Jianping Shen

Most of the current literature on improving pre-service teacher education by means of better school-university collaboration focuses on the use of Professional Development Schools (PDSs). Interviews with teachers at schools designated as PDSs in an extensive collaborative project show significant differences between the teachers' views of the nature and role of a PDS and that expressed in the literature. The article describes these differences and some of their implications.

Voices from the Field:

Emerging Issues from a School-University Partnership

A relatively recent recommendation for the school-university partnership has been that universities and school districts collaborate in creating "teaching schools," which are variously referred to as professional development schools, clinical schools, professional practice schools, professional development academies, and partner schools. Teacher education is an area in which schools and universities share common interests.

The idea of establishing professional development schools (PDSs) is embedded in two trends. The first is the movement to reform teacher education. The Holmes Group's reports, *Tomorrow's Teachers* and *Tomorrow's Schools*, the Carnegie Forum's publication, *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* and John Goodlad's book, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* have all recommended, among other things, that future teachers be trained in a PDS to gain hands-on experience and develop professional beliefs, attitudes, and abilities. The second trend is the school-university partnership movement. School-university collaboration became a popular phenomenon in the mid-1980s. However, relationships between schools and universities vary and the school-university partnerships have different orientations. As Su (1990) observed in reviewing the literature on school-university partnerships, these collaborations can be staff-oriented, student-oriented, task-oriented, or institution-oriented. Among these, the institution-oriented school-university partnership focuses on the mutually beneficial relationship between schools and universities with regard to teacher preparation. Goodlad describes the argument for schools and universities to collaborate on teacher education as follows:

"For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators) universities must have access to school settings exhibiting the very best practices." (Goodlad, 1986, pp. 8-9)

Student teaching is extremely important in the development of future teachers. This is perhaps one of the reasons that both the recent literature related to the teacher education reform movement and the trend toward school-university partnerships came to focus on creating the PDS as a context for student teaching. However, literature is not reality. To translate the ideas in the literature into reality is very complicated. The mere dissemination of information cannot guarantee success in educational change.

Blueprints for the PDS vary in different reports and recommendations. However, they all emphasize the role of the PDS in pre-service teacher education. Goodlad and Soder estimated that by the end of the decade, all relevant teacher education programs in the United States will have moved significantly in this direction.

The prevalent view in academic literature holds that the PDS's role in pre-service teacher education is twofold. The first role is that the PDS must be an **exemplary setting**. Only in such an exemplary setting can student teachers be better educated. The role of PDSs in improving practice and preparing teachers is analogous to the role of "teaching hospitals" in the medical profession. They are clinical sites where professional standards of practice are developed, refined, and institutionalized; where cohorts of student teachers participate in rigorous induction programs; where both teaching practice and induction are knowledge based. The PDS must also be a self-renewing setting so that it maintains its exemplary status.

The second role of the PDS is reflected in how student teaching is organized. The traditional model for organizing student teaching puts student teachers in an "apprenticeship" situation. A student teacher is usually assigned to work solely with one cooperating teacher. In this role, the student teacher is just like an apprentice. Moreover, there is little to suggest that student teaching induces a sense of solidarity with colleagues. Fully ninety years ago, John Dewey, in discussing the relation of theory to practice in education, deplored that because of the lack of a supportive infrastructure in the usual apprentice mode of student teaching, "the student adjusts his actual methods of teaching, not to the principles which he is acquiring, but to what he sees succeed and fail in an empirical way from moment to moment." Student teachers become agents for maintaining the status quo after the apprenticeship of student teaching. In order to move beyond this so as to produce better teachers, the PDS must pay attention not only to socialization and development of future teachers, but also to the element of inquiry in student teaching experiences. Student teaching must become more than being part of the induction process to socialize future teachers. Student teaching in the PDS, along with the course work on the university campus, should also help future teachers inquire into schooling, and develop professionally their own beliefs, knowledge, and skills.

In creating a PDS, much of the power for change lies in the hands of the workers in the field: the school-based faculty. The rhetoric for establishing a PDS will be filtered by this faculty before it materializes in practice. Only when principals as well as teachers become responsive to the challenges facing their emerging PDS through a continuous process of dialogue, decision, implementation, and evaluation, can the new PDS be successfully created. It is therefore very important to listen to the voices from the field. This paper reports on one attempt to do so.

Some Context

In August 1985, nine urban and suburban school districts in the greater Seattle area, joined with the University of Washington College of Education to create the Puget Sound Educational Consortium. As a major project of this Consortium, the

Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PDC) was created in 1988 with one of its tasks to pilot the PDC Middle School Pre-service Teacher Education Program, reforming pre-service teacher education through school-university collaboration. Originally composed of four middle schools and the College of Education at the University of Washington, the PDC has recently been expanded to include six elementary schools.

The PDC Middle School Pre-service Teacher Education Program includes the following three innovations:

• a core seminar on teaching and learning in middle schools, team-taught by university professors and middle school teachers, and integrating core classes taught in the regular teacher education program,

• a field experience, closely aligned with the core seminar, that includes placement at one of the PDSs, and

• on site supervision and evaluation of the student teachers by teacher leaders designated as "site-supervisors."

These activities indicate that the PDC Middle School Pre-service Teacher Education Program is built on a conception of linking schools and universities to overcome the difficulty associated with traditional teacher education programs, the breach between two worlds.

The discussion in the following section is drawn from studies of school faculty members' visions of pre-service teacher education and a student teacher's field experience in a professional development school setting. When these studies were undertaken, the middle schools had been PDSs for five years. A survey of the literature on school-university partnerships before conducting these studies revealed that much of the literature was generated by university faculty members from the university's perspective; school faculty members' voices have rarely been heard. It would be constructive to hear school faculty members' viewpoints and to examine the issues in school-university partnerships from their perspectives. The remainder of this article will first describe some of the issues emerged from studying two PDSs and a student teacher , and then discuss policy implications for universities.

Emerging Issues

Sharing a Common Agenda

In the literature reviewed, three goals characterize professional development schools: providing exemplary programs for students, induction of new teachers and in-service teacher development, and inquiry to strengthen the profession of teaching. The study of school faculty members' vision of pre-service teacher education in the context of a school-university partnership reveals discrepancies between the university faculty and the school faculty.

Comparing voices from the field with the literature, this author found that school-based faculty members' vision of pre-service teacher education in the context of a PDS is largely focused on the socialization and development of student teachers. The following are the principal elements of the teacher's vision of how student teaching should be organized:

• A year-long commitment, so as to allow the student teacher to know all the work that teaching involves, and to strengthen their commitment to teaching;

• gradually enlarging student teachers' responsibilities, with a progression in which student teachers move from their seminar classes to taking over the classroom

completely;

• matching a student teacher with a cooperating teacher in order to avoid interpersonal conflicts and to optimize student teachers' service and learning opportunities;

• having a site supervisor responsible for coordinating and evaluating student teaching, and to act as liaison between the student teacher group and the cooperating teacher group;

• moving beyond classroom teaching, with student teachers taking on additional roles, becoming more and more visible in the professional life, and attending parent meetings;

• working with a team of teachers so as to transcend student teachers' preconceptions regarding teaching and identifying with a more diversified culture of teaching; and

• enhancing school-university coordination.

All these desires expressed by the teachers in the field pertain to the logistics of socializing and developing student teachers. They leave out several significant dimensions in the nature and utilization of PDSs that are stressed in the literature.

In the first place, the school-based faculty members did not mentioned the concept of "cohort group" emphasized by Goodlad (1990, pp. 329, 207-211) – a group of prospective teachers going through the whole program together which can be identified as the classes of 1992, 1993, and so on. In principle, the weekly meeting among student teachers and the site supervisor is an opportunity for student teachers to meet as a cohort group engaged in inquiry and evaluation of their collective experiences. But the teachers at the PDS interviewed in this study justified the weekly meeting from the perspective of facilitating communications between cooperating teachers and student teachers. The concept of cohort group has not become a part of school-based faculty members' vision and, therefore, has not been purposefully institutionalized as a mechanism to strengthen the cohort group in the PDS.

Two further significant differences exist between the literature and the voices from the field. The first difference is that the school faculty do not hold the idea that student teaching should take place in an exemplary setting. There is an assumption underlying school faculty's vision that once a school has been selected as a PDS, it is exemplary. One teacher interpreted "being exemplary" as "being realistic." Another suggested schools take turns in being PDSs. This conception of rotation is based on an assumption that all schools are exemplary. Still another teacher argued that there was no connection necessarily between the quality of a PDS and the effectiveness of student teaching.

The second difference is that the notion of "student teaching as an inquiry-oriented activity" is missing in school teachers' vision. However, according to the literature, "inquiry to strengthen the profession of teaching" is the third goal of the PDS. The PDS must help student teachers inquire into the nature of education, schooling, and teaching as a profession, develop an inquiring attitude, and do so as a natural part of their careers.

Of course, the student teaching experience in a PDS is different from that in the traditional teacher education program because it takes place within the context of a systematic university-school partnership. But if the two key elements of being an exemplary setting and a locus of inquiry are missing in the school faculty's vision of the PDS, the different understandings of a supposedly common agenda pose serious problems to this relationship. The intended goals for a PDS will not be fully

realized, and the difference in understanding the agenda can also exacerbate the tension between the two separate and sometimes antagonistic worlds of schools and universities.

A common agenda for school-university partnership should be developed, shared, and understood by both the school faculty and the university faculty. Furthermore, the agenda building process should become the very process of renewal of schools and universities. For example, while it might be wonderful if student teaching were to take place in an ideal setting, it is difficult or even unrealistic to have those exemplary schools in place before a collaborative pre-service teacher education project begins. This difficulty is faced particularly by school-university partnerships in metropolitan settings. A principle goal of the collaboration should be to affect both partners so as to bring them closer to being exemplary in the way in which each carries out its task. To develop PDSs for teacher education should be a part of the whole partnership agenda, and potentially exemplary PDSs should be found in urban, suburban, and rural settings so that student teachers can have a wide variety of experiences and be prepared for a more and more diversified school population.

Knowing Partners

It is now common sense that in order for school-university partnerships to be successful, schools and universities should be equal partners coming together in areas of mutual self-interest. However, without being understanding partners, schools and universities cannot become equal partners. During a study in one of the PDSs, the principal made the following comment on his lack of familiarity with the university and his resulting accompanying frustration:

"I think that part of it is we have never been taught. We participated in what the university is by the fact we went to the university. But we have not been taught what you have to deal with on a daily basis. . . or the political realities of the College of Education. We don't have a really clear idea about you, and what happens is that does create problems. The reason that creates problems is that we get frustrated because we come up with an idea, it seems incredibly logical to us. And we are met with by the people from the university, they say "we cannot do that." It is really frustrating. . . . By having these relationships with the University of Washington, what the individual teachers in the schools are asked is to make changes. . . . If you draw a picture as to the degree to which schools are changed as opposed to the university. . . . I think you would always see, my conception is, we changed at least twice as much as the university has done."

This principal's observation unveils several common issues which are associated with the concept of equal partners in school-university partnerships. First of all, there should be a two-way communication between schools and universities. In developing a shared agenda, universities should make it clear what their circumstances are so that schools have the opportunity to understand their higher education partners who, in turn, need to understand the constraints existing for the schools. Secondly, there should be a simultaneous renewal of both schools and universities. Universities should not join the school-university partnership by dictating changes in schools but maintaining the *status quo* in their own settings. Nothing short of the simultaneous renewal will succeed. Finally, understanding partners is a prerequisite for developing a common agenda. Without a deep understanding of partners, no mutually beneficial, common agenda would be developed.

Developing a Cadre of School Teachers

One of the interesting findings regarding the vision of the school faculty is that the site supervisors' and teacher leadership coordinators' conceptions regarding the PDS are by comparison closer to the literature. This means that the persons who have more opportunities to work with university people have developed conceptions which are similar to the literature. This finding was confirmed by analyzing informants' answers to the question "How have you shaped your vision of PDS's role in pre-service teacher education?" Site supervisors and the teacher leadership coordinators identified "working with the people from the University of Washington" as their major source.

The site supervisor and the teacher leadership coordinator are the two key persons in developing and implementing the pre-service and in-service programs. The school-university partnership cannot continue without them. They are the bridge between schools and universities. A common agenda is under this cadre's stewardship. The fact that their conceptions are closer to the literature reveals the importance of the interaction between school faculty and university faculty in terms of exchanging ideas. As found in this author's study, school faculty members' conception of pre-service teacher education in the context of a school-university partnership largely consists of what they have already done rather than what they ought to do. When they reflect on difficulties they and their institution were facing in realizing their optimal roles in pre-service teacher education, they tended to talk about doing better what they were doing, rather than reexamining the status quo.

Moving Beyond the Structure

The initial efforts in school-university partnership is usually on establishing an institutionalized structure, which is indispensable for the success of a school-university partnership. An anthropological study of the student teacher in a PDS found that by enrollment in the PDC Middle School Pre-service Teacher Education Program, she benefited tremendously in comparison to student teachers in the traditional teacher education program. The student teacher studied was team-taught by both university faculty and school faculty so that she had perspectives from both worlds. She was engaged in cross-site visits when taking the core seminar on teaching so as to appreciate different approaches to teaching. When she was student teaching in a PDS, she was in a supportive milieu: ninety percent of the school faculty members supported the school's involvement in the PDC Middle School Pre-service Teacher Education Program; she was placed in the PDS with a cohort of her peers; she had a mutually chosen cooperating teacher; and she had weekly meetings with the site supervisor who would conduct the final evaluation. The structural arrangement of this teacher education program in the context of the school-university partnership overcomes some shortcomings associated with the traditional teacher education program in which a student teacher is exposed to *only* one way of teaching and struggles in a sink-or-swim situation.

Nonetheless, the structure *per se* cannot guarantee the success of a school-university partnership. In the case of the student teacher studied by this author, the cooperating teacher allowed her to employ such innovative teaching strategies as "jigsaw" and "snapshot biography" to teach social studies, but the cooperating teacher did not act as a friendly critic, questioning the underlying assumptions of these teaching strategies. Without such challenges, the student teacher might apply and enjoy the innovative teaching strategies, but she did not necessarily develop an in-

quiring attitude toward teaching. Lack of a critical attitude would become an impediment to the student teacher's continuing professional development. The nature of this student teacher's field experience reveals that a supportive structure in the context of a school-university partnership is necessary but not sufficient. In order for the student teacher to have a more educational field experience, efforts should be made to move beyond the structure. This requires developing a large cadre of school faculty members who have a deep understanding of the common agenda, and university faculty members have an indispensable role in this respect.

Building a New Reward and Support System in the University for the School-University Partnership Endeavor

Both principals of the two PDSs this author studied would like to see more involvement of the university faculty members in schools. One principal observed that by being a member in the school-university partnership, school teachers are asked to go to the university campus, but professors seldom come to the school. The other principal would like to have resident professors in the school building who teach classes during school days, which are open, as models, to both student interns and school teachers.

Research and publication are currently the *sine qua non* of the reward and support system in universities, and this research-oriented reward system is detrimental to such activities as school-university partnership. If "messing in the school" is not valued on university campuses, university faculty members, and particularly, junior faculty members are intimidated and unwilling to engage in school-university partnership activities. To make things even worse, working with schools is difficult and requires a substantial time commitment. A paradigm shift in reward and support system, which values teaching, research, and service, should be made in universities. Active involvement in school-university partnership should become a legitimate source for reward and support.

In the higher education arena, there has been a trend to redefine scholarship. Ernest Boyer's book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990) is an example, in which he examined the evolution of the concept of scholarship, proposed four general views of scholarship – discovery, integration, application, and teaching – and encouraged universities and colleges to reconsider the narrowness of the faculty reward system. John Goodlad's comprehensive teacher education reform program – *The Agenda for Teacher Education in a Democracy* – proposed 19 postulates, one of which reads: "Programs for the education of educators must enjoy parity with other campus programs as a legitimate college or university commitment and field of study and service, worthy of rewards for faculty geared to the nature of the field" (1990, p. 55). Goodlad's concept of teacher education is a tripartite enterprise which involves the college of education, the college of arts and sciences, and the professional development school. Therefore, the issue of reward structure arises in the fifteen sites which have been chosen to implement the teacher education reform agenda of the Goodlad project. In these fifteen sites, there are currently some discussions regarding how to change the reward structure so as to support those faculty members who are committed to teacher education. Committees have been created to work on the plans to differentiate the reward structure for education faculty. It is clear from the experience of these sites that the support from the president and the provost is crucial in reforming the reward structure.

Concluding Remarks: Policy Implications for Universities

Listening to the voices from the field reinforces many of the policy implications for universities which are mentioned in other contributions to this issue of *Metropolitan Universities*:

First, the university should make commitment to school-university partnership, and view the commitment as a moral responsibility for the society. This is particularly true for metropolitan universities. With urban schools facing more difficulties, it is more imperative for metropolitan universities to engage in school-university collaboration to improve education in both schools and universities. Preservice teacher education is an area which has great potential for schools and universities to collaborate. Colleges and departments of education alone cannot educate prospective teachers well. Neither can primary and secondary schools. Good teacher education requires a partnership between schools and universities. In addition to establishing an institutionalized inter-organizational structure, which involves investments from both sides, a new reward system must be created in universities to encourage faculty members' involvement in school-university partnership.

Secondly, the university, by its very nature as a major center for generating knowledge, should take up the responsibility to disseminate innovative information. The studies conducted by this author found that there is a difference between the literature and the school faculty's vision of pre-service teacher education in the context of a school-university partnership, with school faculty members having a practice-oriented vision. Overcoming this difficulty requires input from university faculty members. This does not mean a one-way flow of ideas from universities to schools. Rather, there should be a stimulating interaction between school faculty and university faculty so as to develop a cadre of school teachers who share a common agenda with university faculty members.

Thirdly, there should be a simultaneous renewal of both schools and universities. Despite the university's role as a center for generating and disseminating knowledge, it should not take the *noblesse oblige* role of "helping" or "saving" schools. Instead, it should also be open to change. Many difficulties facing both schools and universities cannot be overcome by themselves alone; this is one of the reasons why schools and universities should come together. In doing so, both institutions should be open to change for the best interests of the society.

Finally, school-university partnerships should not be viewed as a strategy for a special project for a short period of time. Rather, it should be perceived as a way of being for universities. Because of the natural connection between schools and universities --- college students coming ultimately from schools, and school teachers, counselors, and administrators coming from universities --- and their ultimate goal of welfare for the individual and the society, collaboration with schools should be a lasting commitment for universities.

Suggested Reading

Boyer, E.L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986), *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* Washington, D.C.: Author. ED 268 120.

Goodlad, J. I. (1986), Toward a More Perfect Union. *State Education Leader* 5 (2), 1, 8-9.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990), *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I., & Soder, R. (1992), *School-University Partnership: An Appraisal of an Idea*. Seattle: Occasional Paper No. 15, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington.

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

Holmes Group. (1990), *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Shen, J. (1993), *Voices from the Field: School-based Faculty Members' Vision of Preservice Teacher Education in the Context of a Professional Development School*. Seattle: Occasional Paper No. 16, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington.

Su, Z. (1990), *School-University Partnership: Ideas and Experiments* (1986-1990). Seattle: Occasional Paper No. 12, Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington.

Publisher's Advice to Contributors...

Our Editor is pleased to provide a detailed guide to the style and preparation of *MU* articles. This condensation is based on his *Guidelines for Contributors*.

Content. *MU* articles should be provocative and challenging, but above all useful. Readers – mostly university administrators and faculty – want to know what works, so they can apply it at their institutions. *MU* is a forum for discussion, not a place to publish original research. Be rigorous but engaging. Write in the first person and include personal experiences and anecdotes. Footnotes are discouraged; if you need to cite references, do so in the text. Please include a short bio and list of readings.

Stylistics. Manuscripts should be about 4,000 words, typed double-spaced on 8.5 x 11 paper, flush left and unjustified, with no hyphenation. Two copies of the manuscript should be submitted with a diskette using WordPerfect 5.0 or higher for IBM PCs. (Please see *Call for Contributions* on p. 4.)

We are guided by *The Chicago Manual of Style*, but flexible. Our goal is readability and consistency, but copy editing is light. If you use British spellings, for instance, we'll leave them that way. Some authors may sprinkle commas more liberally than others. So be it. However, if you can observe the following conventions, it will greatly reduce the number of changes we have to make to set your article in type.

- Place the author's name first, with no "by." Place the title second, followed by subtitle, if any. We cannot handle long main titles, so use a subtitle if you need to.
- Always use upper and lower case titles, not all caps. Use intital caps for key words in each title.
- Center main subheads ("A-Heads"), but do not underscore them, bold them, or italicize them. Just center them. Our program takes care of the rest.
- Place secondary subheads ("B-Heads") flush left on a line by themselves. Again, don't underscore, bold, italicize, or use all caps – just initial caps for key words.
- Don't leave a space between paragraphs. Use the tab key to indent new paragraphs. Never use the space bar to indent paragraphs.
- It's difficult to italicize text in WordPerfect. If you do, thanks, but if you just underscore words to be italicized, we'll take it from there.
- Use the spell-checker before saving copy. Its vocabulary is limited, but it avoids some needless errors.
- Use bullets (like these) when making a list, rather than numbers, dashes, or whatever. If you are not bullet-literate, use asterisks.
- Here, at the Publisher's Office, we do Windows, but not research. If you cite publications but leave pages or dates for us to fill in, we omit them.
- Please have any tables or diagrams set up camera-ready.

A few grammaticisms. We prefer to see a comma before the final "and" in a series, but accept consistent anomalies. Please spell out in full the first use of any person or institution before using acronyms or last names. Don't use Dr. or Ph.D. Read up on the juxtaposition of periods, commas, colons, semi-colons, quotes, parentheses. Also on numbers, arabic and spelled-out; capitalization; gerunds; split infinitives. . . .

Cavils notwithstanding,
We welcome your contribution!