3). *U.S. Department of Education collaborates with ASCD and National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to provide grants that support teacher leadership projects* [Press release]. Retrieved from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-collaborates-ascd-and-national-board-professional-teaching-standards-provide-grants-support-teacher-leadership-projects

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Educacao, Santa Maria, 35*(3), 479-501.