Nathalie Gehrke

Based on her experience in creating a professional development center—a school-university project to improve middle schools and create appropriate professional programs for middle school teachers—the author examines three dysfunctional attitudes in such collaborative efforts: the Trophy Mentality; the Education-as-Entrepreneurship Mindset; and the "I'm Okay, You're Okay" Frame of Mind. To change the three attitudes, the author suggests using three tools: careful selection of incoming participants, education for skills and attitudes of collaboration, and socialization to the collaborative roles through role modeling and rewards.

Simultaneous Improvement of Schooling and the Education of Teachers

Creating a Collaborative Consciousness

In spring 1990, the Holmes Group, a consortium of universities focusing on teacher education and the profession of teaching, published its report, *Tomorrow's Schools*. The report directed the attention of teacher educators to the collaborative creation of professional development schools (PDSs), for which it provided guiding principles. An earlier publication, *Professional Practice Schools*, edited by Marsha Levine (1988) for the American Federation of Teachers, had advocated many of the same ideas, but was not as widely distributed among teacher educators. Actually, John Goodlad, in *A Place Called School* (1984), had discussed the concept of professional development schools several years earlier. He and others since have likened these PDSs to teaching hospitals in which innovative practices and research are combined with the preparation and continuing education of expert practitioners. The primary additional requisites in PDSs are that they be created through a school-university partnership and in already-existing schools with a typical range of students.

Between the time that the PDS concept was intro-

duced and the Holmes Group issued its guiding principles for development, the Ford Foundation made grants to several school-university partnerships to create clinical practice schools. The Puget Sound Educational Consortium, composed of fourteen school districts and the University of Washington, received one of those grants, and has proceeded to plan and then initiate activities in four middle schools in the Seattle metropolitan area. The Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC) is now in its second year of operation, having jointly developed a new education program for middle-school teachers, experimented with a variety of teacher-planned professional growth activities for their practicing colleagues, and initiated a limited number of innovations in school practice that are being carefully monitored through both collaborative teacher-professor research and teacher action research.

Because we seem to be further along in our efforts to develop PDSs than most, we have begun to receive attention from other teacher educators who are anxious to get their efforts under way. Some who seek information from us are skeptical about the potential of PDSs to serve as the vehicles for simultaneous restructuring of teacher education and of schooling; others believe they already have developed a PDS, even though there is little evidence to support their beliefs; still others are such enthusiastic proponents that they seem oblivious to the difficulties. No matter what the opinion, no inquirer has the realism, coupled with dogged optimism, that our two years of leading a PDS effort have brought.

Before proceeding, I would like to convey my own genuine belief that, indeed, PDSs can be powerful vehicles for affecting schooling and the education of teachers. Based on our practical experience, however, we recognize some real difficulties. I discuss briefly some of the primary challenges that we and others must face if we are to steer these powerful vehicles on the restructuring road. At least three challenges manifest themselves in the attitudes of both school and university partners. They are: the challenge of the Trophy Mentality, of the Education-as-Entrepreneurship Mindset, and of the "I'm Okay, You're Okay" Frame of Mind. Addressing these three attitudes will mean more than just acknowledging them. It will mean changing them.

The Challenge of the Trophy Mentality

Both school and university partners exhibit the Trophy Mentality. The sense conveyed is that what counts is "having one"—that is, having a professional development school (or having undertaken the "effort"). "Having one" is good for public relations purposes and institutional reputation. "Having one" is rarely seen as a means to accomplish educational goals.

In the case of the university, the Trophy Mentality is exhibited more through inaction than through action. At my own institution, for example, although my college has been most supportive, there has been no acknowledgment of an institutional commitment to the creation of a professional development center. University administrators are said to be delighted about the recent publicity we have received and particularly pleased at the grants we have garnered. However, the highly complex organization of a large university works against developing projects that have potential for involving multiple departments. Administrators caught up in the maintenance of daily affairs seem hard pressed to make time for discussions about the ways that a PDS could serve a number of educational goals of the university (say, in social work, public health, librarianship, and the arts and sciences). In the opinion of many administrators, having a PDS is sufficient.

At the same time, the Trophy Mentality is found among some of our school district collaborators. The district administrators each sought to have their applicant school become a PDS. They agreed to commit a minimum level of financial support the first year of operation, after a year of planning. However, only one of the four districts increased its financial commitment the second year; only one district coupled its resource commitment with administrative support and statements of expectation for certain kinds of results in the PDS. Only that one district, in other words, saw the PSPDC as a means toward achieving its educational ends, rather than just as a trophy. I must add that the Trophy Mentality is not just the domain of administrators. It can be found among teachers and professors as well. Many like the idea of being in a site engaged in a PDS effort. They see it as though they had received an award for excellence, rather than as a commitment to establish and support something new through action. They do not want to have to do anything for it themselves, or have their working lives changed too much by it.

The Challenge of the Education-as-Entrepreneurship Mindset

Not wishing one's working life to change is related to the second mindset: Education-as-Entrepreneurship. People have been writing about the loneliness and isolation of classroom teachers for many years. Only recently have they begun to acknowledge that many who choose to go into teaching do so just because it is an occupation that has, through that isolation, afforded considerable autonomy, or what I have more loosely called *entrepreneurship*. The term captures the kind of independent nature of the organizer who plans, manages, promotes, and assumes the risks and the rewards of a given enterprise. Judith Warren Little writes especially effectively on this topic (see Suggested Readings). She claims that many

teachers take great satisfaction from private autonomy, and that most forms of collegial interaction actually bolster isolation rather than diminish it.

A teacher's private autonomy is nowhere more evident than in the college classroom, where individual professors have had nearly complete control of what they teach and how they teach it. Team teaching is rarely seen; joint curriculum planning is rare. Teacher education programs, for example, are often a collection of independently operated courses in which professors communicate only minimally with those teaching the other courses—often only to ensure that no one is using the same book or covering the same topic. School teachers show a similar lack of communication from grade to grade or even from room to room in the same grade. They share little within their school, and even less with colleagues in other schools. At the individual level, then, neither school teachers nor university professors are primed for the concept of collaboration, either within their own institutions or between institutions.

Professional development schools demand joint decision making and action, with all the conflicts of human interaction that come with them.

Professional development schools demand what Little calls "collective autonomy" (p. 512), rather than private autonomy—that is, joint decision making and action, with all the conflicts of human interaction that come with them. How we make this collective autonomy attractive to entire occupational groups who previously have self-selected private autonomy is a challenge of the first order.

The "I'm Okay, You're Okay" Frame of Mind

The third major challenge evident in professional development school efforts lies in the sensitive realm of evaluation—evaluation not only of one's own success, but also of one's partner. There are two parts to this challenge, then: realistic judgment of oneself, and authentic communication with one's partner.

When one talks with either teacher educators or with school partners, with few exceptions the self-judgments are mildly favorable. Like the children of Garrison Keillor's Lake Wobegon, our programs are all above average. We acknowledge that there is room for improvement but, considering the constraints we have to face, we are doing okay. We know there are other programs and schools somewhere that are not doing well at all and really need restructuring, but with some added resources and moderate changes (aided a bit by our school or university partner), our own results will be just fine. We are loathe to admit to ourselves that okay is not good enough, much less that there are fundamental defects in our programs that

will not be eliminated by tinkering. Such an admission strikes at our individual and communal sense of efficacy. How can we admit that something in which we have invested years of effort has been unworthy?

At the same time that we judge ourselves to be okay, we communicate to our partners that what they are doing is okay too. Not that we believe it, but we communicate it. While we may each be quick to point out privately the deficiencies in the other partner's performance, when we are brought face to face, we are silent. We are like the first-time dinner guests who pretend not to notice the burned roast or the children's outrageous table manners. In the interest of maintaining good relations, we say nothing; we may even find ourselves delivering faint praise in an effort to cement the budding relationship.

By our silence and mild approval, we soothe the immediate situation, but we actually impede the development of an authentic, equitable relationship built on trust and honesty. Over 150 years ago, Alexis DeToqueville and more recently Robert Bellah and his colleagues (1985) worried about the distinctively American aversion to conflict and argumentation. Nowhere does that characteristic show itself more prominently than when two different institutions attempt to merge their culturally different groups. Instead, one sees the "I'm Okay, You're Okay" phenomenon at work.

Creating a Collaborative Consciousness

Considering the profound challenges of the three attitudes—the Trophy Mentality, the Entrepreneurship Mindset, and the "I'm Okay, You're Okay" Frame of Mind, what are those of us who are optimistic and doggedly committed to school-university partnerships to do? These deep-seated individual, institutional, and nationwide habits of the head (to paraphrase Bellah) can neither be ignored nor minimized. They will not be eliminated by large amounts of financial support, although certainly every school-university partnership needs solid support and is more likely to survive with it than without it. One cannot be glib about these difficult matters, for we are looking at changing no less than the personality of an occupation, the character of two well-established institutions, and a distinguishing feature of an entire culture.

In our professional development center, we have begun efforts to induce a change by using the only tools we know—selection, education, and socialization. A few words on each follow.

Selection

From the beginning of our planning effort, involvement in the PDC has been voluntary, but we have actively recruited those individuals who exem-

plify the critical attributes necessary for collaboration. The students who enter our certification program have been chosen because they exhibit a willingness to work in teams, to be involved in schoolwide and broader professional issues, and to question their own practices. The teachers with whom the students work in the site schools are selected with the same characteristics in mind. Likewise, the teaching team, composed of university professors and a practicing teacher, shares those necessary characteristics. As hiring decisions have been made in both the schools and the colleges of education, the attempt has been made to select candidates who match the profile. This gradual process of adding members to our partner institutions who are less inclined toward entrepreneurship and conflict avoidance and more inclined toward collective autonomy and open communication should move us closer to the critical mass necessary to shape the culture within those sites and within the professional development center. We do not know yet what that critical mass may be.

We are looking at changing no less than the personality of an occupation, the character of two well-established institutions, and a distinguishing feature of an entire culture.

Education

Over time, selection of participants with the appropriate mindset will help build a collaborative culture for restructuring, but selection alone will be insufficient. We must enhance the tendencies already exhibited by educating participants in the kinds of behavior in which we wish them to engage. To that end, in the first year we distributed and discussed articles pertinent to our efforts. We assembled small libraries of professional books and journals at each of our sites. Most importantly, we provided our teacher leaders with initial programs about site-based decision making, peer coaching, and action research—three skills areas directly linked to the attitudes we sought. During our second year, more intensive programs are being provided. Each of the three program focuses was chosen by one school, while the process of change was chosen by a fourth. Curiously, the university participants have encouraged the teacher leaders' further education, but have not considered their own. We have some work to do in this area.

Socialization

The final tools available to us are those most appropriately clustered under the category of socialization. They are modeling and rewards. From the very beginning of our planning efforts, we have attempted to model our

belief in teamwork. All tasks have been addressed by two or more individuals, each representing a different institution. The certification program is taught by a collaborative team; the student teachers are placed, whenever possible, with teams. When we are asked to make presentations to others about our PDC, they are done by a school-university team. We try to model our belief in reflective inquiry by regularly setting aside time for writing and discussion about what we've done and where we're going. Formal evaluation using a variety of qualitative approaches is a critical part of each year's activity. A third area, and perhaps the hardest to model, is that of open communication about areas of difference. As we moved into action, conflicts came to be more visible. This was especially true in the certification program, where placement of student teachers is always a sensitive matter. Nevertheless, by again using a school-university team approach, the crises were faced and resolved. Still, we have much room to grow in this area.

Rewards, finally, are necessary for those who have taken strides in exemplifying the behaviors necessary to a collaborative consciousness. Small but highly symbolic stipends have been awarded to both professors and teacher leaders who have contributed to the PDC. Participants have received recognition in local and national newspapers and other publications. Several school and university participants have felt rewarded by representing the PSPDC at national conferences and meetings. Merit pay decisions at the university have increasingly reflected participation in the effort. All of these have helped to shape the attitude of early participants and the receptivity of those just becoming involved.

Final Thoughts

The multiple tools for beginning to dissolve the three dysfunctional attitudes and create in their place a collaborative consciousness are not sure-fire, monumental, or magical—just practical. They might not convince the skeptical inquirer, modify the beliefs of those who already believe they have achieved restructuring through a PDS, or sober the wildly enthusiastic proponents. They might not affect an entire occupation or change the national character. But maybe, just maybe, their use in our simultaneous effort to restructure a few schools and one university through the PSPDC will combine to effect a local change. We would be satisfied with that start.

Suggested Readings

Bellah, Robert, Richard Madsen, William Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven Tipton. *Habits of the Heart*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

DeToqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1969.

Goodlad, John I. *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1984.

Ann Lieberman, ed. *Building a Professional Culture in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Little, Judith Warren. "The Persistence of Privacy: Autonomy and Initiative in Teachers' Professional Relations." *Teachers College Record* 91, no. 4 (1990): 509-536.