

# **TEACHER LEADERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS**

*This page intentionally left blank*

# TEACHER LEADERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

EDITED BY

**JANA HUNZICKER**

*Bradley University, Peoria, IL, USA*



United Kingdom – North America – Japan India – Malaysia – China

Emerald Publishing Limited  
Howard House, Wagon Lane, Bingley BD16 1WA, UK

First edition 2018

Copyright © 2018 Emerald Publishing Limited

**Reprints and permissions service**

Contact: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher or a licence permitting restricted copying issued in the UK by The Copyright Licensing Agency and in the USA by The Copyright Clearance Center. Any opinions expressed in the chapters are those of the authors. Whilst Emerald makes every effort to ensure the quality and accuracy of its content, Emerald makes no representation implied or otherwise, as to the chapters' suitability and application and disclaims any warranties, express or implied, to their use.

**British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-78743-404-2 (Print)

ISBN: 978-1-78743-403-5 (Online)

ISBN: 978-1-78743-923-8 (Epub)



ISOQAR certified  
Management System,  
awarded to Emerald  
for adherence to  
Environmental  
standard  
ISO 14001:2004.

Certificate Number 1985  
ISO 14001



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

# Contents

Foreword	<i>ix</i>
<i>Bruce E. Field</i>	
Acknowledgements	<i>xiii</i>
Dedication	<i>xv</i>
List of Abbreviations	<i>xvii</i>
<b>Chapter 1 Professional Development Schools: An Overview and Brief History</b>	
<i>Jana Hunzicker</i>	<i>1</i>
<b>Chapter 2 Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools: A Definition, Brief History, and Call for Further Study</b>	
<i>Jana Hunzicker</i>	<i>19</i>
<b>Section I: Teacher Leadership and Student Learning</b>	
<b>Chapter 3 Collaborative Leadership in Meeting the Needs of English Learners in an Urban Elementary PDS</b>	
<i>Nancy Dubetz, Maria Fella, Yokaira LaChapell and Jennifer Rivera</i>	<i>41</i>
<b>Chapter 4 De-Tracking Ninth Grade Algebra: A Teacher Leadership Success Story</b>	
<i>Rhonda Baynes Jeffries</i>	<i>59</i>
<b>Chapter 5 Moving from Collaborative Teacher Inquiry to Leadership: Four Stories from Project Teacher Leadership</b>	
<i>Clare Kruft and Diane Wood</i>	<i>75</i>

**Chapter 6    Teacher Leader Reflections: Teacher Leadership  
and Student Learning** 99

A Courageous, Collegial Partnership  
*Keri Haley and Christopher Urquhart*

From One to Many  
*Nancy Cryder Jones*

Learning and Leading through Collaboration  
*Jamie Silverman*

Questions for Further Reflection  
*Jana Hunzicker*

**Chapter 7    Teacher Leadership and Student Learning** 107  
*Bernard J. Badiali*

**Section II: Definitions, Structures, and  
Cultures that Promote Teacher Leadership**

**Chapter 8    Teacher Leader Identities and Influences as  
Defined by Liaisons-in-Residence** 121  
*Jennifer L. Snow, Sarah Anderson, Carolyn Cort,  
Sherry Dismuke and A. J. Zenkert*

**Chapter 9    Lab School Teacher Leaders as Learners and  
Change Agents** 141  
*Margaret Hudson and Jayne Hellenberg*

**Chapter 10    National Board Certified Teachers as Bridges  
for Teacher Candidates Entering the Profession** 161  
*Anna M. Quinzio-Zafran and Elizabeth A. Wilkins*

**Chapter 11    Teacher Leader Reflections: Definitions,  
Structures, and Cultures that Promote Teacher Leadership** 181

Total Teacher Leaders  
*Ashley Bennett*

Quiet Opportunity  
*P. Erin Lichtenstein*

Bridges  
*Suzanna Nelson*

The Best PDS Perk  
*Azaria Cunningham*

Questions for Further Reflection  
*Jana Hunzicker*

**Chapter 12   Definitions, Structures, and Cultures that Promote  
Teacher Leadership: Making Sense of Section Two**  
*Michael N. Cosenza* 191

### Section III: Teacher Leader Preparation and Development

**Chapter 13   Cultivating Teacher Candidates' Passions into  
Leadership for Tomorrow: The Gift that Keeps on Giving**  
*Vail Matsumoto, Jon Yoshioka and Lori Fulton* 201

**Chapter 14   Developing Teacher Leaders Using a Distributed  
Leadership Model: Five Signature Features of a  
School–University Partnership**  
*Brianne W. Morettini, Kathryn McGinn Luet, Lisa J. Vernon-Dotson,  
Nina Nagib and Sharada Krishnamurthy* 217

**Chapter 15   Growing our Own: Fostering Teacher Leadership in  
K-12 Science Teachers through School–University Partnerships**  
*Zareen G. Rahman, Mika Munakata, Emily Klein,  
Monica Taylor and Kristen Trabona* 235

**Chapter 16   Developing Leadership Capacity in PDS  
Master Teachers**  
*Somer Lewis, Amy Garrett Dikkers, Lynn Sikma  
and Katie Fink* 255

**Chapter 17   Teacher Leader Reflections: Teacher Leader  
Preparation and Development** 269

Knowing and Being Known  
*Mark Meacham*

Tools for Successful Leadership  
*Stefanie D. Livers*

Lost Voices  
*Francisco J. Ocasio*

Questions for Further Reflection

*Jana Hunzicker*

**Chapter 18   Teacher Leader Preparation and Development in PDS:  
Themes and Recommendations**

*Rebecca West Burns*

277

More Questions for Reflection and Discussion

289

Tables, Illustrations, and Figures

295

About the Contributors

297

Index

303



## Foreword

Professional development schools (PDSs) excel in preparing new teachers, supporting practicing teachers in their professional growth, and engaging stakeholders in carefully crafted examinations of issues that directly shape schools. At their very best, PDSs bridge the gap between the two very different cultures of the P-12 and university worlds and, in doing so, positively boost student learning.

That said, the road to a successful PDS partnership is rarely, if ever, smooth, and those who embark on this path typically have to overcome roadblocks that remind them every day just how difficult a task it is to produce a meaningful and productive school–university partnership. These roadblocks often appear in the form of questions. For example, PDS collaborations that rely on grants have often asked, “What happens when the money runs out?” while those that have limited to no funding at all ask, “How can we sustain this partnership over time?”; other frequently asked questions include, “Can not-yet-tenured university faculty really afford to spend their time in schools in the face of tenure and promotion requirements?”; “How much buy in (and from whom) do we need to make this a successful venture?”; “Can we do this without the full support of administrators at the university, district, and/or school levels?”; and, assuming the partnership does indeed have such administrative support, “What happens when the administrators change?” These last few questions about leadership have been pervasive in the PDS world for quite some time, with it now very well understood that crafting and sustaining a successful PDS partnership is next to impossible if you do not have committed support from your dean, superintendent, or principal. And, since individuals in these particular roles seem to change rather quickly and consistently over time, it truly is critical to ask, “What happens when the administrators change?”

The contributors to *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools* understand this last point – that successful PDSs require support from above. However, they also believe that top-down leadership, while critical, is not the only form of leadership necessary to build and

sustain PDSs. In fact, they argue without fail that PDSs are the perfect venue for a different kind of leadership to emerge – the leadership of teachers. As Jana Hunzicker relates in her two opening chapters, the concept of teacher leadership has gained traction in American schools in the last 10–15 years, a time when, perhaps not coincidentally, PDSs have also taken flight. What those two simultaneous events have produced are a new set of questions that Hunzicker and her PDS colleagues pose in this volume. In three carefully crafted sections – each featuring three or four chapters contributed by teacher leaders and scholars from across the United States, three to four personal reflections written by practicing and/or former P-12 teacher leaders, and a synthesis chapter written by a leading expert in the field – PDS practitioners ask, “How can teacher leadership positively shape student learning?”; “What kinds of PDS-embedded structures can be put in place to promote teacher leadership?”; and “How do we prepare and develop teachers to be teacher leaders in the first place?”

What emerges in the pages that follow, as teacher leaders from ten universities and their P-12 school partners address these questions through the sharing of their work, is a powerful image of teachers taking on roles that heretofore were considered off-limits. Or, as one set of contributors put it, involvement in their particular teacher leader project “provided an opportunity for teachers to be treated as the professionals that they are.” This long-overdue recognition is one of many lessons to be learned from *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools*, lessons that will serve all educators well, not just those involved in PDSs. Foremost among these lessons is that students must be our collective and primary focus and that teacher leaders have an obligation (one writer said “the courage”) to do what’s right for students – even if what we do for them flies in the face of conventional practice.

Another lesson from these pages is that teacher leaders can be powerful advocates for turning around what has been a significant weakness of the teaching profession – a collective failure to consistently share the results of our work with others within the profession and with the broader communities we serve. Teachers, and particularly teachers in PDSs, are engaged in remarkable initiatives that significantly benefit their students; yet they typically keep the results of their work, intentionally or unintentionally, to themselves. The end result is that the broader public is kept in the dark about the positive programs taking place in schools, which leads all too often to those involved in the crafting of education policy doing so with limited – and in some cases inaccurate – information. As seen time and again in these pages, teacher leaders can have a major impact on public

policy through the simple act of sharing what's going on in their schools with their school colleagues; teacher candidates; school boards; teachers and administrators in other area schools; and state, regional, and national organizations focused on educational practice.

Teacher leaders can also help schools craft – and stick to – specific goals that meet the unique needs of their individual schools. When the National Association for Professional Development Schools released its Nine Required Essentials of a PDS in 2008, it intentionally began the list with the expectation that PDSs must have “a comprehensive mission that is broader in its outreach and scope than the mission of any [one] partner.” In other words, PDSs are created not for spurious reasons or simply for the sake of coming together, but instead for specific goals and missions. Examples to be found in these pages include helping English Language Learners grow while simultaneously helping their teachers understand the needs of this specific group of students, enhancing the knowledge base and teaching skills of science teachers, providing students not typically given the opportunity to engage in higher level math classes the chance to do just that, and requiring teacher candidates to develop Professional Growth Plans from day one so that they are prepared not only to teach but also to lead. Each of these projects succeeded because a teacher leader, or a group of teacher leaders, took the initiative to introduce and promote an agenda that they believed was important to student success.

In addition to offering these types of lessons, *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools* makes it clear that, while there are multiple paths to becoming a teacher leader, some intentional and others accidental, most of those paths involve individuals stepping out of their comfort zones and accepting challenges not traditionally ascribed to teachers. This can create some awkward situations, as when an instructional coach is told by a school principal that, “You will not come into my school and bother my teachers,” or when another instructional coach learned that her writing observations in a notebook made teachers nervous, or when a new teacher leader realized that she was now privy to information about colleagues that normally would not be available to her. But, as is clear in many of the stories shared in this volume, the role of teacher leader is a long-overdue and positive addition to the world of education. Who, other than teachers, are better positioned to know their students’ and their community’s needs? Who has a more direct impact on those students – and their families? Who has the proverbial boots on the ground? And who is better positioned to help the other teachers in their schools grow “as the professionals that they are”?

The value of *Teacher Leadership in Professional Development Schools* is enhanced by the fact that all of the contributors are affiliated with PDSs that have, over a very long span of time, dedicated themselves to promoting school–university partnerships for the benefit of teaching and learning. It was refreshing – and reassuring – to see the names of these institutions and to know that the work they have been engaged in over time has continued and has produced such positive results. It was also refreshing to read the reflections offered by the P-12 teacher leaders who engaged in this work, and, finally, to know that the synthesis chapters come from three exceptionally well-qualified and enthusiastically engaged PDS scholars. Jana Hunzicker is to be commended for bringing together this impressive collection of PDS advocates and for challenging them to examine – and to share – their work.

Bruce E. Field  
Georgia Southern University

## Acknowledgements

This book would not have been possible without the support and assistance of many. I especially wish to thank Zoe Morris and Kimberley Chadwick for adeptly ushering me through the proposal and editorial management processes, Rebecca West Burns for critiquing my original proposal and offering suggestions that significantly improved the project, and Bruce Field for reading the book's introductory chapters—and later the entire book—and providing invaluable feedback.

I also wish to thank the book's 49 contributors. Thank you to Bruce Field for writing the book's foreword, to Bernard Badiali, Michael Cosenza, and Rebecca West Burns for writing the synthesis chapters for each section, to the 33 authors who wrote scholarly chapters related to their teacher leadership and PDS work. And most of all, thank you to the 11 teacher leaders who wrote personal reflections about their leadership successes, insights, and challenges. Just as teacher leadership is almost always collaborative, the creation of this book was truly a team effort!

Jana Hunzicker  
Bradley University

*This page intentionally left blank*

To America's teacher leaders, past, present, and future.

*This page intentionally left blank*



## List of Abbreviations

AACTE	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
AAT	Architecture of Accomplished Teaching
AFT	American Federation of Teachers
ASCD	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
BCPS	Baltimore County Public Schools
CAB	Community Advisory Board
CAEP	Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
CFG	Critical friends group
CIP	Continuous improvement plan
CP	College prep
CCSSO	Council of Chief State School Officers
CTQ	Center for Teaching Quality
CV	Curriculum vitae
DC	District coordinator
DRA	Developmental Reading Assessment
EL	English learner
ELL	English language learner
ELA	English/Language Arts
ELAS	English Language Arts Standards
ENL	English as a New Language
EPP	Education preparation providers
IEP	Individualized Education Program
IIRP	International Institute for Restorative Practices
IRB	Institutional Review Board
K-8	Kindergarten through eighth grade
K-12	Kindergarten through twelfth grade
LOG	Learning objective goals
MAP	Measures of Academic Progress
MedT	Master of Education in Teaching
MSU	Montclair State University
MSUNER	Montclair State University Network for Educational Renewal

*xviii List of Abbreviations*

MTA	Master teacher associate
NAPDS	National Association for Professional Development Schools
NBCT	National Board Certified Teacher
NBPTS	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards
NCATE	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
NEA	National Education Association
NNER	National Network for Educational Renewal
NYC	New York City
NYSESLAT	New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test
P-12	Pre-school through twelfth grade
P-20	Pre-school through post-graduate school
PDS	Professional development schools
PK-12	Pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade
PLC	Professional learning community
PLS	Professional learning series
POL	Promise of leadership
PTO	Parent and Teacher Organization
SBS	Side By Side
SEC	Supervisory effectiveness continuum
SEF	Science Education Fellowship
SMED	Department of Secondary and Middle School Education
STEM	Science, technology, engineering, mathematics
TC	Teacher candidate
TESOL	Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
TIG	Teacher Impact Grants
TLEC	Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium
TLC	Teacher Leader Competencies
TLMS	Teacher Leader Model Standards
ToM	Targets of Measurement
TPP	Teacher Preparation Program
TQP	Teacher Quality Partnership
TU	Towson University
UHM	University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
UNCW	University of North Carolina Wilmington
UNLV	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
US	United States
UW	University of Wyoming
WCE	Watson College of Education
WPU	William Paterson University

## Chapter 1

# Professional Development Schools: An Overview and Brief History

*Jana Hunzicker*

### 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. Active teacher engagement in PDS work over the past three decades has led to the emergence of teacher leader practice and development as a serendipitous outcome of PDS partnerships. Emphasizing teacher leadership throughout, this chapter provides an overview of PDSs, 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; history of professional development schools; school–university partnerships; history of education in the United States; laboratory schools

Professional development schools (PDSs), a specific type of school–university partnership, were established in the 1990s to bolster the preparation of preservice teachers by placing them in authentic classroom settings from 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 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 led to the emergence of teacher leader practice and development as a serendipitous outcome of PDS partnerships (Cosenza, 2013; Teitel, 2004). Emphasizing teacher leadership throughout, this chapter provides an overview of PDSs, 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 article 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 partnerships between school and university are 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**

A 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 nonhierarchical, voluntary, internally controlled, and responsive to local conditions (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011). Such conditions foster creativity but may possibly lack substance and/or resources. However, PDS work focused on standards or other external parameters, such as a grant, which 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 measureable 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 fourfold 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 in 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. (p. 34)

Thus, laboratory schools set the early stage for a new school–university partnership model: the PDS. 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, which led to the curriculum of American schools – and those who taught it – being 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 were being revised and 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,” which 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.
5. To make schools better places for teachers to work, and to learn (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 4).

Similar to 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 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 fourfold 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
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 the

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 the 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 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 national 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). Therefore in 2008, the NAPDS articulated “nine required essentials of a PDS” (p. 2) to distinguish PDSs from other school–university partnerships (see Figure 1).

The NAPDS Nine Essentials were written to “set the philosophy for the PDS” and “provide direct guidance on some of the logistics and

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).

structures of the PDS relationship” (Neapolitan & Levine, 2011, p. 310) while still leaving room for interpretation and customization. Field (2014) stated as follows:

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 that "[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 preservice 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, 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, promoting 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 has provided an overview of PDSs, 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](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, NY: 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: 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: 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, NY: 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. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- 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.
- 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*. Retrieved from <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. (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, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Rutter, A. (2011). Purpose and vision of professional development schools. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 110(2), 289–305.
- Teitel, L. (1997). Professional development schools and the transformation of teacher leadership. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 24(1), 9–22.
- 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. (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.
- United States Department of Education. (2016, May 23). *Programs: Teacher Quality Partnership Grant Program*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/tqpartnership/index.html>