Expanding University Faculty's Vision of a PDS: So This is What Partnership Really Means?

Susan D. Myers
Margaret A. Price
Texas Tech University and Margaret Price

Abstract The authors' conception of a Professional Development School has been in the making for six years; they have nurtured their high school/university partnership over that period of time with little involvement from other university personnel. Through a self-study approach, they investigated the intricacies of how professional relationships, both in and out of academia. evolve and inform our practice within the partnership. In this article, they address the challenges involved in expanding the professorial roles of PDS activities within an existing school and subsequently adding another. While they believed their philosophies and ideas of working with and in the schools was a shared vision among the university faculty involved, they realized that it was a much more complex task than originally conceived.

School and university partnerships come in a variety of configurations, one being that of the professional development school (PDS). While it might appear intuitive that faculty members who work in teacher preparation programs would embrace opportunities to participate extensively in a PDS, the literature reflects a different perspective. Although teacher educators may espouse valuing the importance of working closely with classroom teachers and each other, the intricacies of working collaboratively can provide several unforeseen challenges (Campoy, 2000).

First and foremost, the differing perspectives with which each member of the collaborative approaches teacher education challenge the partnership arrangement. Specifically, the continuum of theory and practice is quite often a source of differing opinions between the university faculty members and the classroom teachers who work closely in the partnership. Secondly, changes in personnel (both in the university faculty members and the host school) necessitate frequently revisiting the purpose and goals of the partnership as the configuration ebbs and flows. Other barriers such as fluctuating student enrollment, unforeseen schedule changes, administrative directives, and funding concerns impact the operation, feasibility, and implementation of an original plan.

Additional hurdles that factor into the inner workings of a PDS partnership influence the willingness of university faculty members to become actively engaged in the process. Certain aspects unique to academia such as the university's tenure and promotion structure often leave PDS work largely unrewarded, particularly in research intensive institutions. Furthermore, university faculty members who decide to enter into these types of professional relationships may be unaccustomed to having their own teaching practice closely examined by colleagues and those in the field (Campoy, 2000). The resulting inclination is for the professors to remain as outsiders from the university rather than expose themselves to the scrutiny of practitioners whose venue is field-based practice.

As often occurs in collaborative endeavors, mutual trust can take a long time to develop; and tensions among stakeholders often arise. Factor into the mix differences in individual teaching philosophies, varied communication styles, and the immense time required implementing a PDS, and it is not surprising that successful and enduring collaborations are

difficult to maintain, particularly at the secondary school level. University faculty members unfamiliar with developing these types of structures may not completely comprehend the enormity of embarking on this type of long-term professional commitment. What may initially appear to be simply an extension of teacher preparation courses at a remote site may catch initiated faculty members unaware of the juggling required to balance research interests with teaching responsibilities.

There are numerous program descriptions available that relate anecdotal evidence about the complexities of relationships among partnership stakeholders in PDSs. These narratives typically focus on how school and university personnel interact (Campoy, 2000; Gallego, Hollingsworth, & Whitemack, 2001). It may be a foregone conclusion that when university instructors engage in these partnerships that each member possesses the same philosophical background, has similar pedagogical beliefs, and is entering into the partnership with the same intended outcomes. However, our experience was that these are not assumptions that can be made, but must be openly examined and discussed throughout the duration of the relationship.

Purpose and Methods

Examining the process of determining just how to strike a balance between the professional responsibilities inherent in the academe with the necessary give and take among university faculty members working toward a common goal of implementing a PDS became the impetus for this study. The intent of this case study was to examine the authors' perceptions as they expanded an existing PDS partnership to implement a field-based program with three other teacher educators. Conducting courses onsite at two high schools necessitated that the five university faculty members presented here enter into a teaching arrangement unique to this college. The decision to align course content and to integrate common course assignments surfaced questions about our own expectations,

perceptions, and philosophies regarding school/university relationships. This experience also provided an opportunity for us to examine our perceptions about working closely as a unit within established university structures.

Following the guidelines of qualitative research (Merriam, 1998) we employed a constant comparative approach to examine our practice for this case study. The salient questions that emerged from these experiences and that we will present in this article are three-fold:

- How do university faculty members new to field-based collaborative endeavors perceive their roles in PDS partnerships?
- How did the power structures within the university and schools influence our collegiality?
- What types of organizational considerations and personal awareness need to be in place when expanding existing partnerships with untenured faculty?

In examining these points, the authors believed that practitioners who are passionate about PDS work will be able to use their experiences to provide guidance as they embark on similar expansions. Additionally, university and school administrators who work closely with teacher preparation programs might gain insight into the organizational support necessary to sustain successful PDS programs.

Data Sources and Analysis

Data sources consisted of documents such as weekly meeting minutes and electronic communications during the development of the PDS project. Additional sources included the first author's personal journal entries during 2005 to 2007, extensive field notes, including notes from informal conversations among the university faculty members. Data were collected over a two-year period, that is, through the extended time (semesters and summers) that the two authors were involved in implementing the project. Their prolonged engagement at the two high school sites also assisted them in collecting additional data from field notes and observations.

They began the initial analysis process by reading through all of the documentation collected. A first reading of the archived documents, transcripts from the notes taken from informal conversations, field notes, and other sources established the initial coding for major categories and descriptive phrases. A second analysis of the data revealed more detailed themes and categories. These themes and categories were shared between the two researchers to determine commonalities and to adjust their coding or categories for a constant comparative approach to analyzing the data.

During the data analysis process we identified two recurring themes we wished to pursue for closer investigation; how our roles and perceptions evolved over time and how we articulated our expectations about field-based teaching. These topics were selected because they demonstrated overarching motifs reported in PDS literature regarding the struggles of designing effective communication structures among stakeholders (Norman, Goliad, & Hooker, 2005) and the impact of field-based work on the tenure and promotion process at research intensive universities (Boyer, 2005).

Following a brief section regarding literature relevant to PDS work, the context of the partnership and how it has evolved are described. Findings include a discussion of the themes that emerged during the period of time the PDS expanded and evolved into a new configuration and how this transformation shaped the authors' notions about their own professional work in future endeavors. Finally, suggestions from lessons learned are posed for those who embark on similar activities as to how to provide the necessary support for those in teacher preparation programs and ways to value university involvement in school/university partnerships.

Theoretical Context of University Collaboration

Literature regarding working within a professional development school resounds with the complexities of collaboration between teachers and university faculty members (Abdul-Haqq, 1998; Teitel, 2003). A significant amount of literature is focused on teachers' beliefs about collaboration and the changes in perceptions that can occur within this type of partnership (Letterman & Dugan, 2004). Less research is devoted to the impact collaboration has on the beliefs and perceptions of university faculty members who enter into such relationships for the first time.

Interdisciplinary collaborative teaching has long been part of educational reform efforts; however, that was centered primarily on public school K-12 educators (Hayes-Jacobs, 1997; Wiles &, Bondi, 2000). Collaboration between and among university faculty members is much rarer. The authors had previously been public school teachers in systems where interdisciplinary thematic teaching was part of the normal school curriculum. When this concept was introduced to the collective university faculty team, it became apparent that the newest team members viewed the level and intensity of collaboration differently. Quickly the caveats and benefits of inter- and trans-disciplinary teaching of college courses came to the forefront, together with the realization as to why college teaching remains primarily an isolationist endeavor. The caveats fell on several levels: philosophical (Ulveland, 2003); planning and implementation (Smith, Frey & Tollefson, 2003); and, cost benefits to tenure and promotion arrangements (Letternan & Dugan, 2004; Williams, Connell, White, & Kemper, 2003).

The literature on the structure of professional development schools often resonates with varying perspectives on the challenges and promises of university/school partnerships. Schools and colleges of education have formulated varying models of what professional development schools should look like and how they should operate (Abdal-Haqq, 1998). While the individual objectives of the stakeholders in each PDS collaborative guide the construction of the ultimate framework, there is a great deal of groundwork to be developed before these relationships are cemented (Price, Shultz, & Verdi, 2001; Ravid & Handler, 2001; Sandholtz

& Dadles, 2000). For the purpose of this article, the immense amount of literature concerning professional development schools is limited to relevant research in which the complexities of developing the foundational frameworks necessary to implement such initiatives as it relates to university faculty members are examined.

Defining Collaborative Work

As previously stated, working in collaborative partnerships requires many facets of relationship building, one being trust. In their research on educational partnerships, Osguthorpe & Patterson (1998) presented this process of mutuality as occurring in stages. The primary characteristics that encompass that they described as *relationships of mutuality* include interest, commitment, caring, and involvement. These facets of relationship building are definitely characteristics of a PDS. Each time there is a change in the configuration of the partnership (for example a new faculty member or a new PDS teacher enters or leaves), the relationship building and trust building begin anew. The new person entering the collaborative may have only a vague understanding of the goals and philosophies of the initiative. As people continue to engage with others in the work then a deeper understanding is developed and rearticulated.

Other researchers refer to the challenges of establishing roles and responsibilities for each member. Teitel (2003) and Ponticell (1999) address the difficulties of establishing personal role identification within the context of a PDS for the clinical faculty members. Are they college instructors? Are they mentor teachers? Are they *really* perceived as equal contributors to the PDS collaborative or just part of the research interests of university faculty members? Nihlen, Williams, & Sweet (1999) indicate that teacher leadership within the PDS site and among the PDS instructional team develops over time. Prolonged, meaningful engagement within our own PDS sites has meant development of a bond in which all partners have a voice. It has also meant a strong commitment to listening to each other. Whether on matters of meeting our

related standards (state mandated and accreditation agencies), difficulties in scheduling, personal problems, or philosophical differences, the partnership team functions as a sounding board and a quality control medium through which decisions are negotiated.

General Context of the Project and Partnership

The PDS described in this article is the result of an eight-year partnership with a local school district in the northwestern region of a large western state. The original PDS began in 2000 with the leadership of the second author and one secondary school. A relationship was forged that included school administrative and faculty input, assistance, and the teaching responsibilities of the second author at the school site. Beginning with this unfunded initiative, a vision of what a PDS does and is was negotiated over time. In 2002, the first author joined in the effort. They taught two post-baccalaureate classes at the high school and offered the students an extended field experience and placement for their student teaching. School personnel (part of the original PDS clinical faculty) taught intermittent informational classes that centered on practical teaching experiences while the authors assumed roles as substitute teachers for the classroom teachers. The relationship was established and followed the structure of many PDSs, in that the authors conducted professional development meetings, attended professional conferences and mentored each other according to the necessary needs of the partners in preparing exceptional teachers. All of this was accomplished with no financial input from the university or the school district.

When a request for funding announcement from the United States Department of Education (DOE) was posted with the intent to develop fast-track certification programs, the authors recruited three colleagues who expressed interest in a collaborative venture. The grant was written by these five college professors over a two month time period. Using the PDS

configuration as a model, our grant entailed creating a fast-track certification program for post- baccalaureate teacher candidates. With the award of grant funding, the PDS was able to expand its original partnership to a network of two secondary schools in 2004.

Project Activities Timeline

The reconfigured PDS was designed to recruit and retain new teachers to teach in schools identified as high need in terms of higher poverty levels and lower student performance on standardized tests. The primary goal of the program was to provide beginning teachers entering secondary classrooms extensive practical experience with veteran teachers and secondary students while completing certification courses in one semester. Additionally, the program created mentoring networks and resources for participants both while they are enrolled in the program and once they begin as new teachers.

The expansion of our PDS to a network configuration began within the framework of the DOE grant. We were to recruit participants (preservice teachers) in specified content areas (math, science, English, social studies, foreign language), prepare them through college course work (Curriculum development; content area reading; diversity of school populations; adolescent development; strategies of teaching); and, allow them extended field experience opportunities in a one semester block. In the second semester block we were to monitor their student teaching or internship, and offer support through a mentorship network. The organization and management of the two-semester route to teaching resembled some of the emerging alternative certification programs offered through other entities, although it retained some of the structure and requirements of a traditional college-preparatory program.

Roles within the Partnership

This particular PDS configuration included both university faculty members and practicing

teachers and was designed to provide the post baccalaureate preservice teachers an intensive field based component. All five post-baccalaureate courses required by the state certification board were offered on-site at the two secondary schools four days each week during the semester. (For example: Content Area Reading is taught at High School A on Mondays; Curriculum Development is taught at High School B on Thursdays.) The university faculty members were responsible for course assignments, textbooks and materials, and assessment of preservice teachers' progress.

Clinical faculty and administrators at the school sites were responsible for field placement assignments with content area mentor teachers and for providing information and instruction on the day-to-day aspects of teaching activities. In collaboration with the clinical faculty teams at both schools, a slate of important professional development areas were identified that were not covered in our college courses. Clinical faculty members and administrators assumed responsibility for developing and teaching one of these areas throughout the first semester.

All five faculty members involved in the PDS taught full time in the college of education's teacher preparation program. The college is housed within a large public university identified as research intensive. All five women taught courses for the post baccalaureate teacher certification program before becoming members of this PDS. While all of the university faculty members were in tenure-track positions, four were untenured assistant professors, with the second author having recently being promoted and tenured. In addition to the professional academic roles associated with teaching at the university, the award of the federal grant necessitated that the group take on additional grant-related administrative responsibilities. The first author was identified as the primary grant administrator, while another faculty member in the team assumed the mantle of organizing and implementing the internal evaluation. The others within the group volunteered to assist and coordinate other grant-related activities such as recruiting, organizing the field-based components, and working with the mentor teachers.

Discussion of Findings

There were three primary themes that emerged from the data analysis: our evolving roles and our perceptions regarding collaborative field-based work, the transparency of our practice in a PDS environment, and the positioning of our personal philosophies about teaching, students, and research agendas related to field-based work.

Evolving Roles and Perceptions

Funded programs inherently require the necessity of working within the constraints of an imposed time frame. Design, implementation, and completion of activities related to delivering the proposed project must occur within a specified time cycle. The mere fact that a program needs to be up and running within a short time greatly reduces valuable time necessary to provide for the process of building trust and negotiating relationships. Once the authors received notification that they had been awarded funding for our project, the timeline necessitated that they begin immediately in order to begin the program the following semester. Fortunately, the second author's five-year relationship with one of the high schools provided the groundwork to assist us in gaining entry to the second school.

In order to facilitate the expansion of the project at the two school sites and the addition of three university faculty members in the PDS, there were many transitional activities that needed to be accomplished. The authors began their work as university faculty members with a two-day retreat. The retreat was designed as an opportunity to align the course content within this new context and determine how the project would be enacted in practice. The retreat concept was to provide an extended amount of planning time away from campus distractions. The focus of this time was for planning and organization, but not on relationship building, an oversight that was discovered once the implementation of the program began in the next semester.

Not long into the project, it became apparent that there were vast differences in communication styles, expectations about the contributions of other group members, and the roles each could play in the implementation of the project. An examination of meeting minutes, personal journals, and project artifacts revealed several themes that emerged from these tensions. The three broad themes that emerged were the realities of working in public schools, the transparency of practice to each other as well as the other stakeholders, and the necessity of conducting research that would culminate in tenure and promotion (meeting minutes, 20052006). Each aspect of these tensions impacted both how the partnership and collegiality within the partnership were viewed.

The Realities of Working in Schools

One logistical challenge that arose was the scheduling of the five course times to meet the goals and objectives of the partnership while allowing sufficient time for preservice teachers to participate in classrooms. Not only did the scheduling significantly reduce the amount of class time for four of the professors, but it was necessary to factor in the local school campus's schedule. Issues such as state-mandated testing, district-wide professional development release days, and other schedule changes were something university professors typically do not need to consider when developing course outlines and teaching on the university campus. However, these types of scheduling occurrences were now part of weekly planning discussion. Daily details such as the schools' bell schedules and mentor teachers' planning periods became significant items to factor into the matrix of the partnership. An additional consideration was that when teachers presented lessons to the university students, the university professor's time for instruction was reduced further. Using teachers to provide their classroom perspective often necessitated that the professor reciprocate by being available to teach the clinical faculty member's class.

Teaching at two different school sites and organizing course content so that it aligned with the practical experiences of our preservice teachers required that that flexibility be demonstrated, specifically regarding unscheduled and

unpredicted changes. As discussed earlier, schedule changes such as district-wide testing dates, school assemblies, and professional development days required frequent alterations of individual course topic outlines. Flexibility extended beyond school site considerations to the authors' own daily practice. Where once they could change an assigned due date or make alterations in assignment requirements, these seemingly minor changes created a ripple effect on the other four courses. Previously, none of the university instructors had found it unnecessary to consult other professors if we altered an assignment due date. However, now changing a date on an interdisciplinary project created unanticipated and unintended dissension. The resulting perception of the loss of autonomy was something that also had to be negotiated (meeting minutes, January 2006).

When the university students were told that they would need to exhibit characteristics of flexibility and professionalism, it had to be consistent with the practices of their university instructors to be believable. This was evidenced in several ways, one being that they had limited use of what the school could offer them in the way of space and supplies. Essentially any materials or supplies were needed for class had to be brought from the university for each session. Teaching courses at the university campus provided easy access to projectors, computers, and other types of supplies and technology. Participating within the structure of the PDS facilities as well as interacting with school faculty members extended into teaching practice becoming more visible to all stakeholders.

The Authenticity of Working in Schools

The experience of collaborative and interdisciplinary teaching made teaching practice more discernible. Typically, university faculty members teach their courses in isolation, with a great deal of freedom in content, student assessments, and discussion topics. Our intent was that the preservice teachers in our program would observe the course alignment process as a method of bridging the theory versus praxis

disconnect often voiced by those in teacher preparation.

This professional transparency resulted in incidents where students might question one professor about the requirements of assignments, assignment due dates, or project expectations of another university faculty team member. The collective intention for a unified front created additional challenges and nuances in communication structures when attempts were made to respond to specific questions about someone else's course. From the students' perspective, it appeared at times that their instructors were confused or disorganized regarding procedures (faculty course evaluations, April 2005), when in reality each instructor believed that specific course questions were answered most effectively by the instructor who made the assignment (meeting minutes, November 2005).

Conversations during weekly meetings to discuss the PDS revealed another layer of nuance in our team's interactions. Differences in opinion emerged about the preservice teachers' academic performance, the expected roles of the mentor teachers working closely with our students, as well as differing perceptions about how much involvement was needed by each faculty member to maintain a successful partnership. Newer group members, who had limited experiences with school-university partnerships, wanted to relegate the relationship building component and activities to the more experienced members. While it was not explicitly voiced that these members did not value relationship building with the partners, it was apparent that they did not clearly envision their role within this aspect of the organization of the PDS. It was not unusual for at least one member during our weekly meetings to express a lack of empathy or understanding concerning the parity of relationships between ourselves and the classroom teachers as well as the value of the process of establishing trust among all stakeholders. There was a decided preference initially for some in the group simply to arrive at the PDS site and teach their classes and leave. However, once made aware of how important this physical presence was viewed by the partnership resulted in becoming more available and accessible at the

PDS site and interacting with school personnel. For the veteran PDS faculty members, the presence and visibility of university team members on a campus allowed opportunities to trouble-shoot effectively and in a timely manner. However, the newer university faculty members expressed a sense of a lack of confidence to respond properly to the teachers' questions. It seemed easier to redirect most of the professional conversations back to the founding faculty member's expertise and knowledge than to risk providing an incorrect solution. The value of this relationship building activity and dialogue was another assumption that took time to permeate to the rest of the newer PDS members.

Philosophies of Teaching, Students, and Research Agendas

Clearly, practice became more transparent during this first year of collaboration; however, it is also important to note the various philosophies university professors bring to the table when engaged in large-scale partnerships. The commitment of university personnel to specific goals and objectives related to the successful implementation of a PDS is vital to successful collaboration. Several key factors need to be considered when forming collaborative teams. As often is reported in the research on professional collaborations, those university faculty professors who elect to participate in a PDS arrangement are sometimes surprised to discover the immense time commitment necessary to implement a partnership and how that time commitment can intrude on research agendas necessary for the successful attainment of promotion and tenure.

In academia, the pursuit of research interests that culminate in obtaining tenure and promotion is typical. It is often reported in the literature on partnerships that university professors are reluctant to engage with teachers and schools because it reduces the time they can allocate to their personal research agendas (Ravid & Handler, 2001). Professors view the complexity of schools as organizations as something that "others should do" and essentially remove themselves from opportunities to engage in professional conversations. They also

might not receive the anticipated level of professional respect they feel is their due and are not recognized as experts in their field, as they might be in a university campus-based program.

During the proposal writing stage, common precepts seemed aligned regarding teaching, student outcomes, PDS standards, and generally working in schools. However, once the implementation stage began, differences emerged concerning the value and importance placed on collaborative activities. It became apparent that the content of the five courses was not viewed as equal in importance to all instructors. In fact, one course became the touchstone for all classes, where the instructor decided once students entered the school sites, field experiences for the students were to be excluded due to the amount of time required to cover the content. The setting implied that the class was field-based, but in reality it was field-based in name only, resulting in simply a circumstance of geography or proximity, not one of active participation.

Another example of not conveying a shared sense of value for PDS relationships among stakeholders is to disengage oneself. This behavior can be characterized by being present physically on a PDS campus one day a week for class time, yet choosing to have limited interaction with the teachers, administrators, and students. Group members who engage in this type of impersonal relationship become viewed as peripheral members of the team by both the school stakeholders and university personnel who have an understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of PDS objectives.

Implications for Practice

The occurrences presented served as a catalyst to examine how we could improve our communication as a group in an effort to work more cohesively. As mentioned at the beginning of this article, while extended time within the framework of our retreat was allotted to plan the details of implementing the project, the provision of time for the other relationship facets of working collaboratively were neglected. Among the lessons learned from this experience was the

importance of relationship building among the university members of the team. Additionally, assumptions concerning the understanding of the amount of time necessary for PDS work, the parity of group members, and explicitly exploring expected roles and responsibilities for partnerships should be included when creating buy-in from each university faculty member's perspective. The specific components of working together toward a common goal are also quite fragile. The group experienced many of the stages described by Osgutborpe and Patterson in establishing, maintaining, and expanding mutual trust (1998) and by others (Hord, 2008) who are beginning professional communities of learning. Their experiences reinforced how critical a factor trust building becomes when implementing partnerships. While the assumption that the greatest amount of relationship building occurs with those in the field might be made, the importance of developing positive communication structures as university faculty members cannot be neglected. Discussion and dissension among the group was necessary in order for everyone to think deeply about how and why they engage and act in certain ways, thus serving as an impetus for collegial dialogue and improve practice.

Those who work within the structure of a PDS realize that teacher buy-in or change occurs best when all members of the partnership comprehend the realities teachers face each day. In order to help establish avenues of open communication, a valuable lesson learned was the importance of recognizing and articulating the strengths of each group member. Acknowledging the contributions of individuals within the group helped diffuse additional misconceptions about expectations for the PDS. Explicitly expressing the value of how the strengths and expertise of colleagues assisted in attaining our goals provide an additional lens to view experiences.

Additions to partnerships require education about the goals, objectives, and. history of an existing PDS. It also involves entertaining new perspectives and incorporating the expertise of each new member. To accomplish this goal, communication is critical to a partnership.

Within the PDS this component takes on a greater significance. Open channels of communication among the university faculty members are vital for continued success. Making decisions at the beginning of the initiation of the partnership concerning the specific roles and responsibilities of each member can also provide increased parity within the membership. Revisiting these roles often can also improve the communication structure as an additional way to build collegiality. Roles held at the beginning of a partnership may change periodically and dramatically as a result of an increased understanding of PDS philosophy, as well as the desire for members to take on greater responsibility within the collaborative.

As a result of experiences in working together as group members, it was determined that there was a need for synergistic and less structured meetings. These meetings were not only for planning and discussing progress of the project but also provided opportunities for informal discussions regarding individual perceptions and philosophies of teaching. An indirect benefit of these discussions resulted in increasing the number of meetings with the mentor teachers at the PDS school sites. Attendance increased at these meetings by all of the university faculty group members as well as an increased appreciation of the importance of being an active member within the collaborative. Becoming more actively involved in attending sessions at the school sites provided greater insight as to the complexities of scheduling, dealing with administrative changes and group planning on our part. The faculty members began to see the involvement in the PDS was certainly more complex than previously anticipated. Instead of viewing being physically present on the PDS campus as an inconvenience, everyone began to see the benefits of becoming more active participants in the partnership. Becoming more involved in the professional discussions increased opportunities to trouble-shoot potential problems more effectively and in a timely manner. Team members' presence in the hallways and the classrooms made their participation more visible and authentic, and as a result, the students,

mentor teachers, and administrators began to interact with them as genuine members of the school culture.

Concluding Thoughts

While some profess that they are committed to working with teachers and schools, there may be perceptions that are quite different when enacted in reality. Trusting relationships and open communication are critical for sustained success within a partnership. The faculty member who had a long standing relationship with the schools and had a well developed sense of trust and authenticity already established was crucial for this undertaking, as the rest of our group were less experienced with or knowledgeable about PDS work. Being part of a team comes with both rights and expectations Since PDS work is not considered obligatory as professional assignments by school districts or by universities, recognition for its success must come in other facets. The extra energy that is expended in the name of PDS is often invisible to those not involved in such endeavors. Therefore, educators must act as professional advocates for each other in their roles within the partnership. The ability to express one's fears, disagreements, and differences in perceptions, processes, and other concerns is a risky business. Creating that climate of trust can lead to growth and professional development in all stakeholders. This is why collaboration is more difficult to implement that cooperation. Remembering that all lasting change is a slow and evolving process is essential. One way to encourage successful partnerships is to become involved in what Clark (1999) referred to as extended conversations, where individual goals, perceptions, and communication for building, stronger relationships of mutuality are examined. SUP

References

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

Boyer, E. L. (2005). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Campoy, R. W. (2000). A professional development school partnership: Conflict and collaboration. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Clark, C. M. (1999). Talking shop: Authentic conversation and teacher learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gallego, M. A., Hollingsworth, A., & Whitemack, D. A. (2001). Relational knowing in the reform of educational cultures. Teachers College Record, (103)2, 24Q, 266.

Hayes-Jacobs, H. (1997). Mapping the big picture: Integrating curriculum & assessment K-12. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hord, S. M. (2008). Evolution of the professional learning community. *Journal of Staff Development,* 29(3), 10–13.

Letterman, M. , Dugan, K. (2004). Team teaching across an interdisciplinary honors course: Preparation and development. College Teaching (52) 2, 76–79.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nihlen, A. S., William, M. , &, Sweet, A. (1999). Teachers' stories of professional development schools: Restructuring decision making. In Byrd, D. M. , & McIntyre, D. J. (Eds.), Teacher Education Yearbook VII. 92-204. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Norman, P., Goliad, K. & Hooker, H. (2005). "Professional development schools and critical friend groups: supporting student, novice, and teacher learning." The new Educator 1(4): 273–286.

Osguthorpe, R. T. Patterson, R. S. (1998). *Balancing the tensions of change: Eight keys to collaborative education renewal*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ponticell, J. (1999). Understanding teacher risk-taking in a West Texas professional development school. In D. Byrd & D. McIntyre (eds.) *Research on Professional Development Schools: Teacher Education Yearbook VII*, pp. 205–217. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Price, M. A., Shultz, R A. & Verdi, M P. (October 2001). Fast track to teaching: An exploration of a summer post-baccalaureate teacher education experience. *Teacher Education and Practice*, (14)2, 82-103.

Ravid, R., & Handler, M. G. (2001).*The many faces of school-university collaboration: Characteristics of*

successful partnerships. Englewood, CA: Teachers Ideas Press.

Sandholtz, H. & Dadles, S. H. (2000). Professional development school trade-offs in teacher preparation and renewal. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 27(1), 7...27. *Journal* of Research for Educational Leaders Volume 3, Number 1, 2005 http://www.uiowa.edul-jrelpp. 4-29

Smith, S., Frey, B. & Tollefson, N. (2003). A collaborative cohort approach to teacher education: Modeling inclusive practices. *Action in Teacher Education* (25) 1, 55...62.

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

Ulveland, It (2003). Team teaching and the question of philosophy *Education* (123) 4, 659–62.

Wiles, I., & Bondi, J. (2000). *The new American middle school: Educating preadolescents in an era of change* (ltd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall

Williams, N., Connell, M., White, C. & Kemper I. (2003). Real boats rock: A transdisciplinary approach for teacher preparation. *Action in Teacher Education* (24)4, 95-102.

❖ ❖ ❖

Dr. Susan Myers is an Associate Professor in Curriculum & Instruction at Texas Tech University. Her research interests include mentoring new teachers and teaching graduate courses in the Master Mentor Teacher Certificate Program. Email: Susan.myers@ttu.edu

Dr. Margaret Price is an Associate Professor in Curriculum & Instruction and teaches secondary education courses as well as graduate qualitative research courses at Texas Tech University.