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This paper examined the process followed in the selection and establishment of an inner-city Professional Development School located in a large, North Texas school district. The site used for this study was the first Professional Development School project in this part of the state. As such, it offered valuable lessons to those involved in similar endeavors. Since its inception, the site has served as a resource to neighboring school districts engaged in establishing Professional Development Schools. The issues considered in this study included site selection, personnel selection and training, communication structures, collaborative efforts, and the program's impact on students and teachers at the public school and university levels. This historical study used interviews and questionnaires as informational sources, as well as documents obtained from university and school sites. Triangulation was used as the primary method of analysis. Although the information presented in this paper is site specific, recommendations are given for both the study's site and other sites in the process of establishing Professional Development Schools.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

To examine the evolution of teacher preparation in the United States over the last 40 years is to see a process that has been characterized by a constant quest for improvement. John Dewey (cited in Woloszyk & Davis, 1993a) viewed teacher preparation in the same way that the medical professional viewed hospital internships. In light of this comparison, he advocated the establishment of teacher professional development labs. Dewey envisioned these lab schools as places where active learning could occur, where empirical research could be conducted, and where preservice teachers would serve as interns while gaining experience in the practice of teaching. Since their inception in the late 1890s, laboratory schools have existed in the United States with varying degrees of adherence to Dewey’s original idea. Two prime examples of laboratory schools merit mention. The first, the Horace Mann School, was established in 1887 and was located at Teachers College, Columbia University. The second, the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, was established by John Dewey around the turn of the century. Both of these schools focused on educational research as a primary goal. With the passage of time, however, the focus changed from educational research to one of providing prospective teachers with a setting where student teaching could be completed.
Since the primary purpose of laboratory schools was to service teacher education, most educators believed that schools should duplicate as closely as possible the conditions that they would later encounter in the field. Laboratory schools were places where faculty were master teachers who demonstrated their skills in the art and science of teaching while carrying forward research on teaching and learning. Observers and participants were to be introduced to the best possible educational theory and practice (Stallings & Kowalski, 1990).

The Master of Arts in Teaching program emerged during the late 1950s and 1960s as a result of controversies and dissatisfactions over the preparation of teachers. Another precipitating factor was the nation’s concern over the educational deficiency of its public school children. This concern was magnified with the Russian launching of the Sputnik satellite into orbit in 1957.

The Master of Arts in Teaching program focused upon a strong liberal arts content, intensive subject matter specialization, concentration on professional education sequences, and a careful supervision of practice teaching. Gutek (1970) points out that the teacher internship program differed from the conventional student teaching situation in that the internship was a paid teaching assignment holding the intern legally accountable for his instruction. Woodring (1962) states that the Master of Arts in Teaching program was probably the first program for the preparation of secondary teachers to recognize that high school teaching was distinct from both elementary and college teaching.
Another teacher preparation program that warrants mentioning is the Trainers of Teacher Trainers program. The Trainers of Teacher Trainers program was a federally sponsored program that existed in the United States from 1968 until funding ceased in 1973. Four characteristics of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers make this program notable. These elements were: encouraging professional rewards for liberal arts professors working in the education discipline, providing extensive early field-based training, providing courses in methods-methodology, and applying leverage to foster change in the trainers of teachers. The purpose of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers program was to make schools more responsive to pupils who were at risk of dropping out, especially inner-city youth. This goal was to be met by changing the kinds of teachers who went into these inner-city schools (Provus, 1975).

One of the more notable Trainers of Teacher Trainers project was located at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. The major purpose of this project was to train new Ph.D.s in geography, history, and economics. It was hoped that, after the completion of their work, the candidates would seek employment at a university level. Once employed in college-level positions, their new ideas regarding their subject matter and their new teaching methods could be advanced. A second Trainers of Teacher Trainers project that warrants mention was housed at the City University of New York. The project was introduced in New York City as a means of dealing with the challenges of inner-city teacher education. This
program focused on the development of personnel especially trained for service in New York’s inner-city schools (Provus, 1975).

In 1961, the Carnegie Corporation subsidized a study by James Conant on the preparation and certification of teachers. The resulting document, *The Education of American Teachers*, was published in 1963. The major impact of Conant’s report was to fix the responsibility for certification on the institution that prepared the teacher. Conant concluded that practice teaching was the essential professional course in teacher education and urged the creation of a position of “clinical professor.” The clinical professor would be mainly responsible for supervision, teaching methodology classes, guiding the student teachers toward instructional materials, and planning and conducting instruction (Gutek, 1970).

The programs cited above are mere representatives of the myriad of teacher preparation programs that have existed over the past 40 years. Although teacher preparation programs have come and gone, the need for providing beginning teachers with the best possible preservice preparation and the quest for the means of providing this preparation have remained constant throughout the years.

The concept of a Professional Development School arose in the 1980s as a result of the Carnegie Task Force and the Holmes Group calling for new types of schools that would focus on the professionalization of teaching (Nystrand, 1991). A Professional Development School is defined as a functioning, exemplary public school which has three major functions:
student achievement, teacher induction, and empowerment of practice (Abdal-Haq, 1992; Holmes Group, 1986)

The rationale underlying the establishment of Professional Development Schools rests on the assumption that university and school personnel have mutual interests in the improvement of both schools and teacher education. An essential element behind the notion of a Professional Development School is the concept of teacher professionalism. Within this concept, teachers are seen as both knowledgeable and committed workers who are willing to make decisions and accept responsibility for these decisions. This outlook posits teachers and administrators as full partners in teacher preparation as well as school operation (Nystrand, 1991).

Three major purposes have been proposed for Professional Development Schools. These purposes are as follows: to improve the education of both prospective and practicing teachers, to solidify knowledge and the practice of teaching, and to strengthen the profession of teaching by being examples of promising and productive structural relations between teachers and administrators (Sedlak, 1987).

Professional Development Schools are to be places where teachers inquire into their own practice as well as model the most powerful approaches to instruction (Holmes Groups, 1990; Levine, 1988). Jett-Simpson (1992) states that although support for this trend appears to be growing, documentation of what these schools actually look like at various stages in their development and how variations on the school-university partnership play out in different sites is scant.
Additionally, lodged in this general plea for documentation is the need to give specific consideration to the growth of Professional Development Schools in urban areas, especially in the troubled inner cities of our nation’s large, metropolitan school districts. Pugach and Pasch (1992) concur and add that it is under these conditions that pressing educational challenges, such as issues of diversity and equity, can be explored. These sites also have the greatest potential for helping teachers overcome stereotypes regarding children’s capabilities for learning.

In order to objectively examine the processes and dynamics involved in planning and implementing the Professional Development School under study, Easton’s (1965) Political Systems Model was used to provide a conceptual framework. The use of this model allowed for an analysis of the politics present in the interrelationships of the persons and organizations involved. When examined under this model, these interrelationships are ones in which stress in other subsystems of the social environment produces inputs of both demands and supports of a political system. The political system then converts these inputs into public decisions, or outputs, which in turn feed back allocated values and resources into the society where the process began.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to describe the process involved in the establishment of X Middle School as an inner-city Professional Development School and to examine the perceived impact that the presence of a
Professional Development School has had upon both the faculty and student body at this site.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to chronicle the events between September 1991 and June 1994 which resulted in the establishment and implementation of an inner-city Professional Development School.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions served as a focus and guide for this study:

1. What process was followed in the selection and establishment of the school as a Professional Development School site?

2. How was the concept of a Professional Development School explained to members of the university and school faculties? Were the underlying purposes behind a Professional Development School initially explained? How were these purposes perceived by members of the university faculty, as well as members of the school’s faculty and administration?

3. What type of communication structure was established to manage the problems encountered in the process of establishing a Professional Development School at this site? What problems developed? How were these problems resolved?
4. How were faculty members at the university and school level selected and trained for participation in the Professional Development School?

5. What perceived impact has the Professional Development School had on the school's program and curriculum? What was the perceived impact on student achievement, teacher induction, and empowerment of practice?

6. What type of collaborative process was utilized in the establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School?

Significance of the Study

This study examined and described the process involved in the establishment and implementation of an inner-city Professional Development School. In doing so, the study adds to the current research on the nature of Professional Development Schools, as well as fills the need for research describing both the characteristics and the process involved in the creation and implementation of an inner-city Professional Development School.
CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The process involved in the preparation of teachers in the United States is one marked by a constant striving to improve the quality of teacher preparation. This is evidenced in the development and implementation of such programs as Dewey's Laboratory Schools, the Master of Arts in Teaching Program, and the Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program. In more recent years, the research and commitment of such groups as the Carnegie Corporation and the Holmes Group merit mention. The Carnegie Corporation was established in 1911 by Andrew Carnegie and is dedicated to furthering the betterment of education. This goal is met by providing grants to colleges, universities, and other educational institutions that conduct basic research and experimental programs that deal with education and public affairs. The Holmes Group was established in 1983 and is composed of a consortium of over 100 leading universities in the United States. The Holmes Group has two basic goals: the reform of teacher education and the reform of the teaching profession.

The concept of Professional Development Schools took form as part of the "second wave" of educational reform in the United States. In contrast to the initial reform initiatives of the 80s that focused upon academic rigor and blamed teachers for low student performance, these new efforts focused on the professionalization of teaching. In particular, the Carnegie Task Force
(1986) and the Holmes Group (1986) called for new types of schools to support the initial preparation and continuing education of teachers (Nystrand, 1991).

It was the hope of the Holmes Group (1986) that Professional Development Schools would unite university faculty, practicing teachers, and administrators by way of four guiding principles. These four principles were:

1. reciprocity and benefit between research and practice;
2. a willingness to try new forms of practice and structure;
3. the requirement that new ideas be subject to careful study and validation; and
4. a commitment to the development of teaching strategies for a wide range of children with different backgrounds, abilities, and learning styles.

The Holmes Group (1986) further recommended the establishment of Professional Development Schools as vehicles to provide the necessary linkages between colleges of education and the public schools. Professional Development Schools have existed in many forms since the late 19th century and have been described as school settings focused on the professional development of teachers and the development of pedagogy. Laboratory schools, embedded in schools of education, were the earliest forms of Professional Development Schools. John Dewey (cited in Woloszyk & Davis, 1993a) paralleled the necessity of a teacher’s professional development lab to that of a scientist’s or a medical practitioner’s. Such schools, the Holmes Group posits, would recognize the interdependence of teaching and teacher education as well as acknowledge the creation of a
partnership to improve teaching and learning for both students in schools and for prospective teacher education candidates (Zimpher, 1990).

Lewis (1992) states that the Professional Development School conceptualization is based on two assumptions. First, prospective teachers need excellent models in their teacher training so as to become good teachers. Prospective teachers need every opportunity to observe, participate, and reflect on the teaching/learning process as early and often as possible. Second, experienced teachers in public schools need to continue to develop professionally, deal with problems, maintain dynamism, have opportunities to generate new and innovative ideas, interact with other educators from various perspectives, learn from and participate in research, and reflect on their practice. Additionally, while experienced teachers are working at their own growth, they are in a position to play a major role in building the profession by working with novices as they develop their teaching repertoire and become professional educators.

The Holmes Group (1986) has developed several organizational standards for Professional Development Schools. The first standard is the emphasis placed upon getting students to practice those habits of mind which will compel them to go on learning throughout their lifetimes. Students must learn how to learn. To do this well, the Holmes Group stresses, teachers need to teach more towards understanding. The second standard stressed in a Professional Development School is that it provide an atmosphere which would create school and classroom communities which would enable people who live in very unequal home and neighborhood
circumstances to get increasingly high quality education. The acquisition of insight into the differences which exist between races, social classes, and cultures would be stressed. A final standard for a Professional Development School would be the perception of such an institution as a place in which continual reassessment, relearning, and redesign goes on. The atmosphere of such schools would mirror a deep, sustained commitment to the view that the betterment and professionalization of teaching ultimately depends on giving teachers opportunities to add to the body of knowledge concerning their profession (Bauer, 1991).

Winitzky (1991) states that, according to the Holmes Group, six principles of quality education are to guide the genesis of professional development schools. The first is that of teaching and learning for understanding. Students should not merely complete isolated drills. Students need to actively participate in experiences that allow them to construct meaningful learning and to mature into lifetime learners. Second, Professional Development Schools should be arranged as communities of learning in which democracy is both practiced and preached. Third, all students, not just those from predominant cultures, should be involved in learning for understanding. Fourth, continual learning must occur for all adult participants. Teachers, teacher educators, and administrators all need to continue their own professional growth both for its own intrinsic value as well as to serve as a model of lifelong learning for their students. Fifth, reflection and research should characterize life in Professional Development Schools. An essential role for the Professional Development School is the
joint production by teachers and researchers of new knowledge about teaching and learning. This type of knowledge is more accessible and useful to practitioners than that derived from traditional research. Finally, because of the implementation of the first five principles, the sixth will result: inventing a new institution.

The Texas State Board of Education realized the potential for teacher preparation found in the creation of Professional Development Schools and issued a *Position Paper of Task Force on Professional Preparation and Development* in 1992. In this paper, the following policy statements reflect the state's commitment to Professional Development Schools. First, the Legislature must supply appropriate resources for both quality professional preparation and development programs, thus supporting quality education for the students of Texas. An optimal, equitable, cost-effective support system would provide funds to those who deliver professional development activities. Another policy statement issued by the State Board of Education is that professional preparation and development programs may differ in design. These programs should be a collaborative and collegial effort among institutions of higher education, education service centers, public school districts, state agencies, professional associations, and private industry. Additionally, the State Board of Education also recognized the need for preparing educators to work in inner-city settings. This need is recognized in the same document which states that a variety of programs should be developed to identify, recruit, prepare, induct, and retain qualified individuals for the education profession, with special emphasis on minority populations,
underrepresented groups, and critical shortage areas. A final policy statement which is relevant to the nature of this paper declares that professional preparation and development programs should:

1. reflect state-of-the-art teaching and learning practices that are based on current research;

2. respond to current and emerging needs in such fields as technology, the arts, and the affective needs of students;

3. provide educators with the knowledge and experience that enables them to work effectively with students in an ever expanding and diverse culture;

4. be field based to include induction and internship experience;

5. foster ideas and skills for site-based decision making as well as total quality management;

6. include components such as needs assessment, collaborative design and delivery, and evaluation; and

7. respond to short and long-range goals of the campus, the district, and the state.

Professional Development Schools are best characterized as having three complementary agendas. The first of these agendas is to provide a context for rethinking and reinventing schools for the purpose of building and sustaining the best educational practices. The second agenda is to contribute to the preservice education of teachers and induct them into the teaching profession. The third and final agenda is to provide for continuing
development and professional growth of experienced in-service teachers (Lieberman & Miller, 1990).

Professional Development Schools are defined best by their purposes rather than by their operating characteristics. There is general agreement among professionals that these are schools which model exemplary practice, serve as induction sites for new professionals while facilitating continuing development for experienced ones, and generate new knowledge about teaching and learning. What a school should look like to achieve these purposes is a question that is not easily answered. The reason for this may be, in part, that the concept of a Professional Development School is so broad that it is difficult to act upon comprehensively (Nystrand, 1991). In an effort to develop a set of characteristics that would adequately describe a Professional Development School, Houston (cited in Nystrand, 1991) developed nine standards for assessment. These standards are as follows:

1. Students are given opportunities to show their knowledge and know-how in ways that are responsibly diverse. This provides teachers, parents, policymakers, and students themselves with multiple and authentic indices of learning.

2. Teachers combine knowledge and know-how to contribute to student success.

3. Teachers comprehend the mission of the institution and their individual roles and responsibilities.
4. The educational program is determined by a governing body at the school site where policies as well as procedures are written, available to the public, and subject to processes.

5. The establishment of appropriate assessment procedures for students, teachers (both novice and experienced), administrators, and support staff are established.

6. Provisions are made for professional development activities that stem from assessments and are in accordance with the school’s plan.

7. Resources provided to the Professional Practice School are able to support a high quality education program for students and teachers. These resources are responsibly managed at the school site.

8. The induction of beginning teachers into the teaching profession is structured so as to provide maximum opportunity for responsible experimentation on teaching and learning.

9. There is proof of an orientation to educational problem solving and research that is experimental in nature.

Professional Development Schools are intended as places of change, demonstration, inquiry, and self-renewal (Woloszyk & Davis, 1993a). The goals set forth by the Holmes Group (1986) attest to this notion. As envisioned by this organization, the goals for Professional Development Schools are:

- the improved intellectual preparation of teachers in the arts and sciences and in education; improved assessment and evaluation of teacher education achieved through flexible approaches; increased
collaborative effectiveness among colleges of education and arts and sciences and the public schools; and improved environments in which teachers work, practice, and learn. (Woloszyk, & Davis, 1993a, p. 4)

Easton (1989) has developed a conceptual framework that will be useful in the analysis of the process involved in the development and implementation of the Professional Development School under study. System Analysis begins by looking at all the stresses that are placed upon a system. These stresses have the capacity to move from the external environment in the form of exchanges that penetrate the system's boundaries. These stress-generated influences become inputs into the system. Inputs can be of two types: demands or supports. Regardless of their type, they are reflectors of the environmental influences and conditions that shape a particular system. Demands are seen as pressures, whereas supports are seen as a willingness to accept the decisions of the system or the system itself. The system accepts inputs and converts them in a number of ways. The system can combine them, reduce them, or absorb them without any further reaction. The system can also convert them into policies or outputs. Inputs are pushed through depending upon which values the conversion process reinforces and which it frustrates. All of the mentioned interactions also generate certain pressures within the system. These pressures, or withinputs, shape the conversion process and its outcomes. The outcomes of such a system derive meaning from the feedback process. Outputs (outcomes) are sent back through the system through a feedback loop in which values and decisions are sent back into the environment. Once this occurs, the entire system begins again (Easton, 1989).
The use of Easton’s System Analysis added strength to this study. It provided a conceptual framework on which to rely for a systematic analysis of the process and pressures involved in the development and implementation of X Middle School as a Professional Development School.

The Professional Development School is at the heart of restructuring education. The Professional Development School is truly unrivaled. Even though it is a site for schooling, it does not represent the typical school culture. While it is a site for teacher education, it does not represent the typical applied research culture. A Professional Development School is a unique social institution in its own right and develops its own culture distinct from the traditions of schools, teacher education institutions, or research universities. The Professional Development School is not simply a bridge between the school and university; instead, it is a new institution made up of a community of professionals committed to fundamental change. This fundamental change will make education more effective and efficient in producing new learning for all children, youth, and adults (Woloszyk & Davis, 1993b).

Embedded in this general call for documentation is the need to give specific consideration to the growth of Professional Development Schools in urban areas and particularly in the troubled inner cities of the nation’s large, metropolitan school districts (Jett-Simpson, 1992). This study adds to the current body of research on Professional Development Schools and provides documentation on what an actual inner-city Professional Development School looks like during the various stages of its planning and implementation.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The middle school selected for this study was established in 1957 as part of a major North Texas school district. Located in the inner-city, X Middle School has witnessed the demographic changes that are true of most inner-city schools in the United States.

The change in demographics is reflected in the information given by the school district in the April 1994 report to the Texas Education Agency. This information was provided for the Agency’s site visitation. Student enrollment was reported as 1,009. Of these students, 90% were Hispanic, 4% African-American, 4% Anglo, and 2% were of other ethnic backgrounds. Forty-six percent of these students were classified At-Risk according to data received from the 1992-1993 Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas (NAPT). Seventy-seven percent of these same students qualified for free or reduced lunch. Forty-three percent of the 1994-1995 projected enrollment was eligible for English as a Second Language services.

Fifty-eight percent of the 62 member faculty at X Middle School held a Master’s Degree, while 42 percent held a Bachelor’s Degree. The most current school district information reported the ethnic backgrounds of the faculty as 26 percent African-American, 6 percent Hispanic, and 68 percent as "other" (C.E.O. Management Report, 1993).

X Middle School was selected as a Professional Development School site in 1991. An elementary school, located a few blocks from X Middle
School, was also selected to be part of the Professional Development School project. The focus of this study, however, was limited to X Middle School. The selection of these inner-city schools adheres to one of the fundamental principles set forth by the Holmes Group (1986) and the Carnegie Task Force (1986) in their call for the establishment of Professional Development Schools. Zimpher (1990) affirms this when she states that the possibility of focusing a large quantity of resources toward the creation of Professional Development Schools in identified areas of high risk fosters the twofold agenda of assisting schools in need, as well as exposing futures to more culturally diverse perspectives about teaching and learning.

The Center for Professional Development and Technology was established in at the university in 1992. The purpose of this center was to implement and direct the Professional Development School projects that arose as a result of the Texas Education Agency grant given to the university for the purpose of establishing Professional Development Schools. The Center for Professional Development and Technology was headed by a Project Director. A Site Director was responsible for communication between the Project Director and the Elementary and Secondary Site Coordinators. The Site Coordinators were responsible for communication with their respective school's principal and site liaisons. A line/staff chart of the Center's organizational structure can be found in Appendix B.

The school district used in this study is one of the largest in the state of Texas. Because of its size, the district is divided into areas. The general superintendent oversees the district with the help of associate superintendents. Each area in the district is headed by an area director, who reports to the superintendent on a regular basis.
Project Blue Bonnet was involved in initial planning with the university. Project Blue Bonnet was a non-profit corporation composed of members from industry, universities, government agencies, and research organizations. This organization sought to acquire technology for the Professional Development Schools and worked closely with the technology component of the Center for Professional Development and Technology during the 1991-1992 planning year.

This study examines the period from 1991 to 1993. A time line showing the main events which occurred during this period can be found in Table 1.

Table 1

Major Events in the Selection and Establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>Planning Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1991</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University &quot;incentives&quot; given to faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1991</td>
<td>First Operational Planning Meeting conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School site identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1992</td>
<td>School District reneges on PDS administration/teacher application process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1992</td>
<td>&quot;Expectations for Teachers&quot; and &quot;Expectations for Administrators&quot; distributed to PDS site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>Implementation Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1993</td>
<td>Site visits by selected PDS members to other PDS sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 1993</td>
<td>Summer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of school committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Data

This qualitative study utilized various sources of information from documents, questionnaires, and interviews. Documents obtained from both the university and X Middle School were analyzed for patterns. Interviews were conducted after the documents were analyzed and the questionnaires were completed, so as to clarify and verify any discrepancies arising from the initial examination of the documents. These interviews also provided the researcher with an emic perception of the process and problems involved in the selection, planning, and implementation stages of X Middle School as a Professional Development School.

Participants in the research were members of the faculty from the university who were present at the onset of this program. Other participants included X Middle School faculty and administration, especially the site liaisons and those faculty members present from the planning stage of this project. A site liaison is a member of the school faculty who has been selected by the principal to serve as an intermediary between the university faculty and the school administration and faculty. X Middle School utilized two faculty members in this capacity.

Data Collection

Documents obtained from the university were analyzed and coded so as to yield a chronological account of the process involved in the selection, planning, and implementation stages of the establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School site. Minutes obtained from both the
university and the X Middle School Leadership Team were similarly collected, analyzed, and coded. The Leadership Team was composed of faculty from the university, the administration of X Middle School, the Professional Development School site liaisons, and teachers chosen to represent each of the school’s academic teams. Questionnaires were distributed to all members of the Professional Development Leadership team.

As a participant observer, the researcher conducted formal interviews with the faculty from the university who were present during the initial selection and planning process. Spradley (1980) defines a participant observer as a researcher who enters the situation to be studied, establishes a rapport with other participants, and then systematically gathers information. Formal interviews were also conducted with officials from the respective school district, the school administration, and site liaisons. The formal interviews were conducted using a protocol based on the initial analysis of documents, minutes, and questionnaire results.

Informal interview sessions were conducted with the members of the Leadership Team. The interview processes allowed for the identification of both key and ancillary informants. A key informant, as defined by Dobbert (1982), is someone who is more willing to talk to the researcher than others and who may have greater experience in the setting than others. Additionally, key informants are individuals who are strategically placed as regards the central purposes of the study. In contrast, an ancillary informant is someone who can supply complementary or opposing data, provide reliability checks, and balance the choice of key informants. Anonymity was
assured as much as possible and pseudonyms were used. Interviews were recorded as they occurred for later transcription. All data was coded in order to assure that it was stored and organized in a manageable form. Coding allowed the researcher to cluster segments of data related to recurring themes, problems, or research questions. The coding system emerged from an examination of emerging patterns and regularities. Subcoding was conducted in order to categorize the information at different levels. It was expected that some of the units of data would be classified in more than one category.

Data Analysis

Data were coded and reduced on an ongoing basis, beginning with the initial collection phase. All transcriptions were stored on a computer disk, and the original notes were stored in a master file.

After the coding and sorting had been done, the information in each category was examined to determine themes and patterns as they emerged. A form was developed for each category on which to record a summary of each chunk of information that was coded for that category. Data related to each research question was recorded on additional forms. Conclusions were drawn from the analysis of the data that was recorded for each of the research questions and any additional recurring patterns that emerged as a result of the data collection and analysis process.

Triangulation is the process of using multiple-data collection methods so as to contribute to the trustworthiness of the data. Triangulation involves the incorporation of multiple data sources, investigators, and theoretical
perspectives in order to increase confidence in the research findings (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Triangulation addresses both the validity and reliability of the research. Throughout the study, the coded transcriptions were compared to the documents, minutes, questionnaires, and other interview transcriptions. This process, known as grounded theory, is defined by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as an inductive strategy whereby the researcher discovers concepts and hypotheses through constant comparative analysis. The use of grounded theory allowed the researcher to discover concepts and patterns through constant comparative analysis. The data collection and analysis procedures used in this study can be found in summary form in Table 2.

Table 2

**Data Collection and Analysis Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1- Dec. 15, 1994</td>
<td>Initial coding of documents</td>
<td>Secure documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secure school district permission</td>
<td>Analyze documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classification and coding of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter to superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 15- Feb. 15, 1995</td>
<td>Conduct interviews with:</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University faculty</td>
<td>Data analysis, coding and reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School faculty and administration</td>
<td>Transcriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Liaisons</td>
<td>Conduct and analyze questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School district personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong></td>
<td>Exit field</td>
<td>Final collection and analysis of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15- May 10, 1995</td>
<td>Update demographics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In an effort to obtain an accurate portrayal of the events that transpired in the evolution of X Middle School as a Professional Development School, the researcher conducted interviews and sent out questionnaires during the period from February 2, 1995, through March 31, 1995. During this time period, 15 persons were contacted for interviews. Of those who agreed to be interviewed, only the Area Director requested that the interview not be tape recorded. All other interviews were taped, transcribed, and saved, both on a disc and in a file. One of the persons who declined an interview was a technology person working for the school district. The reason given for not wishing to be interviewed was a lack of time due to a very hectic work schedule. The second person, one of the original site coordinators who took a position in another state after the first year of implementation, was contacted various times by telephone and by mail. Since no response was ever received, it is assumed that she did not wish to participate in this study.

A six-item questionnaire was distributed to 13 faculty members of X Middle School who had served on the Professional Development School Leadership Team. Four were completed and returned within a 2-week period. A second request to those who had not responded the first time resulted in one more completed questionnaire. Four more questionnaires
were returned after the researcher personally approached members of the Professional Development School Leadership Team. The questionnaire used in this study can be found in Appendix A.

After transcribing the interviews, the information was analyzed along with questionnaire data. Available minutes, memoranda, and documents were gathered from the university and the school site and were organized chronologically. The information gathered from these documents was also analyzed in order to discover any consistent concepts and patterns. Minutes, memoranda, and other documents can be found in Appendix B.

Table 3 identifies interview respondents by letter and questionnaire respondents by number. Documents obtained from the university and the school site are arranged chronologically and identified by their respective date and heading in Table 4.

The researcher set out to answer the following questions:

1. What process was followed in the selection and establishment of the school as a Professional Development School site?

2. How was the concept of a Professional Development School explained to members of the university and school faculties? Were the underlying purposes behind a Professional Development School initially explained? How were these purposes perceived by members of the university faculty, as well as members of the school's faculty and administration?

3. What type of communication structure was established to manage the problems encountered in the process of establishing a Professional
Table 3

Identification of Interview Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned Letter/Number</th>
<th>Identification of Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Area Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Site Liaison--Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Project Director’s Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Interim Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>School District Employee--Technology Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Site Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Site Liaison--Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Former Site Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>(Members of the Professional Development School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7th Grade E.S.L. teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7th Grade E.S.L. teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8th Grade E.S.L. teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8th Grade Language Arts teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7th Grade Language Arts teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7th Grade Math teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7th Grade History teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7th Grade Language Arts teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7th Grade Science teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

Documents Obtained from the University and the School Site

- Internal Memoranda--University
- Operational Planning Team Meeting Minutes and Agendas
- Professional Development Center Meetings Agendas and Minutes
- Internal Memoranda--Professional Development Center
- University Faculty Meeting Minutes
- Leadership Team Meeting Agendas and Minutes
Development School at this site? What problems developed? How were these problems resolved?

4. How were faculty members at the university and school level selected and trained for participation in the Professional Development School?

5. What perceived impact has the Professional Development School had on the school’s program and curriculum? What was the perceived impact on student achievement, teacher induction, and empowerment of practice?

6. What type of collaborative process was utilized in the establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School? What follows is a reporting of the findings from the interviews and completed questionnaires.

What Process Was Followed in the Selection and Establishment of the School as a Professional Development School Site?

The selection of a school site entailed identification of both a school district and individual school. Political, practical, and ideological concerns in both the university and the school district affected the choice of sites. In keeping with the spirit of the Holmes Report, the university sought an urban district with high minority, low achieving schools. University respondents stated that the district was selected because of an already existing working relationship between the university and the school district. School district
officials reported the selection process as one in which the district was approached by the university.

University and school respondents agreed that the selection of the school site was marked by "political infighting." However, the preponderance of evidence shows the closeness to existing fiber optic lines as critical to the final selection decision. Accessibility to fiber optic cables was essential to this project because of the emphasis on technology and the presence of a Long Distance Learning Lab which would link the school and the university.

School District Selection

Respondent A, the Associate Superintendent of the school district in which X Middle School is located, stated that the school district was approached by the university with the proposition of establishing a Professional Development School project. Respondent D, the Project Director, concurred with this statement, explaining that this particular school district was approached because the university had a working relationship with the district as a result of past joint projects. Respondent G, the Interim Dean, concurred with this, as did Respondent 1. Similarly, Respondent M, a former site coordinator, stated the presence of "inroads" within the district. Specific examples of "inroads" were not given by this respondent. The final selection process occurred after the university made a presentation to the school board. Respondent A stated that "several commitments were made" at that time. He also stated that he was very excited by the possibilities behind the program's format.
School Site Selection

Respondent B, the Area Director, stated that X Middle School was selected because of its closeness to fiber optic lines. This response was also given by Respondents C, D, E, G, I, J, K, 3, and 9. Respondent B also stated that X Middle School was not the "initial choice" for the program site, but the school district had to go with it because they had already "gone too far to tell the university no." Respondent D stated that he felt that the Area Director "decided that he had some schools that needed some help" and picked the elementary and middle school sites because of that and the fact that "they supposedly fit our criteria." The existence of a map, provided by Southwestern Bell, which showed the presence of fiber optic lines near X Middle School was cited by Respondent E, one of the Site Liaisons, as well as by Respondents D and G. The promise of innovative technology which was to accompany the project was mentioned by Respondents D and A. Respondent D reported "political infighting" within the district concerning the actual site location. Furthermore, Respondent D defined the selection process as a "set of centralized decisions that were largely carrying out the political agendas." He added that it was seen as both a political and a symbolic process. Respondent D remembered the Area Director referring to the selection process as "Political Theater" because of the struggle between Hispanic and African-American elements within the district. Respondent I concurred with this and referred to "an undercurrent of political motivation." Neither respondents cited specific examples nor explained the nature of the "infighting."
Respondent B stated that the Professional Development School ended up "somewhere the district didn't want in the first place." He went on to say that the district had plans for some schools in the northern, more affluent part of the city. He added that the district had to "reluctantly" place it at X. He further stated that the process had been "very political" and that he had wanted the project in his area. His reasons for wanting the project included the implications of two new faculties, as well as the program's emphasis on teacher education and instructional leadership. Respondent B also stated that his area got the project, and the district then withdrew its "promises" because "they never felt it would wind up in a place like X." Furthermore, he stated that the district lost enthusiasm for the project and "abandoned" it. He concluded by saying that, had it ended up in the northern part of the city, the district would have made a "wonderful splash" about it, publicized it in the newspapers, spent money on it, and would have "done everything possible to try to make it work."

An internal memorandum dated September 5, 1991, sent to the College of Education Faculty by the Interim Dean, stated that the school district had "committed to collaborate with the College of Education in developing and operating the PDC." A Memorandum of Agreement dated October 14, 1991, and signed by representatives from the university, the school district, the local service center, and Project Blue Bonnet confirmed the commitment. (Project Blue Bonnet was a non-profit corporation consisting of members from industry, universities, research organizations, and government agencies.) An agenda of the Operational Planning Team
meeting dated November 22, 1991, named the members in attendance, among them the principal of X Middle School. A subsequent agenda of the same committee, dated January 21, 1992, showed a school site visit by committee members. The Operational Planning Team consisted of university faculty school district representatives, faculty and administration from the school site, and members of Project Blue Bonnet. The Operational Planning Team met on an on-going basis during the planning year for the purpose of preparing for the project’s implementation.

**Demographical and Geographical Considerations**

Respondent D stated that another factor involved in the selection process was the fact that the university "wanted to express a commitment to urban education." This response was also expressed by Respondents A, H, K, M, 1, and 9, who stated demographic factors such as an inner-city location, high minority population, and socio-economic status as selection criteria. Respondents D, G, and H stated that the low-achieving academic status of X Middle School also was a consideration in the selection process. Schools identified as "low-achieving" were of concern to the district because of low test scores and poor attendance rates. Initiatives such as the establishment of a Professional Development School project at such a site were seen as a positive step in increasing school performance.

Respondent A cited "geographical considerations" as a selection factor. Accessibility to the Interstate was a consideration because of the distance between the school site and the university.
Additional Responses

Respondent A stated that the presence of a Professional Development School in the district would give the district an opportunity to watch the student teachers at work. Of those interviewed, Respondents 1 and 1 stated that the reason for the selection of X Middle School was that the principal was "wanting changes." Respondent L stated that she recalled being told that the project would entail a lot of technology, as well as involvement with the school district and the university. She stated that involvement with technology and the university had indeed happened, but that the involvement with the school district had not. Respondents 2, 4, and 5 did not know why X Middle School had been selected. Respondent 8 said she was not involved in the selection process.

How Was the Concept of a Professional Development School Explained to Members of the University and School Faculties?

Were the Underlying Purposes Behind a Professional Development School Initially Explained?

The Holmes Report defined a Professional Development School as a place where collaboration, in order to develop proven exemplary, results-based educational experiences, occurs. Additionally, the Professional Development School includes access to technology for economically and culturally diverse student populations. Another major purpose of Professional Development Schools is the development and professional
renewal of teachers and administrators for urban schools through the integration of technology and effective teaching practices.

University faculty remembered the concept of the Professional Development School being explained to them through a series of retreats and informal memos during the spring of 1992. Project administrators also reported a lack of "buy-in" among the faculty members. This initial lack of interest resulted in the negotiation of incentives which were not part of the original program grant.

The concept of a Professional Development School was explained to members of X Middle School in a series of general faculty meetings led by university and school district representatives during the spring of 1992. During the course of these meetings, teachers were given the option to remain in the school during the 1992-1993 year or transfer to other schools with the district. The faculty was also told that those wishing to remain would have to complete an application process and agree to added professional responsibilities, such as technology training and extra inservice sessions. Respondents at all levels of involvement recalled the announcement of an application process and the fact that teacher activity caused the district to renege on implementing it. The researcher was not able to ascertain if an actual grievance was filed by a local teacher union or if the mere threat of one was sufficient to cause the district to decide against the application process.

University Faculty. Respondent F, assistant to the Project Director, and Respondent M, a former Site Coordinator, both reported that the
concept of a Professional Development School was explained to the university faculty through a series of planning retreats during the 1991-1992 planning year. Respondent F also stated that a mission statement was formulated during these retreats. Respondent J concurred. Respondent F stated that, although the concept was repeated, the university faculty "weren't getting it." She further stated that "some of the school people got it before the university people." Respondent G said that the concept was explained through a series of internal memos sent to the university faculty. The researcher was unable to locate copies of these memos. When interviewed, Respondent G stated that the Professional Development School concept was the "last best chance for university-based teacher education" to collaborate with school districts and move into a more field-based setting. Respondent K stated that the university faculty members were given an explanation of the goals of the grant.

Respondent H, a university professor, reported "hostility and open opposition to the PDS" as a concept because of the lack of resources and faculty. He also reported a lack of "buy-in." Respondent D, the Project Director, cited "negativity" and "a lot of resistance" because of the way that the Interim Dean explained the project to the university faculty. Respondent D further stated that the elementary education department resisted the concept. Respondents H and M concurred with this. Respondent M referred to the "animosity in that department" and stated that the consensus was that the project was too far away and would involve a lot of work. The secondary faculty, as reported by Respondent D, was more receptive.
Respondent K, the current Site Coordinator, reported "some buy-in" among university faculty.

Respondent G reported that he helped negotiate "concessions," such as extra pay from the Provost's Office, for university faculty willing to make a commitment to the Professional Development School. An internal memorandum, dated October 3, 1991, stated that $18,000 had been allocated for stipends for university personnel willing to work in the Professional Development School. This stipend was a "recognition of the additional demands placed on faculty working in the PDC including a difficult, time-consuming commute." A subsequent memo, dated October 28, 1991, from the Project Director to one of the Site Coordinators listed these additional incentives: supplemental travel funds, travel monies, a supplemental research fund, opportunities to participate on a team of faculty and researchers, workload considerations, and merit, promotion, and tenure credit for work in the Professional Development Center (PDC).

Respondent D mentioned planning groups as a way of explaining the concept initially. Respondents I and J alluded to initial meetings held on the university campus and attended by members of the university, as well as the school. Respondents D, E, and H stated the presence of hidden agendas between the African-American and Hispanic school district representatives during these meetings.

X Middle School. The concept of a Professional Development School was explained to the administration and faculty of X Middle School through a series of faculty meetings during the spring of 1992. The initial meeting
was cited by the majority of Respondents (Respondents A, B, C, D, H, J, L, M, 1, 6, 7, 8, and 9). Follow-up meetings were cited by Respondents A, 5, and 7. Various meeting topics were recalled by respondents.

Respondents I, 5, 8, and 9 remembered that handouts describing the Professional Development School concept were distributed at faculty meetings. Additionally, Respondent 5 stated that the concept was further explained by "academic group representatives," as well as PDC meeting minutes. Academic group representatives were elected faculty from each academic team who served on the school’s Leadership Team. It was their responsibility to represent their academic team and keep them abreast of pertinent information. Respondent E stated that the PDC Institute, held in the summer of 1992, helped to further explain the concept to those in attendance.

**Application Process.** Respondents, A, B, C, D, and 5 all recalled that X Middle School teachers were given the option to stay in the school once it became a Professional Development School or to transfer. Respondent B stated that there was a "two way opt-out" in which teachers could transfer on their own or in which the Principal could transfer them at the end of the year. Respondent 1 stated that the Area Director "cajoled and threatened teachers, promising to fire any teachers not living up to the contract drawn up stating intent of the teachers to support the program, attend extra training classes." Respondent E stated that the school faculty thought that the PDC was a place "that was going to take their jobs." Respondent C stated that a grievance was filed by teacher organizations to stop an
application process that was to take place for the 1992-1993 school year. When asked, Respondent A, an Associate Superintendent, stated that he knew nothing of a grievance, but that would not have been handled at his level. Respondent D stated that he did not know if an actual grievance had been filed or if the threat of one had occurred. He did, however, remember "union intervention of some kind." Respondent I concurred with the latter part of that statement when he stated that the "union made some sort of waves downtown." Respondent E stated that she believed this to be the beginning of the building Principal's "troubles," because he was perceived as a "paper principal" from that time on.

The school district's decision not to employ an application process is alluded to in internal "Notes from meeting" dated January 29, 1992. This decision is merely listed as an item on the meeting agenda. The researcher was unable to locate documents describing the specifics behind the decision.

Additional Responses. Respondents A and 5 recalled the mention of extra training that would be associated with the project. Respondent 6 mentioned the technology that would be brought into the school and referred to it as the "highest selling point." Respondent I stated that the whole concept was the linkage of the school and the university in order to provide better instruction.

How Were These Purposes Perceived by Members of the University Faculty, as Well as Members of the School's Faculty and Administration?

Respondents at the university level felt that the purposes behind the Professional Development School project were not clearly defined and
suffered from a lack of "buy-in." One respondent reported technology as part of the project's purpose. Site visits were made by several university participants in an effort to better understand the project's purposes.

School respondents reported "mutual benefit" to the university and the school. Other respondents reported feeling "unclear," "intimidated," and "cajoled." Most respondents did not specifically answer the question.

**University Faculty.** Respondent K stated that the purposes and designs were "not clearly defined." He also cited the influx of technology as part of the Professional Development School purpose. Respondent F stated that buy-in for the program occurred at X Middle School, but that the university faculty was "not getting it." This last view was also expressed by Respondent H. Respondent M stated that various site visits were made by teams of program participants as a way of understanding the purposes behind a Professional Development School.

**X Middle School Faculty.** When asked about how the concept was perceived, Respondents I and 3 stated that it was to be of mutual benefit to both the university and the school district. Respondent I further stated that "we kind of had a notion of what we wanted to do, but I also felt like we were 'building the plane in flight' because of some unclear lines." He did not elaborate on what he meant by "unclear lines." Respondents C and 1 stated that the faculty felt "intimidated" and "cajoled." Respondent E remembered perceiving technology as "the thrust" of the project. Respondent J described the purpose as one of meeting the need to train
student teachers for "urban involvement." Respondent 6 referred to the original name, "The School of the Future" when asked about the project's perception. Respondent 4 did not answer the question.

**Additional Responses.** The perceptions of the purpose behind a Professional Development School were not specifically answered by most. Respondents D and M stated that it was "needed" because of a lack of involvement within the public school systems on the part of the university faculty. Respondent F stated that the interns helped make it a PDC.

**What Type of Communication Structure Was Established to Manage the Problems Encountered in the Process of Establishing a Professional Development School at this Site?**

As is true of any project involving various organizational structures, the need to establish a communication structure within the Professional Development School project became a concern during the early stages of the project. University faculty remembered committees and meetings as a way of establishing this structure. They also remembered "selective listening" practices and "personal agendas." University faculty remembered realizing the need to formalize the communication structure. This led them to the development of a line/staff chart. What began as an informal structure was transformed into a formalized procedure as needs and concerns arose. University faculty members recalled communication problems at various levels within the project.
School faculty recollections paralleled those of university faculty. Respondents reported the formation of committees, as well as communication problems between various persons in leadership positions within the project. When asked to explain the chain of communication, each school district respondent responded differently.

**University Faculty**

Respondent M, a former Site Coordinator, reported that "communication always seemed to be a problem even when we were in the same room. Personalities and personal agendas seemed to get in the way a lot, and I really feel like some people were practicing selective listening." She further stated that the basic communication structure involved a series of committees and meetings. Respondent H concurred with the meetings and mentioned training as a means of facilitating the communication structure.

An internal memo, dated November 22, 1991, announced the time and date of the first Operational Planning Meeting. A subsequent meeting, dated December 10, 1991, listed the formation and composition of task groups.

Respondents D, F, and K stated that they saw a need to formalize the process. This need resulted in the development of a line/staff communication chart. This chart can be found in Appendix B of this document. Respondent D, the Project Director, also stated that the X Middle School faculty formed committees to run the school because "the school wasn't getting run." He further stated that the communication process
began as an informal one and developed into a "boiling cauldron" that would periodically overflow. When this occurred, he stated that he would have to "go wipe the edges and intervene at some higher level." Respondent F supported this, explaining that the Project Director was "out there a lot."

The Project Director recalled that he had communication problems with the Principal. He also cited conflict between the two Site Coordinators and the Principal's "very passive approach" as factors contributing to the problem of communication. Respondents F and K cited the formation of a Leadership Team as X Middle School as a means of facilitating communications.

**X Middle School Faculty**

Respondents at X Middle School also reported communication problems between the Project Director and the Principal. Respondent E explained that the Project Director had a vision for the project but did not understand how a real school works. She also believed that the Project Director thought the Principal had more power than he actually did and that the district would support the Principal. This respondent felt that the Principal really understood what the Professional Development School "was supposed to be" and that he was realistic about district politics. The Principal also recalled communication problems between himself and the Project Director.

Other activities clarified communications. Respondent E stated that the committees formed during the 1992 Summer Institute were a way of handling the communication process. She stated that there was a
"superficial understanding" of what a Professional Development School was, but that the project was not fully understood until after it started operating. Respondents I, 1, and 9 cited the formation of the Leadership Team as a means of facilitating the communication structure.

**School District Personnel**

The Associate Superintendent, stated that the communication process was handled between the Project Director and the Area Director. The Area Director, stated that the communication process was between the building level administrator and the university. He said that his job was to "broker the system" when problems arose. The building level Principal, stated that the communication process was not clearly defined and referred to it as "stiff" at first.

**What Problems Developed?**

Respondents reported various problems that resulted in the process of establishing the Professional Development School project. These problems included levels of involvement, communication, training, intern placement, and technology.

**Levels of Involvement.** The problem of "buy-in" on the part of both university and school faculty was mentioned by Respondents A, D, E, I, K, and 1. Respondents 4 and 5 stated that there was not enough understanding. Respondent 5 added that the "uninvolved faculty felt left out and perhaps ignored." Respondent A stated that "management" was a problem. Respondent K stated that a problem that existed was the fact that
some school faculty members were still asking what a PDC was even after 3 years of operation. She also stated that, "We are a PDC whether we have 1 intern or 25 interns."

**Communication.** Respondents M, 1, 4, 7, and 9 stated that communication was a problem. Respondent 4 stated that "roadblocks became problems as many teachers/administrators were unwilling or unable to communicate."

**Training.** Respondent 4 cited a lack of able mentors in certain discipline areas and continued training that was helpful but not always successful. Respondent I concurred with this when he stated that the inservices were not always "specific to the need." Respondents K, 4, and 8 cited not enough initial training as a problem. This resulted in teachers not knowing how to mentor.

**Intern Placement.** The problem of intern placement was also cited by Respondents F and K, as well as the problem of determining how many interns a mentor was to have in one year. Respondent I stated that the presence of too many interns at first was a problem. He also stated that the interns were "treated like kids" by one of the Site Coordinators. Respondent 4 concurred with the last part of that statement.

**Technology.** Respondent 6 stated that the school faculty was given a "comfort level survey" to determine their level of computer familiarity. Technology was a problem listed by Respondents F, J, K, L, 1, and 6.
Respondent J stated that she felt that the school district was "ahead of itself" regarding some of the technology promises it made.

Respondent 6 cited Blue Bonnet as a problem and said that "unfortunately, the staff heard wishes that never materialized." Project Blue Bonnet was cited by Respondents A, D, E, G, H, I, and L as a problem area. Blue Bonnet was referred to as "all talk" by Respondent A. Respondent H referred to the director of Project Blue Bonnet as a "blow-hard." Respondent A referred to technology as "an instant problem" and stated that he felt that the university was "over sold" on Blue Bonnet's ability to deliver.

Respondent D stated that the university's Computer Education Department was "heavily hooked into the Project Blue Bonnet agenda" and that they "couldn't make anything happen." Respondent J stated that Project Blue Bonnet consisted of good people who were trying to do "good stuff." She went on to say that they did not understand the costs involved, the equipment that was going to be needed, or the training issues involved in the project. Respondent H stated that there was a lot of "politics involved in the selection of the technology" because of the presence of those favoring an IBM platform and those favoring a Macintosh platform. Respondents A, B, and D stated that the school district ended up incurring some of the technology cost.

Additional Responses. Respondent 3 stated that the red tape involved in working with a "district this large" was a problem. Respondent 1 stated that the benefits associated with a PDC "never got to the large group."
Respondent E cited a lack of consistency in Site Coordinators, a "power monger" Site Coordinator, and a "lack of leadership" Principal.

**How were these problems resolved?**

Respondents stated that the problems resulting from the development of the Professional Development School were resolved in several ways. The creation of a formalized communication structure and the formation of a PDC Leadership Team were cited.

When asked about resolutions to problems, Respondent 6 cited the line/staff chart as a solution. The formation of a communication committee was also mentioned by this respondent.

Respondents F, I, 3, and 6 all mentioned the formation of a Leadership Team, and Respondent E mentioned the meetings held by the Executive Committee. Respondents 3 and 9 stated that the formation of committees during the Summer Institute was a way of resolving the communication structure problem.

**Additional Responses.** Respondents 1 and 3 stated that they were unsure as to whether the communication problem had been resolved. Respondent E concurred and stated that "we just go on to new years with new problems and approaches." She further stated that she saw no carry through in any of the goals that had been set. Respondent K quoted the Project Director's reference to putting the plane together while in flight and added that "it was exciting, but we naturally had problems."
How Were Faculty Members at the University and School Level Selected and Trained for Participation in the Professional Development School?

University faculty remembered the selection and training of participants for the Professional Development School project in various ways. Volunteers were solicited at first. When the level of response was not what had been expected, respondents remembered "other measures" as being used. Respondents also remembered certain faculty members being selected because they were "new faculty" or because they met certain qualifications that the program desired. Training was recalled as having occurred through a series of meetings. One respondent reported the presence of a "tangential agenda" at the training meetings. One respondent reported the presence of a "tangential agenda" at the training meetings.

Those selected for participation from the university in this project at X Middle School included the Project Director, the Site Director, and a Middle School Coordinator. University faculty members interviewed for this study consisted of faculty members who assumed leadership roles in the Professional Development School project within the College of Education faculty.

At the school faculty level, respondents remembered the transfer and application process, and the selection of the location, as opposed to the selection of faculty. Members also recalled some type of teacher activity which resulted in teacher organization intervention. The exact level of teacher union organization remains unclear.
University Faculty

At the university level, Respondent D reported that the faculty was selected on a volunteer basis. He further stated that training occurred "only in the sense that they visited sites." Regular meetings were also a part of the training, but those meetings "were taken up with a subordinate, a tangential agenda, which was to get the fiber optics and distance learning network up on this project." Respondent D also mentioned "dialogic" training being given to university faculty. Respondents F and M concurred, although Respondent M stated that "when the response was less than expected (or perhaps desired) then other measures were taken to almost coerce people into participating."

Respondent H stated that "new faculty tend to get selected." He further stated that he believed one Site Coordinator was selected because she was an ethnographer, and the second Site Coordinator was selected because she was Hispanic. Respondent H also stated that the university faculty was not trained in technology and that he did not "think they were particularly trained for participation in the Professional Development School."

Respondent G stated that "the school district fought any kind of selection" and worried about teacher organizations. He further stated that a compromise was reached, and the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and Project Director met with the school faculty to explain that "the role of most of the teachers was going to change, that there would be an expectation that they would work with significant numbers of per-service
teachers." He also stated that he thought that the Superintendent was "shadow boxing" and did not want to risk union intervention.

X Middle School

Respondent C stated that school faculty members "were not selected to participate per se." She further stated that first-year teachers were transferred by the Principal at his discretion. However, teachers who the Principal desired to have transferred were permitted to remain as a result of a union grievance. Respondent J stated that the selection of the school staff "really depended upon the location." Respondent A mentioned a 3-year commitment with an evaluation component and his intent to "have a meeting of the minds to see if it was worth doing." Respondents F and G stated that members of the school faculty were given surveys to determine a level of commitment and involvement. Respondent B stated that "all teachers were welcome" and that those who were unwilling to participate "were allowed to leave."

Two documents, entitled "Expectations for Teachers" and "Expectations for Administrators," were distributed to the faculty during the spring of 1992. These documents can be found in Appendix B.

Application Process

Respondent H stated that there was to be an application process for Professional Development School teachers. He stated that the initial plans were that every faculty member would have to apply to remain in the school once it became a Professional Development School. Furthermore,
Respondent H stated that "that was the potential strength that this PDS was going to have that it didn't get." Respondent A concurred that an application process had been planned and cited a "two way opt-out" in which the teacher that "wasn't interested in doing all this" could "exit themselves." Respondent I remembered the application process and stated that he thought it was thrown out because it was against school policy. Respondent E stated that the application process was a "weeding out process, and they [the teachers] knew it." She further stated that the application process was another aspect of "superschool" and that the real purpose of the application process was to get super-teachers. She stated that "it was so much . . . so many elements of it that it was real hard to see how it would translate to the real world." Respondent D concurred with the existence of an application process and stated that "all we were looking for was commitment." He stated that the Area Director added a transfer process to this in the hopes of getting "some turnover of faculty that needed to go." Respondent 9 also remembered an application process.

**Training**

Many respondents remembered that training was provided. Respondents I, 1, 3, and 7 reported the training received at the Summer Institute. Respondents I, K, L, 1, 3, and 4 reported the Leadership Team as part of the training. Respondents F and 9 also mentioned that the coaching and mentoring training the mentor teachers received was a big part of the training, as was the creation of a mentoring guide. Respondents L and 4 also mentioned the coaching and mentoring training.
Mentor Selection and Training

The identification of mentor teachers was of prime concern at the start of the Professional Development School project’s implementation year. The initial selection was done by university and school administrators. Later assignments were made by the Mentor Selection Committee. This committee consisted of members from the university, school administration, and school faculty. Responses to the question reflect the evolution of this process. Respondent C stated that mentor teachers were selected by the Principal and the two Site Liaisons the first year. Selections were based upon qualifications of the teacher and content area need. Respondents 6 and 8 concurred with Respondent C. Respondent 6 added that the Mentor Selection Committee "evolved" in the process. Respondents I, K, L, 1, 4, 6, and 7 also identified the Mentor Selection Committee as a way of selecting mentor teachers. Respondent 4 stated that "those looking to be mentors were asked to go through training." Respondent 2 stated that "you must be on the ‘inside’ to have a student teacher." Respondent 1 also mentioned the "inner circle."

What Perceived Impact Did the Professional Development School Have on the School’s Program and Curriculum?

Respondents reported that an increase in attendance rates for both students and teachers at X Middle School had impacted student achievement. Increased test scores as well as the introduction of the program’s technology were also reported as having an impact.
Teacher induction was reported to have been impacted in several ways. Respondents' answers ranged from "positive" to no "vast improvement." Various respondents cited the impact that the presence of the interns had upon the teachers and students of X Middle School. Staff development, innovative instructional strategies, and teacher professionalization were given as ways in which empowerment of practice had occurred.

What was the Perceived Impact on Student Achievement?

Attendance Rates and Test Scores. Respondents D, I, and F all reported increased attendance rates for both faculty and students. An increase in TAAS scores was cited by Respondents C, I, K, 2, 3, 4, and 5. The 1994 School Report Card for X Middle School showed a 15% increase in Reading scores, and 18.7% increase in Math scores, and an overall increase of 16.3% in all tests. The researcher was able to find documents showing the increase in student attendance rates during the period from 1992-1994. Data on teacher attendance was not available. Test scores from 1993 and 1994 were also located. These documents, which show the change in test scores and student attendance rates, can be found in Appendix B.

Technology. Respondents C, 6, and 9 said that technology provided through the Professional Development School had an impact on the school. The Grade Book Program and the Long Distance Learning Lab were especially important. Respondent E stated that she did not believe that the school had changed any as a result of having a Professional Development
School program other than the fact that "some people had interns and computers and others didn't." Respondent I stated that he believed that "the full impact was coming."

**Other Effects of the Professional Development School.** Respondent I stated that the school was moving toward recognizing problems while Respondent M stated that she saw more university faculty involvement in the school. Respondent 5 stated that the perceived impact depended upon the person doing the perceiving. Respondent B stated that the greatest impact was "around the other schools" because the PDC interns were being hired in other schools within the same Area. He also stated that there was a different type of emphasis at the schools in terms of instruction.

Respondents 3 and 5 stated that the impact of the Professional Development School had been "positive." "More hands and eyes" was the answer given by Respondent K. Respondent 8 concurred with this when she cited a low teacher-student ratio. Respondent B stated that having a lot of turnover was a "plus," and that any time you are able to see people working and know what you are getting, you are "better off than just a cold interview." Respondent 9 stated that "the curriculum focus has changed" but did not elaborate on how it had changed.

Respondent A, E, and 9 stated that there was no effect on student achievement. Respondent E added that maybe the program had a negative impact because "you cannot expect a no-experience teacher to teach as well as an experienced teacher." Respondent A stated that he saw no connection and said that he did not think it had the "component parts to substantially impact student achievement."
Respondent C stated that a negative impact of the program was the use of two school classrooms for the Professional Development School. She said that this was perceived as "wasted" space since some teachers had to float. Respondent E cited a possible drop in TAAS scores because of intern inexperience. She also cited the fact that no research had been conducted, even though it was an initial component of the project. Respondent E also stated that having separate Site Coordinators for the elementary and middle school site was negative. Respondent 1 cited "irregular schedules" as a problem. Respondent F stated that the "internal turbulence" within the building had limited the perceived impact on X. Respondent E stated that, although the school had gotten some good teachers, it had also lost some.

What Was the Perceived Impact on Teacher Induction?

Respondent 9 reported that she had "not seen a vast improvement" in teacher induction. Respondents K, 5, and 6 stated that the interns appeared to have a "less difficult first year" as a result of their Professional Development School experience. Respondent 2 cited an "improved" teacher induction. Respondent 4 stated that the interns chose to remain in the area. Respondent I stated that he thought "we were headed in the right direction" and that "the induction part would have a lot to do with the collaboration of the school and the university." Respondent K stated that the interns "go from being a student teacher out here to being teachers and feeling better about the whole situation." Respondents D and F said that the multicultural training given to the interns was a positive effect on teacher induction.

Responses to this question were based upon respondent observation of
interns who chose to remain at X Middle School as teachers of record. Responses were also based on contact which was maintained between interns and project personnel.

**Intern Impact.** X Middle School has served as a placement site for approximately 60 interns during the first 3 years of the program. Respondent D described the impact that the interns have had on the school. She stated that they have helped in extra curricular activities and have been supportive of other school programs. Respondent 5 stated that the program "had enhanced and enlightened mentors and teacher interns, making them more involved and professional." Respondent 3 stated that it had a large impact. She said that "We learned from interns. We got extra training. We were encouraged to try new things." Respondent 8 concurred with this when she mentioned that the interns had brought in both enthusiasm and new ideas. Respondent 1 stated that the program positively affected the student teachers by the fact that many of them wanted inner-city placements at the end of their student teaching semester. Respondents D, F, K, and 1 stated that the presence of the interns gave the students opportunities that they would not have had otherwise.

**What Was the Perceived Impact on Teacher Empowerment?**

Teachers perceived "empowerment" as "enhancement" of their professional expertise. This perception is reflected in the responses given to the researcher. Staff development was cited by Respondents C, I, K, 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 as empowering teachers. Respondents C and E stated that
empowerment had been great prior to the 1994-1995 school year. Respondent E stated that she saw empowerment of practice as "essential" and that last year they had seen "how it could work and the potential that it had and how we could work together to make this school into a good school." Respondent I stated that it "empowered teachers to do things on their own and not to wait for any direction from anybody." He further stated that "we empowered the teachers to do best practice kinds of things."

Respondent 4 stated that the PDS has created an "evolution of the Middle School plan which would have definitely surpassed a 'non-PDS' X. This has had a profound, but perhaps unmeasurable, effect on the students at X." Respondents C, I, K, 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7 stated innovative teaching strategies as a perceived impact. Respondent C stated that the PDC program impacted the curriculum of the mentor teachers in the area of "innovative teaching strategies modeled by the students teachers."

Respondents D, E, I, K, and 6 cited increased levels of professionalization among teachers. Respondent K cited a "leadership role" that had emerged among the faculty and added that she saw teachers who were making "positive contributions to the profession."

Additional Responses. Respondent M stated that the creation of a Professional Development School had caused university faculty to become more involved. Respondent A stated that he didn't have enough information to know if the program had done any good in the areas of student achievement, teacher induction, and empowerment of practice. He stated that he had "never really been to see the program work from day to day."
Respondent B made a similar statement when he said that he couldn’t answer the question because he “wasn’t involved in day to day issues.” Respondent 9 reported no impact on teacher empowerment.

What Type of Collaborative Process Was Utilized in the Establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School?

Respondents from the university cited various efforts to establish a collaborative process. Involvement from the school faculty along with training retreats were mentioned. Other university respondents reported the presence of problems within X Middle School as detrimental to the collaborative process.

Respondents from the school remembered the collaborative process as “on-going” and marked by teacher input. Others, however, were of the opinion that the administration would rather it “go away.” Respondents cited a variety of examples of collaboration.

The question of the collaborative process used in the establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School was not answered by nearly half of the respondents. Respondents A, C, G, H, L, J, 4, 5, and 8 had no response to the question.

University Faculty

Respondent M stated that ”from the start we knew that we wanted to involve teachers and not just administrators in the planning and implementation” of the Professional Development School. She went on to
state that a lot of "effort and energy" were expended attempting to make the venture a collaborative process. Respondent F replied that university faculty attended training retreats. Respondent M stated that the Project Director attempted to get the university faculty involved. Respondent D stated that part of the problem he saw in the collaborative process was that "there were so many concerns about the way the school was going" that it was impossible to isolate the Professional Development School component from the ongoing operations of the school. He also stated that some of the collaborative process got "subverted or ended" by the administration.

Respondent D stated that he viewed the collaborative process as "open" and that "any issue, any problem, any desire about the Professional Development School operation was open to discussion."

X Middle School

Respondent I stated that the collaborative process was an "on-going thing." He went on to say that collaboration did exist on a lot things and that he was sure that, had they gone longer, they would have been equal partners in establishing a new school. Respondents 1 and 9 replied that a collaboration was supposed to exist with the school, the university, and a business/sponsor for the technology input. Respondents 6 and 7 concurred, with Respondent 7 adding that "decisions were typically not made unless input was given from teachers/administrators." Respondent B stated that the collaborative process was "never really engaged." Respondent 2 stated that he believed both Principals would rather the project go away.

Respondent 3 stated that the two Site Liaisons had participated in the
project's establishment and that everyone else was "pretty much in the dark about it." Respondent 5 replied that he was not fully aware of how the collaborative process was established.

Examples of Collaboration

Respondent F cited the Leadership Team meetings, the Distance Learning Lab, the Executive Committee meetings, conference opportunities, and the site visits as examples of collaboration. Respondent K cited the hiring process used to employ the elementary school Site Coordinator as a collaborative effort between university and school district personnel.

Respondent E reported the Summer Institute as an example of collaboration and called it very exciting. She stated that the Summer Institute and the site visits helped participants have "a vision of what the school could look like," as well as realize the potential involved in the project. She further stated that the administration had not attended the Summer Institute and, as a result, did not share the vision of the faculty. She referred to it as "the tail wagging the dog."

An Application of Easton's Political Systems Model in the Development of X Middle School as a Professional Development School

Easton's (1965) Political Systems Model furnishes a conceptual framework that organizes an analysis of the politics present in the interrelationships of organizations. This model provides a framework for analyzing the politics present in the selection and implementation of X
Middle School as a Professional Development School. Figure 1 provides the reader with a visual representation of Easton's model. Figure 2 examines a specific issue as it goes through the political system model. Figure 3 is an application of Easton's model to the process involved in the selection and establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School.

The system's model shows that society is made up of major institutions, or subsystems, such as the economy, educational systems, and religious organizations. Easton (1965) explains that the political system is the source of "authoritative allocation of values." The political system is linked to other subsystems through inputs and outputs. Stress in the other subsystems creates demands on, and supports for, the political system. The political system converts these inputs into decisions or outputs, which then feed back into the environment. Environmental stresses affect the ability of the system to both allocate values and induce individuals to accept decisions as binding.

The Professional Development School movement is one of the many efforts to reform public schools that arose in the 1980s. Concerns about teacher preparation and professionalism, new teacher preparation, and student achievement are all environmental factors that must be considered when analyzing the politics involved in this project. An additional factor that must be considered is the need felt by the university to respond to the challenges of the Holmes Report.

Demands are pressures placed on the system, while supports can be defined as a willingness to abide by either the decisions of the system, or the system itself. According to Easton (1965), the political system converts
Figure 1. Easton’s Political Systems Model
Figure 2. An Example of Easton's Political Systems Model

**Environment**
- Concern about low student achievement

**Political System**
- University
- School district
- School faculty
- Administration

**Demands**
- Increased student attendance rates
- Higher test scores

**Supports**
- Interns and university faculty in building additional professional training
- Funding

**Outputs**
- PDS site designation and implementation
- Technology training specific to areas of weakness

**Implementation**
- Needs: Specific staff development
- Innovative teaching strategies introduced by faculty concerted effort to raise attendance rates and test scores

**Feedback Loop**
- Increased student achievement evidenced by:
  - Increased student attendance rates
  - Higher test scores
Figure 3. An application of Easton's Political Systems Model in the establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School

**Environment**
- Concern about:
  - Teacher preparation & professionalization
  - Student achievement
  - Response to Holmes Report

**Demands**
- Increased student achievement
- Application Process
- Commitment to PDC

**Political System**
- University
- TEA
- School faculty & administration
- Teacher organizations
- Project Blue Bonnet

**Outputs**
- Memorandum of Agreement
- Site designation
- Promised technology
- Committees
- Time line
- Withdrawal of Application Process

**Support**
- Collaboration between university and school district
- Funding
- Training

**Implementation**
- Summer Institute
- Staff development enhanced by university resources
- Technology
- Liaisons selected
- Mentor selection and training
- Interns

**Outcomes**
- Increased teacher awareness and professionalization
- Interns hired by school district
- Technology not operational
- Innovative teaching strategies
- Positive impact:
  - Student achievement
  - New teacher induction
  - Teacher empowerment of practice

**Feedback Loop**
inputs by either absorbing them, reducing them, or combining them. Which inputs make it through the system depends upon the values that are being reinforced by the conversion process as well as the values of the authorities who are operating within the input flow.

The components of the system for this project included the university, the Texas Education Agency, school faculty and administration, and teacher organizations. An analysis of the demands relevant to this project revealed the following demands placed upon the system: collaboration between the university and the school district, increased student achievement, funding, training for both the faculty at large as well as the mentor teachers, the proposed staff "opt-out," an application process requiring a commitment to the Professional Development School, accountability, and a willingness to serve as a mentor teacher.

A constant interaction between those responsible for the political system and those who are both inside and outside the system occurs. The interactive patterns that take place stem partly from the role definitions which the system has imposed. Interactions generate given pressures inside the system. Easton (1965) calls these pressures withinputs and states that they shape both the conversion process and its product.

In order to analyze the outcomes of this project, an awareness of the organizations that played a major part in the political systems of this process must be identified. The university, the school district, the Texas Education Agency, the school faculty and administration, teacher organizations, and
Project Blue Bonnet were all players in the creation of X Middle School as a Professional Development School.

Easton (1965) states that it is through the feedback process that outputs derive meaning. Because of their ability to influence society, outputs generate inputs back into the system through a feedback loop. Subsystems in the environment respond to "outcomes" of the decision outputs. Outcomes are the results of the decisions and are often shaped by the administrative discussions involved in implementation. The interaction of output with its administration becomes an established behavior or outcome.

A list of outputs was generated as a result of the planning that occurred during the 1991-1992 academic year. These outputs included a Memorandum of Agreement, a site designation, promised technology, the formation and meetings of a Planning Committee, a time frame, the withdrawal of the application process, the formation of the Leadership Team, the Summer Institute of 1992, and the formation of a Mentor Selection Committee.

The 1992-1993 academic year witnessed the implementation of the Professional Development School at X Middle School. Training and staff development were provided by the university. Technology arrived at the school in the form of computers and a Long Distance Learning Lab. Space allotment required the use of two classrooms. Mentor selection and training occurred as well as the selection of the two Site Liaisons. Selected faculty members went on site visits to see other Professional Development Schools.
The 1992-1993 school year saw the arrival of the first group of interns to the program.

The following outcomes can be seen as a result of the presence of the Professional Development School at X Middle School. The first outcome was that of increased teacher awareness and professionalization in the areas of technology and instructional strategies. Another outcome resulting from this project was the hiring of X Middle School interns by the school district. Technology was yet another outcome. Computers were introduced into classrooms, and a Long Distance Learning Lab was constructed. The status of being designated as a Professional Development School was another outcome of this project. A lack of shared vision and the problem of limited involvement are additional outcomes that must be mentioned as well as the withdrawal of Project Blue Bonnet’s promise of support. Finally, two areas of positive impact must be noted: student achievement and the professionalization of teachers.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The process that was used in the selection and establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School was that of direct contract between the university and the school district. This process was also used in the selection of J Elementary School as part of the Professional Development School project. J Elementary School is presently a feeder school for X Middle School. Because of previous working relationships, the university approached key school district personnel and suggested the formation of a Professional Development School project within the district. Many of the school district personnel who were approached were former university students. The final location of the project was determined by several factors. The first of these was the assumed proximity to a fiber optic trunk line based upon information provided by the phone company. This was important because of the influx of technology that the program would bring. However, after the site selection had been determined, it was discovered that the trunk line did not exist. Demographic considerations was another factor used in the site selection. The designated site met the university's requirements for a middle school that was inner-city, high minority, and low achieving. A third element that factored into the selection was that of geographical location. Because of the amount of travel involved,
accessibility to a major highway was of importance. Although physical proximity to fiber optic lines and demographic requirements were of importance in the site selection, the presence of "political infighting" between school district personnel, coupled with the Area Director's academic and professional ties with the university, were added elements that factored into the final site selection decision.

The concept of a Professional Development School is the result of the Carnegie Task Force and the Holmes Group calling for new types of schools focusing on the professionalization of teaching. Professional Development Schools have three functions. The first is increased student achievement. The second, teacher induction, can be seen as an effort to ease the transition from student teacher to first year teacher. The third function is that of empowerment of practice, which entails enabling teachers to make decisions and engage in practices which foster the belief that teaching is a profession.

The concept of a Professional Development School was explained to university faculty members by means of internal memos and planning retreats. It was at these retreats that explanations of the Texas Education Agency grant goal and formation of a mission statement occurred. Respondents reported limited initial involvement on the part of university faculty, notably, the elementary faculty. This resistance was attributed to such factors as excessive workload, the amount of travel involved, and the way that the Interim Dean explained the project. Concessions were negotiated by the Interim Dean in an effort to secure faculty participation.
At the school building level, the concept was presented to the faculty through a series of meetings led by the Project Director, the Superintendent, the Associate Superintendent, and the Area Director. During the course of these meetings, several messages were delivered to the faculty. The first of these was that the project would entail extra training and, consequently, would require a commitment on the part of those involved. An application process would be required of all who decided to stay. Additionally, a two-way option was to have been implemented. This option gave the Principal authority to transfer any new teacher from the building that he did not think would be an asset to the program. This process also allowed teachers to request a transfer. The application process was never carried out due to intervention on the part of one of the teacher organizations. Consequently, the majority of the existing faculty remained in the building.

Technology was mentioned by several respondents as a key inducement for the program. Additional methods of explanation used included planning groups and the selection of two faculty Site Liaisons, who were to report developments to the faculty. The presence of a "hidden agenda" among African-American and Hispanic members of the school district was reported by several respondents. The Summer Institute of 1992 was mentioned by several respondents as having played a key role in helping the faculty understand the concept of a Professional Development School.

The perceived purposes behind the project were several. Mutual benefit for the school district and the university was mentioned by several respondents, although it was also stated that the purposes were not clearly
defined. Words such as "threatened" and "cajoled" were used when remembering the Area Director's address to the school faculty. Another perception of the Professional Development School was that of a place to help prepare student teachers for urban involvement. Respondents reported the influx of technology and site visits made to other Professional Development School sites as helpful in acquiring an understanding of the project's purposes. One respondent remembered thinking of it as "Superschool," while another compared it to "building a plane in flight."

When asked to describe the type of communication structure established for managing the program, respondents' answers varied. The Associate Superintendent replied that the communication structure was between the Project Director and the Area Director. The Area Director responded that communication structure was to have been between the Principal and the university. The Principal responded that the communication structure was not clearly defined. The communication structure was formalized by the development of a line/staff chart. Respondents also mentioned extra training and the creation of committees, such as the Leadership Team, to help facilitate communication. These documents can be found in Appendix B.

One problem that developed as a result of the communication structure was a lack of involvement. Two of the respondents stated that the Principal's management style contributed to communication problems. Other problems revolved around the Site Coordinators. These problems included a lack of consistency in Site Coordinators. One of the Site Coordinators was
perceived as being a "power monger" who was unable to deal with the interns as adults. A lack of understanding among the faculty as to the nature of a Professional Development School was reported as was a feeling of the faculty being "uninvolved" and "left out." Insufficient mentor training, the presence of too many interns during the first operational year of the program, and the lack of capable mentors in certain content areas were also reported as problems. Among the resolutions to these problems, respondents cited the line/staff chart and the formation of both the Leadership Team and of various committees during the Summer Institute. The issue of problem resolution was not mentioned by most respondents, although several did say that they were unsure as to whether problems had been resolved.

Selection of university faculty members was reported as occurring on a volunteer basis. Meetings and training sessions were provided for university personnel in both the elementary and secondary departments. The elementary Site Coordinator, who later became the Site Coordinator for both the elementary and middle school campuses, was added to the university's elementary faculty through a collaborative process between the university and the school district. Other responses included "new faculty tend to get selected" and "other measures were used" when the level of desired response was not attained.

In terms of the selection of the school faculty, location was a prime determinant. Because the school district chose not to enforce the application process, the faculty was not selected per se. Several
respondents reported the Mentor Selection Committee as a way of selecting faculty to participate. The Mentor Selection Committee consisted of the Site Coordinator, school administrators, teachers, and two Site Liaisons. This committee was charged with the responsibility of placing incoming interns with mentor teachers. Other respondents mentioned attendance at the 1992 Summer Institute.

Perceived impact on student achievement was reported in terms of increased attendance rates for both students and teachers, the influx of technology, and the increase in TAAS scores. Negative impact was reported as the possibility of a decrease in TAAS scores because of intern inexperience. The loss of classroom space in order to accommodate the program in the building was also perceived as negative. The acquisition of interns by neighboring schools was, however, reported as positive. While some respondents reported a “positive” impact, others cited “no change” as a result of the program’s presence in the building. The impact of the intern’s presence in the school, coupled with the new ideas and enthusiasm that they had brought into the building, was mentioned as having affected induction into the teaching profession. Respondents also cited that interns appeared to experience a “less difficult” first year of teaching as well as the fact that many interns asked for inner-city placements as a result of their experience in X Middle School. Extra training was also mentioned as influencing induction into the teaching profession.

The perceived impact on teacher empowerment included enhanced staff development opportunities. Faculty members at X Middle School were
requested to submit topics of interest for future staff development sessions. Many of topics were included in the school's staff development plan. Teacher professionalization was another perceived impact. Respondents reported an increased awareness of themselves as professionals along with a desire to use innovative teaching strategies in their classrooms. The emergence of leadership roles within the faculty was also attributed to the professionalization of teaching. School involvement by university faculty was a third perceived impact. The presence of university faculty on the school campus was seen as enhancing the belief that teaching is a profession.

The collaborative process engaged in the establishment of X Middle School as a Professional Development School was described by the Project Director as an "open" process. The Principal described it as an "on-going" process. Input was solicited from the school's faculty and administration. Training retreats were conducted in an effort to involve the university faculty. As previously stated, the elementary Site Coordinator was hired through a collaborative process between the school district and the university. Leadership Team meetings were cited as examples of the collaborative process. Respondent B, the Area Director, reported that the collaborative process was "never really engaged." Both the Associate Superintendent and the Dean of Instruction gave no response when asked to define the collaborative process. Respondents F and K answered with examples of the collaborative process. Respondent M reported that "a lot of
it followed a top-down model." The majority of respondents did not answer the question.

Conclusions

Although X Middle School met the university's demographic and geographical requirements, it cannot be concluded that this site was the school district's first choice. The repeated mention of the desire to locate the Professional Development School project in the northern, more affluent section of the city, coupled with the reported "infighting" between ethnic groups within the school district, led the researcher to conclude that the selection of X Middle School was largely based on political factors. The ties that existed between the Area Director and the university must be kept in mind. Additionally, the fact that, after 3 years of existence, both the Associate Superintendent and the Area Director stated that they had never observed the project's daily operation led the researcher to question the school district's commitment to the success of the program.

It can be concluded that the concept of a Professional Development School was explained to both university and school faculties through meetings and memoranda. The university faculty was initially solicited on a voluntary basis. When full support was not given, however, it would appear that other measures, such as administrative concessions, were taken. The school faculty was not selected per se. The initial intent to enforce an application process for both administrators and faculty succumbed to pressure by teacher organizations. The result was a faculty composed of teachers of varying degrees of competency, some of whom might not meet
the criteria for serving as mentor teachers. The project’s initial explanation on the part of the Area Director left a negative impression on the faculty that, to date, has not been forgotten.

The Professional Development School project has been plagued with technological problems since its inception. The fact that a majority of respondents reported technology as a key component of the project attests to the initial perception of the influx of technology that was to have accompanied this program. Project Blue Bonnet, although well-intentioned, made promises it was unable to keep. This resulted in faculty disillusionment. The supposed fiber optic trunk line proved to be non-existent. After 3 years, the Long Distance Learning Lab remains unoperational because of unresolved technical problems.

Perhaps the prime conclusion that the researcher drew regarding the communication structure was that it never appeared to have been defined. The fact that key players, such as the Associate Superintendent, the Area Director, and the Principal, responded differently when asked about the communication structure indicated the absence of definition. Although roles and responsibilities were delineated on a line/staff chart, a Leadership Committee was formed as a method of disseminating information and making decisions. Additionally, the conflict between the management styles of the Project Director and the Principal as well as the problems between the original Site Coordinators factored into the researcher’s conclusion that communication was not clearly defined or established within the project.
Student achievement, teacher induction, and empowerment of practice appear to have been positively impacted by the presence of the Professional Development School project at X Middle School. Increased student and teacher attendance rates, coupled with the 1993-1994 TAAS results, which were the highest on record for the school, attest to the positive effect that the program has had on student achievement. The commitment on the part of many of the interns to remain in the inner-city area of the district, plus reports of positive first year teaching experiences, led the researcher to conclude that new teacher induction had also been positively impacted by the program. The emergence of leadership roles within the faculty, the freedom to explore innovative teaching practices, and the reported increase in the level of teacher professionalization attest to a positive impact on teacher empowerment.

The collaborative process engaged in developing X Middle School as a Professional Development School did not appear to be clearly understood by involved participants. Although it was perceived to be an open and on-going process by some, the majority of respondents had no answer as to how the process was engaged. This, coupled with the awareness of who responded to the question, led the researcher to conclude that the collaborative process was something that was perceived primarily by those in authoritative positions.

The final step in Easton's (1965) Political Systems Model is an examination of the lessons that can be learned from the analysis of the component parts of the model itself. What lessons can be learned from the
process involved in the emergence of X Middle School and a Professional Development School? The first lesson is that of the danger of premature promises. This is exemplified by the myriad of technological problems that the project has been unable to overcome. It is also exemplified by the district’s inability to fulfill its promise of an application process and the problems that this action has caused the project.

Another lesson to be learned is the importance of a good first impression. The value and potential of this project was cut short in the minds of many by the Area Director’s perceived threats to the school faculty. No amount of "damage control" on the part of the Project Director was able to erase that first, negative impression. Apparently, some members of the university faculty were similarly treated and had similar reactions.

A third lesson to be gleaned from this project is the importance of a clearly defined communication structure. Time initially spent in defining and establishing communication is time that yields the benefits of collaboration and trust among participants.

Recommendations for the Future

This study provided a basis for recommending steps to improve the Professional Development School at X Middle School. It also supported recommendations for working with new Professional Development School sites.
Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that:

1. Given the potential that this program has for impacting teacher preparation and professionalization, school district officials should demonstrate an active interest in the future of the Professional Development School.

2. The district's personnel office, with specific criteria in mind, recruit teachers and administrators assigned to the Professional Development School. These criteria should be developed by the Leadership Team and presented in the form of an informational packet. The district personnel office can then use this information to educate applicants to X Middle School about the requirements and expectations involved in participation in a Professional Development School.

3. University and district give high priority to resolving the myriad of technological problems that have plagued the Long Distance Learning Lab. Both the university and the school district should become actively involved in this matter.

4. University personnel meet with school administrators and members of the Leadership Team to clearly define the communication structure. A contemporary line/staff chart which clearly delineates duties and responsibilities might be helpful.

5. Members of the Leadership Team formulate a presentation explaining the Professional Development School project, considering the
faculty turn-over that occurs naturally in schools. This presentation can be given to the faculty at the beginning of the next school year.

6. Members of the Leadership Team re-evaluate the original mission statement formulated during the Summer Institute of 1992. This process would serve two purposes: it would refresh the concept of the Professional Development School in the minds of the original participants as well as give newer participants the opportunity to feel included in the program. A greater sense of involvement may result from this process.

7. The administration encourage the evaluation of teacher empowerment and the emergence of innovative teaching strategies.

8. University and school personnel provide training in the effective use of the collaborative process.

9. All involved in the Professional Development School undertake a concerted effort to re-focus on the original intent of the program: the professionalization of teachers and the challenge of providing the students with the best possible academic preparation.

Emerging Professional Development School Sites

Based upon the findings of this study, it is recommended that:

1. University personnel work with the school superintendent to establish the underlying concepts behind a Professional Development School at the beginning of the collaborative venture. The commitment to establish a Professional Development School must be honored by all parties involved.

2. Professional Development School project coordinators provide an evaluation component in order to assess the program’s progress.
3. Teachers involved in the Professional Development School make a personal commitment to the program. This will enhance the success of the program.

4. University, school district, and school personnel be cognizant of the potential that the Professional Development School concept has for positively impacting teacher preparation and professionalization and should commit to the success of such a program.

5. School district personnel recruit teachers and administrators for Professional Development Schools using criteria established through a collaborative effort between the university, the school district, and the school staff. This criteria should explain the program's concept, as well as delineate the requirements and expectations associated with participation in a Professional Development School.

6. All involved parties make every effort made to clearly define and implement the communication structure to be adhered to within the program.

7. The Leadership Team develop presentations which explain the concept of a Professional Development School. This presentation needs to be kept current and presented to new faculty members as needed.

8. Those involved in formulating a mission statement make every effort to include as many program participants as possible. This will foster the sense of involvement among faculty members.

9. Participants receive training in the effective use of the collaborative process occur during the early stages of the program's development.
X Middle School was the first Professional Development School project in this area. It has served as a prototype of the struggles, difficulties, and successes inherent in the undertaking of a project of this nature. Subsequent Professional Development Schools have approached members of the school's Leadership Team for advice, which has been generously and openly shared. This sharing has enabled other schools to open Professional Development Schools without some of the difficulties which X Middle School encountered. The story of the emergence of X Middle School as a Professional Development School has truly been that of "building the plane in flight."
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What was the process which was used in selecting this school as a Professional Development School?

2. How was the concept of the P.D.S. explained to the faculty? How were the underlying purposes of the P.D.S. explained?

3. What problems emerged as a result of the process involved in establishing the P.D.S.? What type of communication structure was set in place to manage any problems that might emerge?

4. How were faculty members selected and trained for participation in the P.D.S.?

5. What perceived impact has the P.D.S. had on the school’s program and curriculum? What has been the perceived impact on student achievement, teacher induction, and empowerment of practice?

6. What collaborative process was utilized in the establishment of the school as a P.D.S.?
APPENDIX B

MINUTES, MEMOS, MEMORANDA
MEMORANDUM

To: College of Education Faculty

From: Richard L. Simms

Re: Professional Development Center

Considerable progress has been made on establishment of the Professional Development Center since I talked with you at the faculty meeting on August 19. I want to take this opportunity to bring you up to date.

The Dallas Independent School District has committed to collaborate with the College of Education in developing and operating the PDC. The school district is suggesting the possibility of the PDC being located in an intermediate school with grades 4-8 for 500 students, to be created at the InfoMart on Stemmons Expressway. My only concern about this was whether we could be assured a low socioeconomic, predominately minority student population. DISD has given those assurances. With that issue out of the way, the InfoMart has many things going for it including central location, instant name recognition, excellent facilities, and fiber optics wiring needed for interactive television and networked computers.

I will be meeting with Commissioner of Education Lionel Meno on September 9 to discuss possible Texas Education Agency funding for our PDC and SchoolLINC. General Telephone is flying seven of us including Dallas Superintendent Marvin Edwards to visit the Mississippi 2000 Distance Learning Project on September 20. That visit should be very instructive though the technology our PDC will incorporate is the next level beyond that of the Mississippi project.

We are pursuing foundation funding for start-up costs for the PDC. One funding proposal has gone out with several more in preparation. We are optimistic that we will succeed in locating several sources of support.

Gerald Ponder has taken a leave of absence as chair of Secondary Education to serve as director of the PDC. Gerald has excellent ideas plus extensive experience in field-based teacher education programs. We are fortunate to have Gerald take a leadership role in the Professional Development Center.

A number of you have expressed interest in playing a role in the PDC. Planning for implementation of the Center will begin very soon in order for the first cohort of preservice teachers to begin training in August of 1992. Please contact Gerald about any role you would be willing to play in this endeavor. Thanks.
MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Blaine A. Brownell
   Provost
From: Richard L. Simms
Re: Stipends for PDC Faculty

This will confirm our agreement on September 30, 1991 that a sum in the amount of $18,000 annually will be made available to the dean of the College of Education to provide stipends for faculty willing to work in the UNT/DISD Professional Development Center. It is understood that participating faculty will receive these stipends during the period they work in the PDC and that such payments will not become part of the faculty member's permanent base salary. Stipends will be paid in recognition of the additional demands placed on faculty working in the PDC including a difficult, time-consuming commute.

I appreciate your support of the Professional Development Center and your understanding of the need to provide financial rewards to faculty willing to take professional risks to work in the PDC.

cc: Dean Walter Sandefur
    Dean Cliff Hardy
    Dr. Gerald Ponder
DATE: October 28, 1991

TO: Karen Ford

FROM: Gerald Pondei

RE: Incentives & Arrangements for working in PDC

As a follow up to our earlier conversations about becoming a faculty member in the UNT/DISD Professional Development Center, let me provide this memo with a description of the job, as well as a list of incentives and assurances for faculty members who work in the PDC. I also have attached a copy of the current iteration of the concept paper explaining the PDC, for your perusal. I would like for you to review these materials and think deeply about your willingness to participate in this project. Obviously, I hope that you will answer affirmatively, as you are one of the initial faculty that Dean Simms and I have designated as first preference to work in the PDC (the preferred initial faculty team will be Ponder, Ford, Nistler, Wilhelm, plus one to be named in incoming Urban Education line authorized for the Department of Secondary Education. I hope that you will take these materials and reflect on them quickly and make your decision by November 3, 1991. The time frame on putting together the PDC faculty and planning team is growing short, and there is much to be done. If you need further conversation with Dean Simms or with me, each of us will be more than happy to talk further with you. The remainder of the memo consists of the job description as well as the set of incentives and arrangements for working in the PDC.
Incentives
A set of considerations and incentives for working in the PDC has been negotiated with the Provost and the Personnel Affairs Committees of the Departments of Secondary and Elementary Education. These considerations and incentives are as follows:

1. A salary supplement for each semester of successful service in the PDC. The salary supplement may be in the range of $1500 per semester. The salary supplement is attached to service in the PDC and will cease when service in the PDC is terminated.

2. Opportunity to receive supplemental travel funds for professional travel to conferences, especially when presenting papers related to PDC.

3. Travel monies to travel between Dallas and Denton for work in the PDC.

4. Opportunities to participate in a supplemental research fund directed toward research and development projects in the PDC.

5. Opportunities to participate on a team of faculty and researchers. Participation on this team should provide ample opportunity to conduct research related to the PDC, as well as to enact personal research agendas.

6. Workload considerations for work in the PDC. It is anticipated that the workload in the PDC will include two-thirds instructional related work (classes and supervision) and one-third project development or management. One possible arrangement of workload for the PDC, for example, might include teaching the equivalent of two classes in the PDC, plus curriculum development or research project management in the PDC. It is anticipated that, at least for the first one to two years, the PDC will require a full time workload for PDC faculty, with no other instructional duties.

7. The Personal Affairs Committees from the Departments of Elementary and Secondary Education have agreed to provide merit, promotion, and tenure credit for work in the PDC. This credit is indicated on the attached copies of the memos from the Personal Affairs Committees from Secondary and Elementary Education.

This list of incentives and considerations for the PDC provide the basis for an agreement to become a member of the PDC faculty. Again, if you have questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call. I would request that you provide me a written memo regarding your decision to work in the Professional Development Center. Please get that memo to be by November 5. Thanks.
November 20, 1995

Mr. Gerald Ponder
Professor & Director
UNT/DISD Professional Development Center
P. O. Box 1347
Denton, Texas 76203-3857

Dear Gerald:

I am pleased to submit the names of our members of the Operational Planning Team which will represent the Dallas Independent School District.

Chad Woolery - Deputy Superintendent
Dr. Vera Brooks-Ray - Division Executive, Curriculum & Instruction
Vivian Johnson - Director, School Centered Education
Ruben Gallegos - Division Executive Training & Development
Diana Redspinner - Coordinator-Cable Communications
Richard Marquez - Area Director-Area 1
Alberto Miranda - Principal-L. V. Stockard Middle School
Fernando Lozano - Principal-Lelia P. Chwart Elementary School
Two teachers to be identified.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Chad Woolery
Deputy Superintendent
DATE: November 22, 1991

TO: UNT/DISD PDC Operational Planning Team

FROM: Gerald Ponder, Director, UNT/DISD PDC

RE: Meeting of December 3

The first meeting of the UNT/DISD Professional Development Center Operational Planning Team will be from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 3, in Matthews Hall, Room 322. While we start at 1:00 p.m., some of you may be driving during lunch, and we will have finger sandwiches and snacks at the meeting, if you care to wait until then to eat. An initial agenda for the meeting is attached. If you have other items that should be on the agenda, please let me know by phone or FAX (817-565-4415) ASAP. Otherwise, we will use the other items of business portion of the agenda to address your concerns.

I look forward to seeing all of you on Tuesday, December 3. For those of you coming to North Texas without a parking permit, the most efficient way to do things is to stop by Sullivan Visitor Center (the Police Station) and pick up a parking permit. They will not allow us to do this beforehand, so we will have to ask you for this inconvenience. A map of the campus is enclosed.
DATE: December 10, 1991

TO: Operational Planning Team

FROM: Gerald Ponder

RE: Task Force Assignments and Meeting Times

At our meeting on Tuesday, December 3, we agreed to the following Task Forces and Committee Assignments. Please remember that our next meeting will be during the second week in January at Nolan Estes Plaza. The projected date should be Tuesday, January 14, from 1:00-4:00 p.m. Further details to come later.

TASK GROUPS

Staff/Parent Development
Ruben Gallegos
Sandy Maddox
Arnie Molina
Richard Marquez
Al Miranda
Jeri Hodges
Fernando Lozano
DISD Personnel

Technology
Chad Wollery
Diana Radsipinner
Jeri Hodges
Michael Brown
Jon Young
Kathleen Holmes
Robert Bane
Gerald Knezek
Paul Schieve

Research/Development/Evaluation
Gerald Ponder
Karen Ford
Jon Young
Reg Hinely
Kathleen Holmes
Gerald Knezek
Paul Schieve
Orby Holden

Curriculum (Teacher Education & School)
Richard Marquez
Vera Brooks-Ray
Orby Holden
Diana Radsipinner
Reg Hinely
Robert Bane
Kathleen Holmes
DISD Faculty
UNT Faculty

Mission Statement
Gerald Ponder
Richard Marquez
Vivian Williamson-Johnson

Governors
Community/Parent
School Council Members
Ruben Gallegos
Vivian Williamson-Johnson
Fernando Lozano
Principals

Student Efficacy
Gerald Ponder
Richard Marquez
Vivian Williamson-Johnson
Kathleen Holmes
AGENDA
UNT/DISD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER
OPERATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
January 21, 1992
1:00 - 4:00, Nolan Estes Plaza
Dallas

1:00 1. Updates/Development/Tasks ahead

• Request for application (RFA) process
• PDC developments

1:30 2. Breakouts

• Mission Statement
• Curriculum/Technology
• Staff/Parent Development

2:30 3. Reports from Breakout groups

3:00 4. School Visits
Notes from Meeting
Ford and Ponder

1. Recruiting of individual for position, develop search committee to review applications
   - Assistant professor
   - Fellowship - from DISD
     - sabbatical
     - 1/2 time person

Committee: Hinely
           Ponder
           Ford
           DISD (2)

2. GTE - renig on commitment to project Bluebonnet
   $2000/month charge instead

3. DISD renig on its re-application process
   Simms (Hurley), Ponder, Edwards = Thursday Feb 6, 1992

4. Send copy of survey and cover letter to Gerald

5. Dallas: Spring Break
   Tuesday 2/18
   Tuesday 3/3
   Tuesday 3/10

6. Legislation intent = population
August 10, 1992

Dr. Richard Simms, Interim Dean
University of North Texas
College of Education
P.O. Box 13857
Denton, Texas 76203

Dear Dr. Simms:

The Dallas Independent School District is committed to enter into a collaborative partnership with the University of North Texas, Region 10 Education Service Center, Project Bluebonnet, and the Texas Center for Educational Technology for the purpose of applying to the Texas Education Agency for funding to establish a Professional Development and Technology Center.

The planned project supports and enhances the Dallas Independent School District efforts to develop and renew exceptional teachers and other educators for urban schools through the integration of technology and effective teaching practices into pre-service and staff development training programs. Additionally, it supports our efforts to utilize telecommunications and distance learning for students, staff, parents, and the Dallas community. District staff is committed to participate in the planning, development, implementation and evaluation of the project.

The Professional Development Center offers a way to integrate urban school instruction and staff training with technology in new ways. It allows educators to learn, to teach, and to continue to learn in coming years. It can help redefine the concept of "teaching" and help open doors to a more diverse, technologically demanding learning/workplace of the 21st century.

We are excited about the possibility of working with the Professional Development Center collaborative team and believe that our partnership will prove to be a very successful blend of effective practice and applied research that could truly become a model for Texas and nation.

Sincerely,

Marvin E. Edwards
General Superintendent

Dallas Independent School District

Marvin E. Edwards
General Superintendent
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

FOR

CREATION OF A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

BY

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROJECT BLUEBONNET

REGION 10 EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

The parties named above agree to collaborate on the creation and operation of a Professional Development Center to be physically located in the Dallas Independent School District. The PDC will be housed in a DISD elementary school and the middle school it feeds, and perhaps a third site to be determined. UNT and DISD will use these sites to demonstrate exemplary instruction for students attending those schools and for the training of preservice and inservice teachers and other school personnel.

The Dallas Independent School District pledges the following:

- Strong commitment to the success of the PDC.
- Designation of member of Superintendent's Executive Team to provide DISD liaison to PDC.
- Identification and participation of an elementary school and the middle school it feeds located in a lower socioeconomic neighborhood and near fiber optics cable connections.
- Office space and phones in each school for PDC faculty/staff.
- Teachers and administrators recruited for PDC schools from across the DISD based on their proven expertise and expressed willingness to participate in a PDC which models research-validated teaching methods and utilizes the latest instructional technologies.
- Assistance in recruiting cohorts of preservice teachers from a variety of sources including regular University of North Texas undergraduate teacher education students, alternative certification candidates, and a "grow your own" minority teacher recruitment model targeting current DISD teacher aides.
Commitment to work collaboratively with other PDC parties in seeking extramural funding for PDC.

Participation of DISD personnel in providing preservice and inservice teacher and administrator training, as well as collaborative research and development through the PDC.

Active participation on the PDC Steering Committee.

PDC staff participation on the School Council.

The University of North Texas pledges the following:

Strong commitment to the success of the PDC.

Designation and support of a UNT Project Director of the PDC.

Selection of UNT faculty to work as partners with DISD teachers and administrators in the PDC in preservice and inservice teacher and administrator training, as well as collaborative research and development.

Recruitment of preservice teachers committed to teaching in the Dallas Independent School District.

Payment of travel costs for UNT faculty to work in the PDC.

Delivery of university credit courses on-site at the PDC and via SchoolLINC distance learning model.

Active participation on the PDC Steering Committee.

Commitment to work collaboratively with other PDC parties in seeking extramural funding for PDC.

Project Bluebonnet pledges the following:

Strong commitment to the success of the PDC.

To identify among Project Bluebonnet members technology and telecommunication companies willing to commit equipment and expertise to create "classrooms of the future" in the PDC and at University of North Texas to model the viability and cost-effectiveness of distance learning.

Active participation on the PDC Steering Committee.
o Commitment to work collaboratively with other PDC parties in seeking extramural funding for PDC.

Region 10 Educational Service Center pledges the following:

o Strong commitment to the proposed outcomes of the PDC.

o Joint planning via the PDC Steering Committee.

o Collaborative delivery of training through the PDC.

o Commitment to work collaboratively with other PDC parties in seeking extramural funding for PDC.

Each institution reserves the right to cease participation in the PDC by written notification to other cooperating institutions.

We, the undersigned, agree to participate in a Professional Development School as described in this document:

Signature: Superintendent Dallas Independent School District

Signature: Chancellor University of North Texas

Signature: President Project Bluebonnet

Signature: Executive Director Region 10 Educational Service Center
EXPECTATIONS
for
TEACHERS
working in the UNT/DISD Professional Development Center

- Commitment to additional training in technology and innovative teaching practices. Training may occur after school or in summer.

- Commitment to training in coaching and mentoring for preservice teachers. Training may occur after school or in summer.

- Participation on planning teams with university personnel, district administrators, Service Center personnel, and business and community representatives. Planning time may occur during school day and require a substitute teacher.

- Participation on research teams with university personnel and other teachers.

- Commitment to role extension from classroom teacher to clinical teacher educator.

- Willingness to open classroom for observation.

- Commitment to accept preservice candidates into classroom as active participants.

- Commitment to professional growth, development of new teachers and other educators.

- Commitment to practice and model an attitude of professionalism and problem-solving.

- Commitment to success of students of the school and the teacher candidates in training in the PDC.

- Willingness to attend professional conferences when supported by district or other monies.

- Commitment to serve on planning and evaluation teams for teacher education and staff development.

- Commitment to use new technology in teaching practice.

- Commitment to use and model innovative teaching practices.
EXPECTATIONS
for
ADMINISTRATORS
working in the UNT/DISD Professional Development Center

- Commitment to additional training in technology and innovative teaching practices. Training may occur after school or in summer.

- Commitment to training in coaching and mentoring for preservice teachers. Training may occur after school or in summer.

- Participation on planning teams with university personnel, classroom teachers, Service Center personnel, and business and community representatives. Planning time may occur during school day.

- Collaboration on research projects with university personnel and teachers.

- Commitment to role extension from building administrator to clinical teacher educator and leader in a professional development environment.

- Willingness to open building for observation by interested parties.

- Commitment to accept preservice candidates into the school as active participants in the instructional program.

- Commitment to professional growth, development of new teachers and other educators.

- Commitment to mentor administrative interns.

- Commitment to practice and model an attitude of professionalism and problem-solving.

- Commitment to success of students of the school and the educators in training in the PDC.

- Willingness to attend professional conferences when supported by district or other monies.

- Commitment to serve on planning and evaluation teams for teacher education and staff development.

- Commitment to use new technology in administration and instructional program.

- Commitment to use and model innovative teaching practices and effective leadership principles.
PDC COMMITTEE / STOCKARD
Tuesday, September 21, 1993

COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE- will distribute meeting notes to the faculty

REPRESENTATIVES who attended:
Linda Hogan- liaison
Sue Smith - liaison
Chris Nee- principal
Matt Hunter- Team I
Jerry Mahle- Team ESL
Judy Kucher- area board
Nancy Miller- Team B
David Lhuillier- Team A
Carol Bowens- Team G
Terri Allen- Teams D,E,J
Kristy Showalter- Team C
Ron Landers- Team H

UNT:
Gerald Ponder
Melinda Cowart
Ron Wilhelm

RESPONSIBILITIES:
Linda Hogan- Co-Chair
Sue Smith—Co-Chair
Kristy Showalter- Scribe

COMMITTEES:
Communication distribute and communicate all information relating to PDC newsletter, promo video, fireside chats
School Climate morale, promotes PDC within school, works with FAC
Staff Development seminar topics
Research investigate areas of concern, acts as a channel for researchers from UNT
Finance funding ideas, write grants
Intern handle intern matters
Social Services investigate community and government services which would aid Stockard

FAC addresses faculty concerns, channels morale issues through Climate committee

Accountability addresses Low Achieving School concerns
Team Leaders academic concerns
CAC networks with local businesses to provide resources
* COMMITTEES - decide goals, agendas, and purposes (share with PDC)

* PDC leadership team will meet last working Tuesday of each month:
  - October 26, 1993
  - November 30, 1993
  - December 14, 1993
  - January 25, 1994
  - February 22, 1994
  - March 29, 1994
  - April 26, 1994
  - May 17, 1994

* TECHNOLOGY:
  1. Multimedia production unit will be installed, training will be provided
  2. Survey will assess needs in how to administer technology training

* STAFF DEVELOPMENT:
  1. Plan for needs - coach/mentoring, train teacher cadre to teach faculty
  2. Kids and DLL - demonstrate how to use Distance Learning Lab with faculty and students.

* YEAR LONG FIELD BASED PROGRAM:
  1995 - Interns will start and end with Stockard students, concept is being developed

* OTHER ITEMS:
  1. Interns will be with mentors full-time after this week (except Fridays)
  2. Interns have gained valuable info observing classes
  3. Cowart interns would like to observe Stockard
  4. Projects or special services need to be routed through Melinda Cowart!!
PLANNING FRAMEWORK
UNT/DISD PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

This planning framework provides a draft of the major planning events required for implementing the Professional Development Center. The Framework assumes that the first cohort will begin with the start of the fall semester, 1992.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING EVENT</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED PRODUCT(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial meeting for UNT team.</td>
<td>UNT Planning Team</td>
<td>Early Nov. 1991</td>
<td>Concept statement, strategy outline for PDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Initial meeting for UNT, DISD, and ESC 10.</td>
<td>Planning team with high-level representatives from partners in PDC.</td>
<td>Early Nov. 1991</td>
<td>Concept statement, planning calendar for PDC, site selection, naming of operational planning team from partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initial meeting for operation planning team.</td>
<td>Operational Planning Team</td>
<td>Mid-late Nov.,</td>
<td>Concept statement, planning calendar, initial list of planning tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING EVENT</td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>ANTICIPATED PRODUCT(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Planning meeting for inservice staff development with UNT, DISD, and ESC 10 personnel.</td>
<td>Representatives from operational planning team, other DISD staff development, and ESC 10 personnel.</td>
<td>February 1992 - August 1992</td>
<td>Staff development plan and agreements regarding delivery, responsibility, and billing for staff development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planning meetings between UNT, DISD, and ESC 10 technology personnel</td>
<td>Representatives of operational planning team, technology personnel from partners.</td>
<td>November 1991 - August 1992</td>
<td>Design for technology in PDC and remote sites; agreements for installation, maintenance, and support of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Research and Developmental Planning</td>
<td>Operational planning team; UNT Planning Team; teacher-researchers and school councils of PDC site schools; DISD R&amp;E.</td>
<td>April, 1992 - Fall 1993</td>
<td>Research and evaluation projects targeted and designed for instructional, organizational culture, and technology research projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The School Report Card gives you important information about your child's school. As you read it, remember that every school is different with its own special strengths and needs. The Texas Education Agency urges you to stay actively involved in your child's education. A more detailed report, the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) report, is available upon request from your school. Contact your school if you have questions about this report card.
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1994 TAAS Percent Passing for All Grades Combined

School ratings are based on the percent of students passing each subject of the TAAS for all grades combined at the school, in addition to other requirements. The TAAS standards are:

- Exemplary: at least 90% passing
- Recognized: 85% to 89% passing
- Acceptable: 75% to 84% passing
- Low-Performing: less than 25% passing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Tests</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School (1994)</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (1993)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (1994)</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (1994)</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (1994)</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Produced by Policy Planning and Information Management
Texas Education Agency 087-905-069
The TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Test) is a standardized test that students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 must take. The TAAS has tests in Reading, Math and Writing. Reading and Math are given at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10. Writing is given at grades 4, 8 and 10 only. The graph shows what percent of students passed each subject of the TAAS in 1994. Student groups are denoted by letters within the graph and are read as:

Af - African American
Hi - Hispanic
Wh - White
Ec - Economic Disadvantaged

The table shows what percent of students passed each subject of the TAAS. It shows the percent who passed in the state, the district, the school group and the school. Two years are given for the school. "Group" is a set of 100 other Texas schools that are similar to this school.

TAAS results show the performance of non-special education students who were in the district as of late October in each school year. The graph(s) and table(s) that follow show TAAS results for each grade in the school.

*1994 TAAS Percent Passing for Grade 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Tests</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School (1994)</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (1993)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (1994)</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (1994)</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (1994)</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the tables in this report, a dash (−) indicates that no students were in this classification; an asterisk (*) indicates that fewer than 5 students were in this classification; and a question mark (?) indicates that values were reported outside a reasonable range. In the graphs in this report, values based on fewer than 5 students were not graphed. "ALL" gives the % passing for all tests.*
1994 TAAS Percent Passing for Grade 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Tests</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School (1994)</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (1993)</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (1994)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District (1994)</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (1994)</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Characteristics

This section of the report card shows student characteristics for the school, the school district and the state. It also gives information on attendance, program enrollment and school finances.

Total Students: 1,104  
Grade Span: 07 - 08

### Student Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* African-American</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hispanic</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* White</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Other</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Economic Disadvantaged</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Mobility</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students per Teacher</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* African-Am.</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hispanic</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* White</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Other</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Total</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Program Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Special Ed.</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Career &amp; Tech.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bilingual/ESL</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Gifted &amp; Talented</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Costs per School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$2,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Admin.</td>
<td>$245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Budget</td>
<td>$3,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures are dollar amounts budgeted to be spent during the 1993/94 school year. Total dollar amounts have been divided by the number of students in the school. The district amounts are the average of the school amounts in the district. District central office amounts are not included in the district averages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>94.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>91.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>90.70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TH</td>
<td>87.74%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5TH</td>
<td>89.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>91.79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>90.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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