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This qualitative research study investigated the role of the principal in implementing change in the professional development school (PDS). The study involved 7 elementary schools and 4 school-university collaboratives in the Texas network of 17 Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDTs). The research questions focused on the role, leadership, and management concerns of the PDS principal.

Sites were selected to reflect the widest range in diversity in location, school size, and demographics. Principals, university site coordinators, and mentor teachers from each site were interviewed. Triangulation of data included interviews, and government and school documents.

Findings suggest that the principal is critical to the implementation of the PDS program. Even though CPDT planners gave little thought to the principal's job description or expectations, participants considered the principal a key player. Principals tended to conceptualize their role themselves, based on their individual
circumstances. All principals identified specific PDS role expectations as being a liaison between the school, district, and university; and being an instructional leader. Principals found that they had to balance the needs of university students with the needs of the school children when dealing with the PDS program.

Other findings implied that principal supports, school and university cooperation, university intern selection, and teacher empowerment are important issues in PDS programs. Further research topics in the areas of principal supports, principal stages of concern, principal as change agent, school and university collaboration, and effective PDS designs were suggested.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (1983) raised concerns about the quality of education in public schools, more voices were added to the chorus for school reform (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Crawford, Bodine, & Hoglund, 1993; Deal, 1992; Teitel, 1996). At national, state, and local levels the spotlight focused on teacher training and staff development as a prelude to bringing about change.

Teacher pre-service and in-service training was a key element in federal reform efforts. For example, the Secretary of Labor’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS, 1991) report, What Work Requires of Schools, called for "transforming" public schools to showcase the SCANS competencies and foundation skills and to assess student performance based on the same. In the concluding report, Learning a Living: A Blueprint for Higher Performance (1992), the Commission stated:

This Commission believes that a massive reexamination of teacher training and inservice education is required ....We believe that this task will eventually involve redefining state curriculum frameworks and
certification requirements for teachers....We urge state and local educators (including administrators, teachers, principals, and school board members) to work with local advisory groups....to review pedagogy, curriculum, and the administration of schools for opportunities to advance the SCANS know-how. (p. 20)

Thus, the Commission added its voice to the chorus for educational reform via teacher training and staff development.

In 1994, Congress passed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. This legislation added 2 goals to the 5 National Education Goals established in 1987 by President Bush and the nation’s governors. One of the new goals addressed teacher training:

The nation’s teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century. (U. S. Department of Education, 1994, p. 7)

Overall demands for reform at the national level promoted educational reforms at the state level (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991), the nature of which will be discussed more fully in the literature review. The professional development school emerged as a vehicle for improving the
pre-service preparation of teachers and the continuing professional development of teachers (Teitel, 1996).

Darling-Hammond (1994) cited efforts at the local level to improve teacher training and staff development by building collaborative relationships between schools and universities in Professional Development Centers (PDC). Darling-Hammond (1994) described the Centers as "places of ongoing invention and discovery; places where school and university faculty together carry on the applied study and demonstration of the good practice and policy the profession needs to improve learning for young students and prospective educators" (p. ix). Thus, the local professional development school became the stage for the performance of educational innovation with teachers, administrators, and university personnel cast as troubadours of change.

When new programs or innovations were attempted, leadership was central to effective implementation (Cuban, 1987). Restructuring of education was associated with calls for new forms of leadership. According to Daresh and Playko (1991) and Rodriguez (1989), the increasing recognition of the importance of leadership as a key ingredient in effective schools lead to a corresponding interest in the ways people were made ready for educational leadership. Daresh and Playko (1991) described 3 historical perspectives that have played a part in approaches to educational administration: scientific management, human relations, and
human resource development. However, Daresh and Playko (1991) suggested, 

We may currently be at a time in the development of the field of educational leadership where none of the historical orientations describe the best way to proceed with professional development. With current school restructuring efforts, site-based management, and teachers being asked (or demanding) to take over decision-making roles, educational administration preparation may begin to shift into a fourth perspective characterized by responsiveness to change, necessitating a very different educational leader and policy maker than historical models have hypothesized. (p. 11)

With the complex interorganizational relationships that exist between universities and public schools and the multiple purposes of the professional development schools, the role of the principal in implementing change increased in importance.

While the literature on the principal and on school change showed that principals played a major role in successful (and unsuccessful change), the professional development school literature tended to ignore the principal (Teitel, 1996). Little consideration appeared to have been given to how collaboration with university faculty and staff from other organizations, teacher empowerment, and the
addition of new goals affect the role of the school principal (Teitel, 1996). This study was designed to explore the impact of the professional development school organization on the role of the principal and the effect principals have on implementation of the PDS.

**Statement of the Problem**

Though much has been written to describe the changing role of teachers in the professional development schools, little was known about the role of the principal in these collaborative organizations. The problem this research addressed was to describe the role of the principal in an emerging form of organization—the professional development school—and to identify management or leadership concerns specific to the PDS principal.

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of the study was to add to the body of literature on the professional development school and to the knowledge base on the principalship. A secondary purpose was to provide information that decision makers and planners can use to promote successful PDS implementation.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the formal job description and expectations for the professional development school principal?
2. How are principals in professional development schools selected for their positions?

3. What is the role of the principal in implementing change in the professional development school?

4. What are the additional management concerns of the professional development school principal?
   a. How does the presence of large numbers of pre-service teachers affect the school?
   b. How does teacher empowerment associated with professional development schools affect the principal’s role?
   c. How do university staff interact with the professional development school?

5. What are the formal governance and authority relationships between schools, universities, and other partners in CPDT professional development schools?

6. What supports are provided for professional development school principals (e.g. additional support staff, training, and development opportunities)?

**Definition of Terms**

**Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT):** A network of 17 Texas centers funded by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) for teacher development.

**Education Service Center (ESC):** One of 20 centers that served as the state education agency’s liaison to Texas school districts.
**Intern:** A university student engaged in educational activities with school children at a local school under the supervision of a mentor teacher and university supervisor.

**Internship:** The process that a university student underwent to become a public school teacher. Duties and length of time in training varied according to individual CPDT guidelines.

**Mentor teacher:** A professional teacher in a professional development school that had the responsibility of showing a university student how to become a teacher.

**Professional Development School (PDS):** A place where school and university faculty collaborated and carried out applied study and demonstration for the purpose of preparing new teachers and improving instruction.

**Public School Administrator:** This term included elementary, middle school, and high school principals.

**Resident:** A university student that fulfilled educational requirements to become a public school teacher and was in the process of doing solo or student teaching to demonstrate readiness for the profession.

**Site coordinator:** Person (either university professor or school teacher) designated to coordinate the activities of the interns and residents at the PDS site.

**Site professor:** A university faculty member that taught university education courses on a professional development site and supervised interns and residents.
University facilitator: A university faculty member who acted as a representative to the PDS sites and worked with the school site coordinator to implement and facilitate the PDS program.

Limitations of the Study

Miles and Huberman (1984) listed 4 limitations of case study research. First, because qualitative research was a labor-intensive process in which mountains of data were collected and analyzed, it was unlikely that more than a few dozen cases could be managed. This study included only 7 schools as sites for data collection.

Second, there was a serious question of case sampling involved. The question was whether or not the limited number of cases could be considered a reasonable sample of schools from which generalizations could be made about the larger population of professional development schools. No such claim concerning generalizability was made. Rather, the purpose of the qualitative study was to derive an explanation and to develop a model to be tested in a broader setting.

Third, using word descriptions introduced the possibility of researcher bias which could interfere with the replicability of qualitative analyses. Triangulation of data was utilized to control for researcher bias. Interviews and documentation were carefully analyzed and compared to increase confidence in the results.
The most serious problem with qualitative analysis was that the methods of analysis were not well formulated. Explicit, systematic methods for drawing conclusions and testing them were needed in the field of qualitative research. This analysis followed procedures Miles and Huberman (1984) recommended. These processes of data collection, coding, and analysis were described to aid in future replication.

Significance of the Study

This research contributed to the literature on professional development schools, organizational change, and the role of the principal. The findings can be used to design the formal development and training programs for PDS principals. In addition, the study of Fullan’s 6 themes of change in PDSs provided insight into the successful implementation of change which could aid in school reform.
CHAPTER 2

SYNTHESIS OF RELATED LITERATURE

To understand the role of the principal in implementing change in the professional development school, at least 4 themes of inquiry were examined. They were the (1) school reform initiatives at the national, state, and district level; (2) research concerning the change process; (3) history of school-university collaboration including professional development schools; and (4) the role of the principal within the school.

School Reform and Restructuring Initiatives

National Reform and Restructuring

The SCANS report was 1 example of calls to restructure education. The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS, 1992) was asked by the U.S. Department of Labor to determine the skills required to enter employment. The SCANS made 5 recommendations, 1 of which stated, "The nation's school systems should make the SCANS foundation skills and workplace competencies explicit objectives of instruction of all levels" (p. xv).

In the SCANS (1992) report, the Commission identified 5 competencies and 3 foundation skills as "workplace know-how" or knowledge that should become a regular part of
instruction. The competencies included the effective use of resources, interpersonal skills, information, systems, and technology. The foundation skills were basic skills, thinking skills, and personal qualities.

According to the SCANS (1992), facilitating the above changes necessitated reinventing schools. Teacher training and staff development were required to develop the instructional skills to accomplish the task. The necessary training and staff development were both costly and time consuming.

AMERICA 2000 was a second example to reform schools. In 1991, President George Bush and U.S. Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander introduced AMERICA 2000, a four-part strategy to reform public education (American Association of School Administrators, 1991). The first strategy involved improving all of the nation’s schools and making them more accountable for results. The second strategy advocated the invention of new schools, a New Generation of American Schools, that would meet the demands of the future. The other strategies dealt with education for the current work force and our communities.

Rundell (1992) described the vision of the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), a private, non-profit organization established in 1991 by American business leaders to support the reexamination of our nation’s schools and to address comprehensive systemic change in education.
Rundell stated,

Our charge is to use the unprecedented resources and talent business has at hand to create schools that will help all students make a quantum leap in learning, and that will restore American education to world preeminence. (p. 15)

The NASDC advocated systemic change in which business would have a vital partnership role in sponsoring Design Teams that would design, test, and implement educational prototypes that it considered to be realistic and successful approaches for replication in schools nationwide.

Another example of calls to restructure education at the national level came in 1991 at the "Education 2000: A Visionary Odyssey" conference that was held at the University of Oregon in Eugene to provide information concerning the future of education, and to promote collaboration among people from education, business, communities, and state government.

Shirley McCune, president of Learning Trends and senior director with Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, stated that by becoming an information-based society, our nation was now faced with the key challenges of how to use information productively and develop our human resources and organizational capital (Belcher and DeBuse, 1991). According to McCune, economic, social, demographic, organizational, educational, and behavioral forces were
contributing to the restructuring of society to the extent that what was needed was "as different from the old way as the Model T is from the supersonic jet" (p. 5). Thus, what McCune advocated was similar in content to the above recommendations to restructure education and to develop our nation's human and technological resources to keep abreast with societal changes.

Reigeluth (1992) discussed the need for systemic change in education, a paradigm shift which entails replacing the present educational system. Reigeluth (1992) stated, Systemic change is comprehensive. It recognizes that a fundamental change in one aspect of a system requires fundamental changes in other aspects in order for it to be successful. In education, it must pervade all levels of the system: classroom, building, district, community, state government, and federal government. And it must include the nature of the learning experiences, the instructional system that implements those learning experiences, the administrative system that supports the instructional system, and the governance system that governs the whole educational system. (p. 9)

Thus, Reigeluth’s (1992) assessment was that restructuring education systemically was paramount.

Reigeluth (1992) suggested that information-age schools included features such as continuous progress, personal
learning plans, outcomes-based learning, individualized testing, performance assessment, cooperative learning, teachers as facilitators, learning centers, thinking and problem-solving, communications skills, and technological tools. Restructuring public schools in the above ways would radically change current educational practice that could lead to improvement in student learning.

State Reform and Restructuring

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) reported that, in the 1980's, the states initiated reforms both through intensification and restructuring. Intensification came in the form of increased curriculum definition, mandated textbooks, standardized tests, specified methods of teaching, teacher evaluation, and district monitoring. Concerning intensification, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) stated that the "two major areas of activity have been upgrading the academic curriculum, linked to higher standards and achievement testing, and improving teaching through changes in certification and compensation of teachers" (p. 265). While intensification assumed the existing system was appropriate and could be improved by receiving more of the same elements, restructuring initiatives assumed that the system was part of the problem.

Restructuring included school-based management; expanded teacher roles in instruction and decision making; redesigned time schedules to support collaborative work
efforts; development of mission goals involving teachers, administrators, community members, parents, and sometimes students; and the reorganization of teacher education (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991; Holmes Group, 1986; Goodlad, 1990).

District Reform and Restructuring

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) reported that research showed surprising effects of state initiatives on local school districts. They found that districts offered very little resistance to reforms that involved increased academic content; that much of the progress on the restructuring agenda resulted from district initiatives; and that some districts actively used state policies to promote local priorities. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) suggested that very little serious improvement would occur solely from state reform efforts without developing the capacity for implementing change at the district level.

In addition, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) stated that the laissez-faire, let-the-districts-handle-it approach was not the answer. After due consideration Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) reported,

The research we have reviewed, and the theory of meaning which we hold as the key to real reform, strongly suggest that low to medium regulation (guidelines more than prescriptions), combined with high engagement (negotiation, technical assistance,
monitoring, feedback, problem solving), works better. (p. 270)

It appeared that Fullan and Stiegelbauer favored a more collaborative approach in state-district relationships to promote restructuring.

Teacher Educators Respond to Reform and Restructuring

Teacher educators also responded to the calls for reform. Goodlad (1990) commented that America was awakening to the realization that circumstances were overwhelming its system of schooling as evidenced by the call for restructuring that began in the 1980’s and has not abated. Goodlad (1990) stated that there were 4 sets of circumstances that impacted schools and their ability to educate the nation’s children.

First, as Goodlad (1990) stated, the Great American Experiment, Universal Schooling, was much easier earlier in America’s history because the schools and their surrounding communities held common values and expectations and only a small percentage of children went beyond the elementary school. Goodlad (1990) held that schools were being overwhelmed by the task of educating the nation’s increasingly heterogeneous minority student population.

Second, schools were having a hard time meeting the challenges of educating today’s youth simply by doing better what they have always done (Goodlad, 1990). Goodlad urged
rethinking what education was, what schools were for, and reworking structures and practices or restructuring.

Third, Goodlad (1990) stated that designating schools to solve national socio-economic problems was unrealistic and dysfunctional. He argued that poverty, starvation, and lack of education were circumstances that continued to cause disparity between people. America must address social and economic woes through political reform outside the schools.

As posited by Goodlad (1990), there was a natural connection between good teachers and good schools which was ignored. Goodlad stated,

"During successive eras of school reform, insufficient attention has been paid to the recruitment, education, and support of the men and women who are essential to school renewal. Excellent teachers do not in themselves ensure excellent schools. But it is folly to assume that schools can be exemplary when their stewards are ill-prepared." (p. xii)

Thus, teacher education was the first step toward educational restructuring and school reform.

In 1983, the Holmes Group (1986), composed of academic vice-presidents and education deans from the leading research universities in the country, began their participation in the "re-creation" of American schools. With the assistance of former U.S. Secretary of Education Terrel Bell, the Holmes Group began to analyze teacher
education, stating that "American students’ performance will not improve much if the quality of teaching is not much improved. And teaching will not improve much without dramatic improvements in teacher education" (1986, p. 3).

The Holmes Group (1990) plan of action to improve teacher education included the following goals:

- Make the education of teachers intellectually sound.
- Make better use of differences in knowledge, skill, and commitment among teachers. Create relevant and defensible standards of entry to the profession of teaching. Connect schools of education with schools.
- Help make schools better places for practicing teachers to work and learn. (p. vii)

Thus, the Holmes Group focused on reform of teacher education as a means to improve public education.

A survey was conducted to compare the thinking of educational theorists with the thinking of educational practitioners concerning the general restructuring of public education (Smith, Tourgee, Turner, Lashley, and Lashley, 1992). A questionnaire was mailed to 43 theorists, known as authors of papers on education restructuring, which elicited a 63% response rate. Completing the same questionnaire with a response rate of 67% were 131 principals, 95 teachers, and 12 other staff members from 129 out of 178 schools located in 30 states (Smith et al., 1992).
Of the respondents, 66% of the theorists and 94% of the practitioners indicated that they were currently involved in specific efforts to restructure education (Smith et al., 1992). Of the theorists, 89% stated that the effort was to continue over several years, while 89% of the practitioners stated the same expectation (Smith et al., 1992). These findings indicated that the restructuring efforts were considered a process to be engaged in rather than a project with time lines.

According to practitioners' comments on the survey, "restructuring from within arose from 'a stated need or shared vision'" (Smith et al., 1992, p. 21). This comment highlighted an important theme for change, a shared vision. In addition, practitioners stated, "Restructuring is something school-based administrators and teachers do to solve problems at their school and increase student achievement" (Smith et al., 1992, p. 21). Assuming a leadership role to solve problems related to 2 other important themes for change, initiative and monitoring.

According to the survey, both practitioners and theorists expressed reservations about the availability of sufficient time, training, energy, commitment, and monetary resources to bring about needed change (Smith et al., 1992). Resources and appropriate training seemed to be another important theme for change.
Concerning paradigms for restructuring, "58% of practitioners and 41% of theorists indicated that fixing the existing system (old paradigm) and developing new approaches to public schooling (new paradigm) were both useful" (Smith et al., 1992, p. 62). This indicated a blending of top-down and bottom-up approaches that suggested an on-going evolution of change.

Vision, initiative, monitoring, resources, and evolutionary planning were important concepts in the process of change noted in the research that must be considered in the restructuring of education. Other features seemed to emerge such as outcomes-based learning, individualized testing, performance-based assessment, learning centers, personal learning plans, cooperative learning, teacher facilitators, thinking and problem-solving skills, and advanced technological tools. These concepts and accompanying features will be included in the following discussion concerning restructuring public schools.

In the above, certain concepts concerning teacher training and education were spotlighted for the purpose of pointing out that on the national, state, and district levels, teacher education was considered a key component in improving public school education. Attention will now be focused on the implementation of change in education.
The Change Process

Contemporary authors espoused views concerning the process of change in public education. Goodlad (1988) pointed out that the United States underwent several cycles of attention to educational reform in this century which regularly addressed virtually the same issues and posed the same recommendations for reform.

According to Goodlad (1988), even though it was the institution or program that required attention, the teacher or student were the recipients of reform efforts, such as tougher programs and more tests. He (1988) stated: "Reluctant to prepare or engage in comprehensive overhaul, we make a few modest changes and add a few new people. No wonder that periodic proposals for reform tend to be repetitive regarding the identification of both problems and solutions" (p. 5).

Goodlad (1984) proposed that schools need to become renewing institutions where educators identify the problems unique to their setting, gather data, formulate solutions, implement plans, and monitor the results in an ongoing improvement process. Two essentials of renewal were identified by Goodlad (1988). First, workers at all levels must have the opportunity to infuse their efforts with the expertise of others involved in the same work. Second, there must be a continual flow of knowledge and alternate ideas for practice stemming from inquiry into the
enterprise. Goodlad (1988) also suggested that time for dialogue and reflection, and a supportive infrastructure that provides necessary resources and supporting mechanisms were essential ingredients in a renewing institution.

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) identified 3 distinct phases in the change process. The first phase known as initiation, adoption, or mobilization, was the decision making process to adopt or proceed with a change. The second phase, implementation or initial use, was the attempt over a period of several years to put the reform into practice. The third phase, continuation, incorporation, or institutionalization, occurred when the change becomes an ongoing part of the system. Decisions for change generally were made, implemented, and continued based on whether or not they produced the desired results.

According to Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991), there were six basic themes or ideas that were mandatory for successful change to occur: "leadership and vision, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking and empowerment, staff development and assistance, monitoring/problem-coping, and restructuring" (p. 88). Leadership and vision involved a highly sophisticated dynamic process that lead to a shared vision of what the school could look like and a shared sense of purpose concerning the process of change to bring it about (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).
Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) stated that the most successful schools "adapted their plans as they went along to improve the fit between the change and condition in the school to take advantage of unexpected developments and opportunities" (p. 83). As an example, they reported, "Blending top-down initiative and bottom-up participation is often a characteristic of successful multilevel reforms that use what amounts to evolutionary planning approaches" (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 83).

In regard to initiative-taking and empowerment, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) stated that when it came to implementation which involved "the doing, getting, and supporting people who are acting and interacting in purposeful direction" (p. 83), the sharing of power was crucial. They found that successful school leaders supported and encouraged initiative-taking by others, delegated authority and resources to steering committees, maintained active involvement, and developed a collaborative work environment (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) argued that, "most forms of in-service training are not designed to provide the ongoing, interactive, cumulative learning necessary to develop new conceptions, skills, and behavior" (p. 85) to bring about needed change. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) suggested that effective staff development combined concrete, teacher-oriented training activities with ongoing
assistance and support during the implementation process, and regular meetings with peers. They stated, "Research on implementation has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that these processes of sustained interaction and staff development are crucial regardless of what the change is concerned with" (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 86).

Concerning monitoring and problem-coping, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) stated that monitoring was not simply evaluation; it involved gathering information and working through problems to bring about the desired changes. They reported that "unsuccessful sites used shallow coping strategies such as avoidance, denial, procrastination, and people-shuffling, while successful sites engaged in deep problem solving such as redesign, creating new roles, providing additional assistance and time" (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 87).

Restructuring, the final theme discussed by Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991), involved how the school as a workplace was reorganized to include some of the concepts previously mentioned. They stated, "There is a strong conceptual rationale for the importance of restructuring schools, but there is not much empirical evidence of its positive effects" (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 88).

Fullan and Stiegelbauer depicted the implementation of change as an exceedingly complex process worthy of further study. Miles' (1983) research, on the other hand, focused
on the complexities of innovation institutionalization. His model identified supports that must be present and threats that must be warded off to assure institutionalization.

Miles' (1983) model began with the administrative commitment to the innovation which lead to both administrative pressure on users to implement the innovation and administrative support which often showed up in the form of assistance to users. Both pressure and assistance lead to increased user effort.

Miles (1983) found that the harder people worked at an innovation, the more committed they grew. Their commitment was fueled by increasing technical mastery of the innovation. Both commitment and mastery lead to increasing stabilization of use where the innovation settled down in the system.

Barriers to institutionalization resulted from the lack of supports and the inability to ward off threats (Miles, 1983). His research showed that when administrators were committed to the innovation, they took direct action to bring about organizational changes which went beyond those the stabilized innovation had already brought. They altered the structure and approach of in-service training, wrote the innovations' requirements into job descriptions, made new budget lines, appointed permanent coordinators for the innovation, and made sure that needed materials and equipment would be available in succeeding years.
Miles (1983) reported that administrators must provide supports as well as ward off threats to the innovation to insure institutionalization. Warding off threats from environmental turbulence (such as funding cuts and shrinking student populations) and career advancement motivation (such as the genuine desire of professionals to switch jobs) were necessary (Miles, 1983). Both threatened innovation institutionalization because they destabilized program staff and leadership (Miles, 1983).

While Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) directed their research to the implementation of innovation, Miles (1983) focused on institutionalization. The current research literature concerning the process of change through school-university collaboration will now be examined.

**History of School-University Collaboration**

The idea of cooperation between schools and universities to improve public education was not a new one. According to Clark (1988), one of the best known efforts was initiated in 1892 by a group referred to as the committee of ten, chaired by Charles Eliot, President of Harvard. The committee called for a conference of school and college teachers of principal subjects to be held to address programs in secondary school, the best instructional and testing methods, and time allocations (Clark, 1988). As reported by Clark (1988),
Their recommendations spoke to the need for an earlier introduction of basic elements of all the disciplines, interdisciplinary instruction, emphasis on study skills and critical thinking, upgrading of grammar school studies, and uniformity of teaching for all students—college-bound or not. In addition, they called for improvement of teacher preparation for both elementary and secondary levels. (p. 42-3)

Thus, cooperative programs involving local school officials and the universities were advocated as a strategy for school improvement as early as the late nineteenth century.

In Clark's (1988) view, school-university collaboration between the late nineteenth century and World War II was characterized generally by "college efforts to provide for articulation with the lower schools by prescribing entrance requirements, specifying courses, and establishing entrance examinations" (p. 46). School-university collaboration was further characterized by Clark (1988) as having "informal networks of university and school leaders that served to produce similarity among schools, to promote the personal power of individuals in the networks, and to establish conceptual, 'scientific' approaches to school management" (p. 46).

Following World War II, school-university collaboration was fueled by the "baby boom" which increased the need for services provided by the universities such as conducting
surveys and field studies and preparing teachers (Clark, 1988). In the late 1950's after Sputnik, school-university collaboration flourished with new curricula in a push for excellence in education (Clark, 1988). In the 1970's, the major emphasis switched to in-service education and continuing professional development (Clark, 1988).

In his narrative concerning the history of school-university collaboration, Clark (1988) listed 7 reasons for cooperation between the entities. First, Clark (1988) noted that schools and universities are reciprocally interdependent in that the outputs of each organization become the inputs of the other. Clark (1988) listed survival of the institution from an outside threat or a common problem and the need to investigate as 2 other reasons. The psychological advantages for participants from a shared purpose, untapped potential of collaboration, potential for research, and money were also noted by Clark (1988).

Historically, there have been problems in school-university collaboration. First, the 2 institutions were incompatible. Second, there was difficulty in getting colleges and lower school to cooperate. Third, some personnel had attitudes that interfered with collaborative efforts. The lack of reward for university personnel in working with schools was another problem. Finally, the view
of some university personnel that they are only providing a service to the schools posed another problem.

The above discussion of the history of school-university collaboration highlighted some of the issues that have caused tension between schools and universities in the past, and have implications for current school-university collaborative efforts such as professional development schools. Attention will now be focused on the evolution of professional development schools.

**Professional Development Schools**

The concept of the professional development school was not new to the educational scene (Holmes, 1990). Two variations of the theme included the laboratory school and the portal school (Lange, 1993). As Lange (1993) stated, "Historically, a professional development school is linked to the Deweyian concept of university laboratory school, an analogy to the physics or biology laboratory" (p. 75). The laboratory schools of the 1920-1940 period were conceptualized as places in university schools of education where the relationship between theory and practice was evaluated for the purpose of improving existing knowledge (Lange, 1993).

Even though laboratory schools were expected to address the process and product of teaching and learning, as well as the development of new teachers, they never fully satisfied those expectations (Lange, 1993). Their decline in the
1960’s was due to their inability to emulate public school classrooms and fulfil their intended research function (Lange, 1993).

During the late 1960’s to 1980, portal schools replaced the fading laboratory schools for the purpose of providing self-renewal for teachers, interfacing with teacher development programs in universities, and implementing and evaluating curricular innovations, (Lange, 1993). As Lange stated, "These schools were a part of a collaborative of teachers and administrators from schools, university administration, college faculty, community, union, and the like, which planned, developed, implemented, and evaluated programs to meet collaborative goals" (1993, p. 76). However, due to a lack of systematic assessment of programs and lack of a research plan, portal schools also disappeared (Lange, 1993).

Much of the discussion in the literature centered around the concept of the professional development school as being 1 place where reforms could be discussed, critiqued, incorporated, and evaluated (Lange, 1993). As previously indicated, the professional development school was a place where school and university personnel could collaborate and carry out applied study and demonstration for the purpose of preparing new teachers and improving instruction. By utilizing existing school sites, forming a collaborative partnership between the school and university, engaging in
on-going research, and evaluating and revising the program, the professional development school was designed to succeed where the portal and laboratory schools failed.

Lange indicated that before professional development schools are established, the problems inherent in school-university collaboration must be addressed. As Lange (1993) suggested, care must be taken to include parents and students as players in collaboration efforts, trust for all partners must be established, the system of merit reward for university faculty members must be revamped, multiculturalism and outcome-based education must be addressed, adequate resources of money and personnel must be allocated, and increasing licensing and legislative control must be effectively dealt with.

Similarly, the Holmes Group (1990) suggested that for professional development schools to provide the instructional base for restructuring schools, they must become places where teachers engage in the serious work of improving teaching and learning, teachers learn to deal with questions that do not have ready answers through reflection and inquiry, school-based personnel know parents and the community, and parents become part of the school’s decision making. Politicians and business people needed to understand that the work of the professional development schools is a long-term developmental process that does not have a model to readily emulate.
In addition, the Holmes Group (1990) suggested that to create a permanent, long-term relationship between schools and universities, participants must agree upon a stable governance arrangement, permanent budget allocations, new positions that span institutional boundaries through integration of school and university faculty and staff, plans that set progress toward goals, new reward and incentive structures that promote participation, and recruitment of school and university faculty who are committed to collaborative work.

As posited by Lange (1993),

In spite of the many difficulties, pitfalls, problems, and lack of resources, to establish such an entity within teacher development, the possibilities give professional development schools the potential to contribute to solutions to some of the major problems of schooling and teacher development....The challenge of realizing the possibilities is to maintain the dialogue among partners, work through the problems, seek solutions, and make the collaboration work.

(p. 95)

Though there were problems that plagued school-university collaboration in the past and threaten professional development schools currently, solutions can be worked out through collaboration.
Professional Development School Principals

It was interesting to note that out of approximately 175 articles on professional development schools available through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), none examined the role of the principal. In addition, only 2 dissertations listed in Dissertation Abstracts mentioned the principal in professional development schools.

The Holmes Group (1990) stressed that administrators were indispensable to the creation of professional development schools and that the concept of leadership may be significantly redefined within the professional development schools. No single model for leadership emerged within the Holmes Group (1990), rather they espoused two alternate notions of the "enabler" and the "strong leader" (p. 83). Some argued that leadership was a complex function diffused throughout an effective school and that the principal's goal was to encourage or enable the emergence of leadership from participants (Holmes, 1990).

Others, on the other hand, argued that the principal should have vested authority to secure and mobilize resources, run interference politically, coordinate activities, and manage the whole process of change (Holmes, 1990). As the Holmes Group (1990) added,

The widespread dissatisfaction with traditional, bureaucratic forms of organization and management produced agreement among seminar participants that
Professional Development Schools must be inventive and not bound by the past. As teachers must experiment with new forms of instruction, so must administrators experiment with new forms of organization, new approaches to leadership in support of ambitious teaching and learning. (p. 84)

Therefore, professional development schools were considered places where principals can learn and develop skills as they interact with teachers, university personnel, community members, and others as they explored problems in real settings.

A large body of research showed that principals have a key role in implementing change in their schools (Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; Hall & Hord, 1987; Hord, 1992, LaPlant, 1986). Current research contended that an important characteristic of successful principals was fostering a shared vision through collaborative efforts (Mendez-Morse, 1992). In the report America 2000: Where School Leaders Stand (1991), the American Association of School Administrators stated,

Effective schools have at least one thing in common: sound leadership. School administrators have never had a more crucial role in American society; they must be the ones who stimulate the debate and help form a vision of what our schools should become in communities across the nation. (p. 6)
A study in Victoria, Australia illustrated the importance of the principal in implementing change. Collaborative decision-making between beginning principals and teachers was examined as it was considered to be a key activity of administrators (Beeson & Matthews, 1993). As reported by Beeson and Matthews (1993), "Government policy required devolution of authority and responsibility to the school community, collaborative decision making, a responsive bureaucracy, educational outcomes, and the active redress of disadvantage and discrimination" (in the abstract). The purpose of the study was in part to describe the ways in which beginning principals implemented collaborative decision making.

To investigate the effect of recent Australian policy changes on the principalship, The Beginning Principals Study was designed to develop a picture of the work life of first-time principals to identify keys to success for the role of principal, and to propose training and support systems for beginning principals (Beeson & Matthews, 1993). In the study, 2 samples of 8 and 4 first-time principals were selected to represent a reasonable geographic and socio-economic spread of schools, and included at least 1 female principal among the primary and secondary school principals selected.

Analysis of the data revealed that during the first year 8 major areas of concern for the principal were
identified: policies and curriculum, relationships with staff, school image in the community, administrative matters, communication, discipline, time management, and improvement in consultative procedures (Beeson & Matthews, 1993). Two areas of major concern, policies and curriculum and staff relationships, involved the principal working with the local administrative committee (LAC) charged with assisting the principal with certain organization and administrative duties (Beeson & Matthews, 1993). Particularly sensitive issues included teaching workloads, time allocations to subjects, staffing, and teachers declared "in excess".

Beeson and Matthews (1993) found that when teachers were satisfied they were being consulted, collaborative procedures were adhered to, and things were going smoothly, they were less anxious to be involved. Conversely, when the situation was difficult, the LAC could be a powerful critic of the principal (Beeson & Matthews, 1993). Beeson and Matthews concluded that "the teachers wanted a principal to be decisive, but within a collaborative model" (1993, p. 10). Finally, there was some evidence that indicated that expanding the range of decisions to which participative decision making applies increased low-level, short-term conflict, but reduced significant, longer-term conflict (Beeson & Matthews, 1993).
There was much to learn about the role of the principal in implementing change in professional development schools. Professional development schools became sites where rich naturalistic studies were conducted to shed light on the complex world of the principal. Attention will be focused now on Texas reform initiatives and the Centers for Professional Development and Technology in Texas.

**Texas Reform Initiatives**

The state of Texas reflected the national restructuring movement calls for changes in governance, curriculum, and teacher education and inservice. In April, 1993, Texas Commissioner of Education, Lionel R. Meno, introduced *The Master Plan for Career and Technical Education* in which he stated, "Our state and federal tax dollars for career and technical education must provide the foundation for a highly skilled and educated work force which can compete in today's international economy" (p. iii). The conclusion of the Master Plan listed 7 guiding concepts that reflected the SCANS (1992) recommendations:

1. Texas work force development policy requires a focus on student and adult learner skills and competencies.

2. Local and state coordination is essential for progress, with the Quality Work Force Planning system being the primary mechanism for the state.

3. Economic development requires employers to shift toward high-performance workplace organizations.
4. A high skills/high wages policy must be adopted by both the private sector of business, industry, and labor and the public sector of state and local government in Texas.

5. All education and training providers, but particularly our public schools, must target educational excellence as the outcome of ALL students.

6. System and institutional equity and access are essential prerequisites to attain educational excellence.

7. Results must be assessed primarily in terms of successful student and adult outcomes, including skills demonstration, degree or program completion graduation, pursuit of additional higher education and training, employment, earnings, and progress along career paths to high skills/high wages occupations. (Texas Education Agency, 1993, p. 25).

By focusing on the concepts of learner skills and competencies, local and state coordination, high-performance workplace organizations, high skills/high wages policy, excellence and equity educational targets, equal access, and outcome based assessment, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) exercised its leadership function as it clearly delineated areas for improvement. TEA established the SCANS vision for the state of Texas which spoke to Fullan and Stiegelbauer's (1991) first theme for change, leadership and vision.

In another TEA publication, One Student At a Time (1992), the State Board of Education Task Force on High
School Education reported that Texas schools must be restructured because the traditional goals of a high school education such as basic knowledge of academic subjects, good citizenship, and marketable skills are not sufficient for the coming century. The TEA position clearly agreed with Fullan and Stiegelbauer's (1991) sixth theme for change, restructuring.

In addition to the recommendation in the above publication by TEA (1992), the Education Service Centers were given the responsibility to provide technical assistance to high schools in consultation with other practitioners from client districts. The TEA (1992) assumed responsibility to support the primary academic mission of high schools through consistent, coordinated, and meaningful assistance. In the above recommendations, the TEA advocated Fullan and Stiegelbauer's (1991) fourth theme for change, staff development and assistance.

In yet another TEA publication, Spotlight on the Middle (1991), the Texas Task Force on Middle School Education described a developmentally appropriate middle grade education and presented strategies by which it could be achieved. The three remaining themes for change posited by Fullan and Stiegelbauer were included in the discussion of the campus planning process in which local objectives were developed to restructure the instructional setting of the middle schools to better meet student needs.
The Texas Legislature sought to increase the involvement of professional staff in establishing and reviewing educational goals and instructional programs through legislation. In 1991 the legislature enacted a statute requiring schools to engage in site-based decision making (Kemerer & Walsh, 1994). School districts must establish site-based committees for each campus and describe their functions concerning school goals, curriculum, budgets, staff, and organization.

As TEA (1991) removed restrictions and barriers to school wide innovations, campus personnel reconsidered common school practices and initiated changes deemed necessary to improve student learning. The state provided for Fullan and Stiegelbauer's (1991) third theme for change, initiative-taking and empowerment. As campus personnel engaged in site-based decision making to effect change such as interdisciplinary teaming, advisory periods planning, and flexible scheduling, they were essentially engaging in evolutionary planning, Fullan and Stiegelbauer's (1991) second theme. Inherent in the planning process was Fullan's (1991) fifth theme, monitoring and problem-coping.

**CPDT Legislation Initiative**

The Texas Legislature enacted legislation to develop professional development schools by funding the Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT) "for the purpose of integrating technology and innovative teaching
practices in the pre-service and staff development training of teachers and administrators" (TEA, 1992, p. 117). Texas institutions of higher education with approved teacher education programs competed for funding to develop centers in collaboration with public schools, regional education service centers, businesses, and other entities.

Requirements for the establishment of centers (TEA, 1992) included the following:

1. development by universities in collaboration with the above named agencies;

2. implementation of comprehensive field-based teacher education programs;

3. incorporation of state-of-the-art teaching practices, curriculum and instructional knowledge and application that includes strategies to work with culturally diverse populations, evaluation of student and teacher outcomes, and effective application of technology; and

4. development of rigorous internal and external evaluation procedures.

TEA established the CPDTs to be collaborative ventures designed to address pre-service and staff development training for teachers and administrators, and issues addressing the educational needs of all children, especially those in low-achieving schools, through curricula, textbooks, technology, and practices.
TEA (1992) intended that no one group represented in the collaborative would dominate an individual CPDT's governance structure. TEA gave complete authority to each CPDT to design, implement, operate, and evaluate all aspects of the center. In addition, TEA specified that the contributions of faculty and staff be acknowledged as a form of legitimate scholarship in support of the mission of institutions of higher education. TEA intended that the CPDTs be places where theory joins practice in concerted efforts to improve teaching, for the ultimate purpose of impacting student learning.

Four themes of inquiry were examined to gain understanding of the role of the principal in implementing change in the professional development school. They were school reform initiatives at the national, state, and district level; research concerning the change process; history of school-university collaboration including professional development school; and the role of the principal within the school.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For the past several decades, researchers have increasingly recognized qualitative methodologies because "They [qualitative studies] are a source of well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts. With qualitative data one can preserve chronological flow, assess local causality, and derive fruitful explanations" (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 15). Qualitative methodology can supply new data with which to answer questions concerning restructuring and point to new directions for further study.

Procedures

A triangulated data collection process consisting of interviews, and document analysis was used to form the data base of information from which to draw conclusions about the role of the principal in implementing change in professional development schools. Utilization of the triangulation strategy allowed for a broader, more in-depth view of the processes at work at the PDSs rather than use of just one data source.

The researcher conducted interviews with key participants in the professional development schools
including principals, university personnel, site coordinators, mentor teachers, and others as needed. The researcher reviewed minutes from faculty, district administrator, site-based, school board, or community meetings during the 1994-5 school year to collect data. The researcher attempted to schedule attendance at meetings during site visits.

Extensive field notes and audio tape recordings of interviews and meetings documented the observations of the researcher. Documents such as Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT) original grant applications and other official publications, public school Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data, meeting agendas, written communications and guidelines, and other memoranda regarding the principal’s role in implementing change in the professional development school were examined.

As of December, 1994, 44 Texas colleges and universities had received state funding as Centers for Professional Development and Technology. Research sites selected for this study were 7 elementary schools from 4 CPDTs. A pilot study was conducted in an elementary school in another CPDT to test the interview protocol, the results of which were not included in the study.

Before selecting the actual school sites, consideration was given to CPDTs around the state. Several factors helped to decide which CPDTs would be included in the site. First,
CPDTs had to be located in either rural, suburban, or urban areas or be associated with schools in those areas to satisfy the requirement of student diversity. Another factor was the CPDT had to have an association with a business partner that had expertise in the use of technology.

Seven elementary schools were selected to represent the greatest diversity possible among schools. Factors such as grade level, size of school, location, and demographics were considered. At least 1 school in its first year of operation was included. Other schools represented a range of 1 to 3 years in operation. All persons interviewed were informed about the presence of the researcher and the purpose of the study.

In the course of the 1994-5 school year, the school sites were visited 1 to 3 times. Some PDSs were visited for an entire day, while others were visited on 1 to 3 occasions over a semester, with telephone, letter, and fax contact in-between visits. The actual number of visits and total number of days depended on the proximity of the site, the complexity of the program, and the availability of participants.

Interview questions covered the basic research questions. Detailed reports were generated for each site from data collected from observations, interviews, and documentation. Findings were summarized in data displays
such as graphs, charts, and matrices for further clarification.

Dissertation Pilot Study Summary

To conduct the dissertation pilot study, an elementary school site was selected from another CPDT not included in the actual study. Interview protocol, research methodology and strategies were tested and refined after reflecting on the interviews and reviewing the data collected.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This study examined the role of the principal in professional development schools in the Texas Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDTs) network. It was designed to determine the role and identify principals' concerns in bringing about complex change in their schools.

Six research questions structured the interviews and collection of documentary evidence. This chapter presented the information in the following sections: An overview of the CPDT initiative; a description of the CPDTs as well as the research sites and program participants; governance and decision making structures; the role expectations for PDS principals; the impact of pre-service teachers; teacher empowerment; university interaction with the school; and supports provided for the principal. The data were presented for each site to provide contextual relevancy.

The CPDT Initiative

To understand the role and management concerns of the PDS principal, it was necessary to comprehend the CPDT initiative, the relationships between CPDT partners, and the resulting configurations that emerged. The Centers for Professional Development and Technology was a statewide
initiative to improve teacher training. The Centers competed for state funds. Consequently, their structure was shaped by the enabling legislation and guidelines in the request for proposals.

The Texas legislature adopted the Texas Education Code 13.050, thereby establishing the CPDTs beginning with the 1992-93 school year. The Texas Education Agency (TEA), the state's teacher credentialing agency, determined teacher education program requirements that must be carried out by universities in the CPDT field-based programs. The CPDT rules (TEA, 1992) required that each CPDT establish a collaborative partnership that includes administrators, teachers, education service center (about 20 statewide organizations that function as liaisons between the state education agency and the local districts) staff, faculty and administrators for institutions of higher education, and persons from other entities or businesses. Further, TEA (1992) established selection criteria for the school sites which included low performance according to state standards, and a diverse, low socio-economic student population.

Each participating university, center, and district had both rights and responsibilities under the CPDT plan. As the recipient of the state grant, the university served as the fiscal agent for the funds. The university provided professors and university students for the field based professional development school (PDS) programs.
The center was allowed to work independently of the university as a collaborative. The center had the authority and responsibility to design, implement, operate, and evaluate all aspects of its program by designing a governance structure providing for shared decision-making at each site.

The school districts had the legal right to prohibit any activities or procedures that might violate district policy. Participating schools were responsible for providing the facilities, teachers, and access to the classrooms at the PDS sites.

Each of the 17 CPDTs funded by the state designed and implemented a plan addressing the unique needs and concerns of its member districts, universities, other partners, and constituencies. Although diverse in their individual program descriptions, the CPDTs are united by their focus on 5 components: collaboration, restructuring educator preparation, staff development, technology, and multicultural education (TEA, 1995).

The 4 CPDTs in this study had a governance structure as required. Data on governance structures were found in formal documents such as the CPDT proposals submitted to the funding agency and internal documents such as internship handbooks. Interviews provided evidence that those structures were implemented. In addition, participants clarified and elaborated on the formal structures.
Table 1, CPDT Summary Table, shows the governance structures on each site. In addition, it shows the staffing patterns, university student numbers and assignments, school and university professionals working within the PDS, student enrollment, and grade levels.

For the most part, the governance structures reflected what was written in each grant application. In the four CPDTs, the Board of Directors (also known as the Governing Board or Steering Committee) was the major governing body charged with the responsibility of implementing the approved CPDT plan in accordance with state rules and regulations. Each CPDT had a Project Director who was a university based employee responsible for overseeing the CPDT program.

The Formal CPDT Organization and PDS Research Sites

The following narrative described each CPDT and the participating sites. Each CPDT description included information about the CPDT mission, university, program, district, school, principal, and interviewees. Specific details that would allow identification of participants were omitted.

Alpha CPDT and Sites

Mission. The Alpha CPDT application to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) for funding included a mission statement which was "to improve the quality of teachers ...and thus increase student achievement among the diverse student populations of the schools." The center focused on
innovative teaching practices, state-of-the-art technology, staff development, research and teacher recruitment to accomplish this mission.

University. The university, located in a rural part of Texas, was classified, according to the Carnegie classification system for colleges and universities in the United States, in the Comprehensive I category (Evangelauf, 1994). Institutions of this type offered a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the master’s degree, and awarded 40 or more master’s degrees annually in three or more disciplines. The university’s college of education recommended 400-500 students for teacher certification annually.

Two university professors were assigned to each Professional Development School (PDS) to teach classes at the site. One served as site coordinator (or lead professor) to facilitate the year-long internship program.

The site coordinator was responsible for the overall coordination of the internship experience, delivered instruction, served as a resource person for the interns, interpreted University policies that apply to interns, and was the liaison between the University and public school. The site coordinator maintained an office on site to better facilitate the program.

Program. University personnel collaborated with the PDS campus advisory committees (or site based decision
making committees) as part of the shared decision making related to campus planning and assessment. While committees made major decisions, the project directors (university employees that serve as directors of the CPDTs), mentor teachers, and principals made the smaller decisions needed to carry out the daily work of the PDS.

University students (interns) in the internship program spent 2 full semesters at the public school site. During the first semester they observed the classroom teacher (mentor) and assisted the mentor by tutoring students or working with small groups of children. During the second semester (student teaching) interns completed formal requirements such as lesson planning and were responsible for teaching duties for weeks at a time as in traditional student teaching.

Mentor teachers, as partners in the PDS program, modeled the role of professional educator. In addition, mentors positively influenced the development of pre-service teachers; introduced interns to school staff; shared information about school resources and equipment; guided the planning of teaching experiences; and explained classroom management, grading, policies, philosophy, and methods. The grant application and the internship handbook did not address the principals’ responsibilities.

Public School Setting. The University entered into a partnership with a rural school district. According to the
TEA’s Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) 1994-95 report, the district’s enrollment was 6,077 students.

For this study, data were collected at 2 of the participating schools. Nelson Intermediate School, grades 5 and 6, enrolled 948 students in the 1994-95 school year. Mason Elementary, grades 1 to 4, had a student population of 330 during the same school year. Both schools had been professional development schools (PDSs) for 3 years at the time of the study and are located in the same community as the university. See Table A-1, Appendix A, for student demographic and AEIS information.

Principal Flowers of Nelson Intermediate School was a middle-aged, white male who has been a principal 14 years, 4 of which have been at this small town intermediate school. Principal Adair of Mason Elementary School was a middle-aged, white female whose 8 years of experience had been at the same small town school. See Table A-2, Principal Demographics, Appendix A.

Three interviews conducted at Nelson Intermediate provided the bulk of the data for that site. Interview participants included the principal, Flowers; the site coordinator, Tiffin; and a mentor teacher, Stewart. Data for Mason Elementary were garnered through interviews with the principal, Adair; the site coordinator, Brown; and a mentor teacher, Grimms.
Alpha Governance Structure

The Alpha CPDT's governance structure consisted of 4 parts. First, the Collaborative Board included representatives from its member organizations: the regional service center, university, school district, and community. The Board's role was to guide the direction of the Center based on input from its members. The CPDT application stated that the "governance structure is vital for systematic change to be productive, and that it must include representatives from all collaborators to assure that potentially conflicting views will be mediated effectively."

Some of the Board's members also served on the Executive Committee which was a smaller unit that carried out the day-to-day decision making responsibilities of the Board. The Project Director was a university based person who oversaw CPDT operations.

Collaborative Teams (also known as Professional Development Instructional Teams or leadership teams) made campus level decisions. The Alpha CPDT plan stipulated that these teams include university faculty and school personnel at each site. In addition, "The teams will collaboratively determine how the on-site instructional days and hours of instruction and classroom participation and observations will be allocated."
Beta CPDT and Sites

Mission. The Beta CPDT's plan stated that its mission "is to enable prospective and practicing educators to develop and apply the skills, knowledge, attitudes, and abilities necessary to prepare students to succeed in a diverse information-based society." In restructuring Beta University's teacher education program, the Collaborative focused on professional development at each PDS site, the infusion of technology at all levels of schooling, and an increase in the number of minority teachers.

University. The university, located in an urban Texas area, was categorized as a Comprehensive I according to the Carnegie classification system (Evangelauf, 1994). The university's college of education recommended approximately 200 students for teacher certification yearly. The university assigned 1 professor as the University Facilitator to each site to serve as a liaison and to supervise and evaluate interns.

The CPDT handbook listed the University Facilitator's responsibilities. They were to deliver mentorship training to mentor teams, visit interns regularly, conference with school staff regularly, mediate conflicts if necessary, inform interns and staff about professional development opportunities, serve as liaison with university, chair intern evaluation committees, and conduct intern evaluations in collaboration with school staff.
The CPDT, districts, and school principals agreed to select a teacher to serve as the Site Coordinator. Each district also agreed to hire a replacement teacher, while the CPDT agreed to pay the teacher's salary out of grant funds. The Site Coordinator served as liaison with the Collaborative, coordinated PDS activities, provided staff development, and assisted in developing the teacher education program and technology. Other duties were to advise interns of campus procedures, help interns and teams deal with problems, coordinate seminar activities, chair the campus advisory committee, supervise interns' daily activities, and observe interns for formative evaluations.

Johnson, the site coordinator at Crawford Elementary in Solo ISD, worked in a full-time position. Drew, the site coordinator at Bryson Elementary in Organa ISD, worked half-time as a kindergarten teacher in addition to her other PDS duties.

Program. University students (interns) assigned to Crawford PDS experienced a full-year internship. Interns attended the same pre-service training as first-year teachers. During the first 6-8 weeks of the first semester, interns rotated through all of the grade levels in the school to observe the developmental levels of children. Then the interns rotated through the classrooms at 1 grade level to observe different teaching styles.
During the second semester each intern was paired with a mentor teacher and became increasingly responsible for the teacher’s classroom duties. After successfully completing the year-long internship, interns went to another campus to do a final semester of student teaching.

Bryson Elementary interns completed a full-year internship program that incorporated the student teaching component into the second semester of the program. During the first semester, an intern rotated around to classrooms at every grade level for approximately 6 weeks. Then the intern was assigned to a multi-grade level mentor team consisting of 4 teachers and rotated through their classrooms to experience different teaching styles. During the second semester, the student teacher completed student teaching requirements with 1 mentor from the team.

Each school agreed to provide teachers to serve on mentor teams which would plan and conduct educational activities for interns. Mentor teacher responsibilities were to complete mentor training, coach the intern, support the intern daily, demonstrate lessons, integrate intern into the team, advise intern of procedures, help intern deal with problems and paperwork, provide constructive feedback, and serve on the evaluation committee.

School principals’ responsibilities were also listed in the Collaborative internship handbook. They were to establish a supportive campus environment for the interns,
help mentors assist interns, allow teams and interns time to meet, maintain contact with university facilitator and site coordinator about interns’ progress, serve as a role model and instructional leader for interns.

Public School Setting. Two urban school districts, with only 1 PDS site per district, participated in the study. Both districts were located on the outskirts of a large urban area. Solo ISD had an enrollment of 17,844 students during the 1994-95 school year. Organa ISD had an enrollment of 5,790 students during the same time period.

Two schools within Beta CPDT participated in the study: Crawford and Bryson Elementary Schools. Crawford, in Solo ISD, had grades Pre-K to 5, with a student enrollment of 875 students for the 1993-94 school year. Crawford, at least a 30 minute drive from the university, had been a PDS site for 3 years.

Bryson, in Organa ISD, had Early Childhood through first grade classes, with a student enrollment of 767 for the same time period. Bryson, at least a 30 minute drive from the university, had been a PDS site for 1 semester. See Table A-1, School Demographics, Appendix A, for student demographic and AEIS information.

Starnes, principal of Crawford Elementary School, was a white male in his thirties. He had spent 4 years as a principal in this metropolitan school, with 3 of those years as a PDS principal. Dreskin, principal of Bryson
Elementary, was a middle-age white male. He had served 8 of his 17 years in the principalship at Bryson Elementary which was located in a suburban district. See Table A-2, Principal Demographics, in Appendix A.

Data for Crawford Elementary was collected from CPDT documents and interviews with Starnes, principal; Johnson, site coordinator; Hansen, university facilitator; and Raines, mentor teacher. Interviews with Dreskin, principal; Drew, site coordinator; Banks, university facilitator; and Binning, mentor teacher, and other PDS documentation provided data about Bryson Elementary.

Beta Governance Structure

The Beta CPDT program was served by 3 management teams. First, the Collaborative Planning and Policy Committee was the overall governing body of the CPDT. It was comprised of the school principals, team leaders, and teacher liaisons; representatives from higher education such as university facilitators, principal investigators, directors, coordinators, and faculty; and business, government, industry, and regional service center partners.

Second, the Beta Steering Committee, a smaller group from the Collaborative Planning and Policy Committee, consisted of school principals, internship site coordinators or teacher liaisons, a university facilitator, site-based course instructors, principal investigators, and Directors of Teacher Technology Exploration Center (TTEC-the
university lab available to students and teachers to utilize current technology). The Steering Committee made decisions about procedures and activities to be used in implementing collaborative policies. The Beta CPDT Project Director who managed the CPDT project staff was also a member of the Steering Committee.

The third management team was the Site Implementation Committee. As the decision making group for the site, it was responsible for implementing the teacher preparation, professional development, and other project activities at that site. Each Site Implementation Committee included the school principal, internship site coordinator, university facilitator, team leader or teacher from the academic team, intern representative, and parent.

Gamma CPDT and Sites

Mission. The Gamma CPDT mission was to provide a relevant field-based education system that infused the use of technology, built on the strengths of participants, encouraged shared decision making and responsibility, and respected the talents and benefits of a pluralist society. Their focus was on continuously improving and assuring equity and excellence among all learners.

University. The university, located in a large suburban area, was classified as a Doctoral I university according to the Carnegie classification system (Evangelauf, 1994). It offered a full range of baccalaureate programs,
was committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and awarded at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in 5 or more disciplines. The university’s college of education recommended approximately 280 students for teacher certification annually.

The CPDT plan described the roles of various university faculty participants. The University Liaison or coordinator was responsible for effective communication between the PDS site and the University. The Liaison’s responsibilities included coordinating university field-based classes and classroom application time slots, acting as troubleshooter and conflict mediator, participating in decisions on the placement of interns and residents, acting as a resource for interns and residents, and providing staff development.

The University Field Based Faculty, already employed by the university, delivered field-based instruction. Their responsibilities were to provide instruction and supervision for Interns and Residents, evaluate and provide feedback for Interns and Residents, act as a resource for Interns and Residents, participate in reviewing and interviewing applicants for the PDS sites, provide teaching demonstrations and staff development, and establish a research agenda and disseminate data.

Program. University students at Barnett were assigned to the year-long Gamma CPDT internship program which included the student teaching component. During the first
semester, students were assigned to Instructional Leadership Teams (ILT) consisting of 2-4 multi-grade level teachers. These interns began the school year with the other teachers by attending staff development and in-service days. During the second semester, interns became residents and taught full-time while new interns were added to the ILT.

The instructional leader (classroom teacher or mentor) was a teacher trainer and member of an Instructional Leadership Team who volunteered to work with university interns and residents. As listed in the CPDT application, an instructional leader had responsibilities that included modeling effective teaching strategies; providing leadership in conflict resolution; conferencing and planning with university students and teachers; evaluating and providing feedback to university students; working cooperatively with CPDT partners; acting as a resource person for university students; providing leadership in professional behavior and instruction.

The principal was designated as the Chief Executive Officer of the PDS site. As listed in the CPDT application, the principal’s responsibilities were to inform faculty of pertinent information; provide necessary support and time to ILTs; provide material, resources, and training time; interview Interns and Residents and match with ILTs; select and monitor mentor teachers; make logistical arrangements of space and facilities; and provide staff development.
**Public School Setting.** One suburban school district, the only school district in partnership with Gamma CPDT, agreed to participate in the study. The district’s enrollment was 50,293 students for the 1994-95 school year.

Barnett Elementary was 1 out of 3 sites that agreed to participate in the study. This site was in transition which affected professional and university staff positions. Due to a university teaching overload, the professor was no longer able to fulfill his site coordinator’s duties at the time of the study. The PDS functioned without a site coordinator for most of the spring semester until Kelly, a mentor teacher, was eventually promoted to site coordinator. Another person was also employed by the university to assist the professors in supervising and evaluating the interns at Barnett. See Table A-1, *School Demographics*, Appendix A, for student demographic and AEIS information.

Dutch, principal of Barnett Elementary School, was a middle-aged, white male. At the time of the interview, Dutch had served as principal of Barnett for 5 years. His suburban school had been a PDS for 3 years. See Table A-2, *Principal Demographics*, Appendix A.

Data for Barnett Elementary in Gamma ISD was collected through 3 interviews and other CPDT documentation. The interviewees were Dutch, principal; Jeffers, site professor and site coordinator; and Kelly, mentor teacher.
Gamma Governance Structure

The Gamma CPDT plan established governance structures at 4 levels. The overarching structure, the Governing Board, included representatives from its partner school districts, university, campus teams, businesses, regional service center, and university students. The Governing Board was to meet as often as necessary to address programmatic issues and technical grant writing, review research projects, and disseminate information.

The steering committee, which included representatives from campus ILTs, principals, superintendents, university faculty and students, and community, provided governance at the district level. The purpose of the steering committee was to assess campus needs; provide staff development based on needs of campus personnel; disseminate information back to the campuses regarding innovative strategies, technology, legislative action; and provide for more global community involvement.

The campus PDS committee included the principal, ILT member, site coordinator, university faculty, business, and a university student. The campus committee addressed the needs of the school regarding staff development, pre-service training, technology, additional training, and community relations.

The fourth structure was the instructional leadership team (ILT), made up of teachers, interns, residents, and
university faculty assigned to the campus. Each ILT included from 2 to 4 teacher trainers who agreed to work together and serve on committees. The responsibilities of the ILT were to work directly with interns and residents; meet weekly to plan lessons, strategies, and technology; coordinate intern and resident experiences, and provide feedback to university students.

Delta CPDT and Sites.

Mission. The mission of Delta CPDT is "to provide, through a collaborative commitment, relevant field-based teacher education and staff development programs in a way that integrates research supported, innovative teaching and assessment practices with technology so that educators share a common vision of improving the learning and achievement of all students." Delta CPDT envisioned a reconstructed pre-service teacher education program with features that included field-based instruction, site governance, technology, university and ISD teaching partnership, and alignment of staff development and graduate studies.

University. Based on the Carnegie Classification system for universities and colleges (Evangelauf, 1994), Delta University was in the Doctoral I category, offering a full range of baccalaureate programs and awarding at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in 5 or more disciplines. The university's college of education recommended approximately 415 student candidates for teacher certification yearly.
Although the original Delta CPDT plan did not address a site coordinator's role per se, the revised 1994-95 Delta CPDT Field-based Program Handbook described the involvement and duties of 2 university faculty positions. First, the role of the instructional faculty was to assist in the development, delivery, and assessment of teacher education curriculum and courses; participate in research; identify and select potential teacher candidates; promote field-based program, model effective teaching practices; maintain communication between partners; provide instructional assistance; and attend meetings. In general, the instructional faculty was more involved with the university students and coordinating the day-to-day processes of the internship than the other faculty.

Second, the role of the University Liaisons and Building Coordinators called for weekly visits to the schools and classrooms, attendance at CPDT meetings and seminars, evaluations of the residents, identification of field-based teachers to conduct seminars, and occasional lesson demonstrations. Though only on the PDS campus once a week, the University Liaisons were responsible for the actual evaluation (or grade) of the University Residents.

Program. The Delta CPDT plan called for a change from the traditional model of 1 student teacher assigned to 1 cooperating teacher and 1 university supervisor. University students were assigned to Instructional Leadership Teams
(ILTs) of 3-4 teachers (from both primary and intermediate grades or from 1 grade level) who determined how the requirements of the year-long, field-based, teacher education program would be fulfilled.

During the first semester students (interns) were assigned to an ILT. In the second semester, interns became residents and taught full-time for the entire semester while new interns were added to ILTs.

Pre-service and in-service seminars and classes were taught by teams involving both university and school personnel. Some school personnel assumed clinical faculty roles and had primary responsibility for a course. Interns spent Mondays and Wednesdays all day with teacher trainers (classroom or mentor teachers) and Fridays with university and school faculty reflecting on what had been learned and preparing for the next week.

The purpose of the ILTs was to promote team planning, schedule teaching assignments, provide feedback for university students, and model instructional and classroom management techniques. One member of the ILT, appointed by the principal as Team Facilitator, scheduled ILT meetings, mediated conflicts, supervised the evaluation process of the university students, and acted as a liaison between the ILT, Campus CPDT Committee, and the CPDT coordinators.

Public school setting. One school district out of 5 districts in partnership with Delta CPDT agreed to
participate in the study. The district, located in a rural area of Texas, had an enrollment of 5,343 students.

Two schools from Delta CPDT participated in the study, Caldwell Elementary and Gibson Intermediate. Caldwell Elementary, a K-4 school, had an enrollment of 339 students during the 1993-94 school year. Gibson Intermediate, a 5-6 campus, had an enrollment of 849 students during the same academic year. Both schools were located in the same rural community at least a 30 minute drive from the university and had been in the CPDT for 3 years. See Table A-1, School Demographics, Appendix A, for more student demographic and AEIS information.

Martinez, principal at Caldwell Elementary School, was an Hispanic female principal in her thirties who had served 3 of her 4 years as a principal at this rural site. Summers was a black, male principal in his thirties. Three of his 5 years in the principalship was served at Gibson Elementary School, a rural intermediate school. See Table A-2, Principal Demographics, Appendix A.

Information for both Caldwell Elementary and Gibson Intermediate in Delta ISD, was garnered through CPDT documentation and 3 interviews at each site. Caldwell interviewees were Martinez, principal; Shaffer, site coordinator; and Williams, mentor teacher. Interviewees at Gibson were Summers, principal; Evans, site coordinator; and Slavin, mentor teacher.
Delta Governance Structure

The Delta CPDT Handbook indicated a change in the governance hierarchy approximately 2 years after the implementation of the program. At the inception of the Delta program, the governance hierarchy included 4 structures: the Governing Board, ISD Steering Committee, Campus Committee, and ILTs. To ensure that maximum autonomy and authority were retained at each campus and throughout each school district, the Governing Board established the ILT as the main governance structure.

The Delta Collaborative called for a paradigm shift from University control to a decision-making model that empowered the Instructional Leadership Team (the teacher trainers, and their interns and residents) to determine how the interns and residents fulfilled the formal requirements of the field-based teacher education program. The plan called for each campus to have a governance committee consisting of the principal, University Coordinator, Team Facilitators, and Interns and Residents. Further removed were district steering committees that were charged with the governance at the district level and the Governing Board which was charged with oversight of the entire project.
Table 1

**CPDT Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPDTs</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>Nelson PDS</td>
<td>Mason PDS</td>
<td>Crawford PDS</td>
<td>Bryan PDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>PM-1</td>
<td>PK-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Assistant Principals</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other PDS Support</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns in Spring Semester</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents or Student Teachers in Spring Sem.</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The assistant principal was on maternity leave and was due to be replaced.
2. The site was in transition at the time of the researcher's visit. This CPDT originally utilized a professor as the site coordinator, but due to university overload this plan changed. The CPDT eventually promoted a teacher to the position of site coordinator.
3. This site utilized university employees other than professors as site coordinators.
4. This site utilized a university employee who was not a professor, but was responsible for two sites.
5. Due to the professors' overload, another university employee assisted the professor in working with the interns on a weekly basis.
Participants Responses to Governance Structure

Participants at the 7 research sites were asked to respond to an interview question about the formal governance and authority relationships between the school, university, and other CPDT partners. The purpose was to determine if the 4 CPDTs had been implemented as planned with the formal governance structures firmly established. This was a necessary step before the actual context could be described and the research questions answered.

It was confirmed that all 4 CPDTs had their formal governance structures in place, and personnel at the 7 school sites were actively involved in the PDS programs implemented on their campuses. Alpha, Beta, and Gamma CPDT programs were implemented as originally planned and continued in operation during the time of this study. However, Delta CPDT experienced a change from the original plan to a new inverted triangle plan about 3 years after initial implementation in the PDSs. The following discussion focused on the Delta participants' responses.

Delta CPDT. Martinez, Caldwell principal, described the overall governance structure of Delta CPDT. Martinez confirmed that the Governing Board was the overarching governance structure. However, Martinez commented that the governance structure was recently changed to meet the needs of its collaborative members. She stated, "Now that we are in to our third year the need has come to break that down a
Martinez described the new CPDT governance structure as a pyramid with the Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTs) at the top with the primary decision making authority. Martinez stated,

If you begin with the ILTs, then...you have a campus committee that meets with all of the ILTs in the school....Then under that we have ISD steering committees where we bring in the different campuses in an ISD. Then members of the steering committee are selected to be on an advisory board. This advisory board will deal with issues such as admission and retention, technology, research, and evaluation and intern placement, basically programmatic issues. Under that is the council which you could call the larger board, but it does not function in a primary role....It is more of a guiding group.

Therefore, Martinez confirmed the pyramid style governance structure where decisions flow from the ILTs down to the campus, ISD, advisory board, and finally the CPDT council. Shaffer, University site coordinator, also confirmed the new governance model, calling it the "up-side-down model."

The second Delta CPDT school to participate in the study was Gibson Intermediate. Gibson principal, Summers commented on the change in the CPDT governance structure.
Summers reported that the plan "flip-flopped where the people who should be playing the pivotal role, the teachers, are the decision makers." Summers stated,

[T]he teams decide what they are going to do. They let me know. I let central office know. They let the University know, or I may let the University know. But the school is making the decisions. We decide how many interns we want. We decide who we want to work with. We decide if people are going to share across teams. We do all that decision making and the University listens to us tell them what we want them to do.

Delta CPDT University and public school personnel confirmed that the governance structures formed an inverted model. The ILTS were in the top position, followed by the campus committees, school district steering committees, and the governing board.

Summary

When discussing the formal governance and authority relationships between CPDT partners, the participants' indicated that they were aware of or involved with either state, CPDT, district, and campus governance structures. A more detailed, site-by-site analysis of those structures revealed a variety of participant involvement at all levels. As noted above, there was dramatic differences in the numbers of university students on the campuses and the personnel helping with the programs.
It was determined that the four CPDTs were actually implemented at each campus with little variation from their original plans. However, Delta CPDT showed significant change in its governance structure and authority relationships after a time. Understanding the actual setting in which the principals and other CPDT participants work and how the authority relationships actually function on each campus shed light on the principals' role and management concerns.

**The PDS Principal**

The research participants were asked how principals were selected to be PDS principals or how their school was selected to be a PDS. All seven responded that they were already the principals of their schools when they became PDS sites. Some reported that they or their school had prior involvement with the university before becoming a PDS. Participants' responses are analyzed on a site-by-site basis. See Table 2 below.

**Alpha CPDT**

**Nelson PDS.** Nelson principal Flowers stated that, when he became the principal of Nelson Intermediate, he took the initiative in involving the local university in writing an innovative grant for math and science projects on his campus. This association with the university eventually led to involvement in the CPDT program. Flowers reported, "They called me in the spring whenever...they applied for grants."
I went down with them to Austin where they did their presentation...and we got a grant. So we started with interns that spring at this site."

Flowers indicated that he had to sell the university on the idea of making his school a PDS site. He explained, "5th and 6th grade was not the choice for the college, but I had empty rooms. I had opened the door and said 'come on in....' I pretty much sold that we can do this."

Tiffin, University professor and Nelson site coordinator, provided a different perspective. He reported that Nelson was selected "because we needed one [a site]. You can't get too distant from the university because students have to take other classes at the same time. Obviously, we need them, but also they were willing, and they have the space available."

Stewart, Nelson mentor teacher, supported Flowers' explanation on how Nelson became a PDS. Stewart stated, "I think he [Flowers] actively sought it....because he's a very innovative person. He's very motivated and he wants to keep improving...." Stewart indicated that Nelson became a PDS because Flowers actively campaigned for it, and it is a large school with a diversified student population.

Three Nelson participants commented on factors that caused Nelson to become a PDS. They included the principal's willingness, selling the school, location student diversity, and space.
Mason PDS. Adair, Mason Elementary principal, commented on how she got involved in the CPDT as a PDS principal. Adair reported that her school was involved in the Partnership School Program (an innovative state program) and teachers were already in an innovative mode. She then became involved in the CPDT program when the elementary coordinator of her district asked her to serve on the original CPDT grant writing committee. Adair stated that "they just chose a real diverse group to write, and they coordinated everybody from the service centers and other school districts, and I was chosen as the elementary principal....I've been in on it from the very beginning."

Adair indicated that the district encouraged her involvement as a principal in the CPDT grant writing process.

Adair believed that her school was selected to become a PDS site because "we were already in the 'innovative mode'....we were willing already to do different things, and we saw the need for it, then we were real open to other suggestions and other ideas." Through district encouragement, prior university involvement, and willingness to be innovative, Mason became a PDS.

Brown, University site coordinator and professor, identified the University's rationale for selecting Mason. "It was more a site selection—is the principal willing and does the site meet certain other criteria in terms of student population." Brown explained, "We were looking for
a campus that had a diverse student population....students with specific needs and the campus also needed assistance in trying to raise the scores of the students." Brown added, "Initially accessibility for our university students was an issue although not a main issue." Brown cited reasons for Mason becoming a PDS as willingness, student diversity, low test scores, and accessibility.

Grimms, Mason mentor teacher, commented on how Mason became a PDS. She stated that "it had something to do with it being a partnership school." Grimms was further removed from the decision to become a PDS, and was therefore not as knowledgeable as the other participants concerning reasons for becoming a PDS.

Mason PDS participants listed reasons why the school became a PDS. They included district encouragement, prior university involvement, willingness, student diversity, low student test scores, and accessibility.

Beta CPDT

Crawford PDS. Starnes, Crawford principal, commented that he too was involved with the university prior to involvement in the Beta CPDT. He had served as an adjunct professor at the university and had invited professors to his school as consultants. Starnes explained, "I was involved with the university, and the university saw [Crawford] as an opportunity to expand their program into areas where their students would have the opportunity to
work in high minority, high-risk, low-income areas." He added, "I was not named the principal of a PDS, I was the principal at this school when the PDS came in."

Hansen, the University facilitator at Crawford, also noted that Starnes was an adjunct professor and had been involved with the university. Hansen stated that Beta University had criteria for selecting schools interested in becoming PDSs. Hansen reported, "One of the things we did look for was the principal and how willing they were to cooperate." Hansen added that other criterion included "the socio-economic status of the school and whether the district would be willing to cooperate in the things that we were asking them to do."

Johnson, Crawford site coordinator, commented on the factors that contributed to Crawford becoming a PDS. She stated, "I think we were chosen because of the principal... [who] was introducing these innovative ideas and was a risk-taker and willing to try these new things. And then I think our school was chosen...because of our demographics." Johnson indicated that their school had a low socio-economic, diverse student population.

Raines, Crawford mentor teacher, commented on how Crawford became a PDS. Raines stated that "[Starnes] heard about it and decided that we would be good. That was what we needed to do. We need all the help we can get."

According to all of the Crawford interviewees, the
principal's willingness to be innovative and student demographics were factors for Crawford becoming a PDS.

**Bryson PDS.** Dreskin, new to the Beta CPDT this year, said that before becoming a PDS, his school had been "a field-based site for 20-30 kids [university students] every semester who come here every Thursday for field experiences with their early childhood classes." He explained that he first learned about the program from Starnes, and when the university added additional sites, "Some teachers on my campus and myself took it upon ourselves to try to become involved...We applied and sold our school and our program as a good site for them and came on board that way." Banks, University facilitator, and Binning, a mentor teacher, confirmed that the principal and staff took the initiative to become a PDS.

The Bryson principal and other interviewees confirmed that the school had been involved with the university and applied to become a PDS. Because of the principal and the teachers' willingness to be innovative, the school became a PDS site.

**Gamma CPDT**

**Barnett PDS.** Before coming to Barnett from another community, Dutch also had worked with a university to secure a grant for an extended day care program for his school's migrant students. When he became principal of Barnett, he collaborated with Gamma University to start a similar
program. Though that program was not funded, the collaboration laid the groundwork for a CPDT partnership. When the CPDT announcement came out "I was approached by the university as a possible participant."

Dutch reported that there were several factors involved in the school’s selection as a PDS. Dutch stated that Barnett was chosen "because of the interest that I had.... the interest of the faculty....Location was mentioned as part of it and, yes, demographics was also part of it." He indicated that he and his teachers took the initiative to become a PDS and were chosen on the basis of principal and faculty willingness, location, and student demographics.

Jeffers, University professor and former site coordinator, and Kelly, Barnett mentor teacher, confirmed that Barnett became a PDS due to principal and staff initiative. Kelly explained that Dutch played the crucial role in convincing teachers. "Our principal volunteered. First of all he did come to the faculty once he heard about the program; he did ask for support from the faculty....then he went ahead and put our name in the hat."

Barnett became a PDS based on several factors. Not only were the principal and staff willing to become a PDS, location and student demographics also played a part.

Delta CPDT

Caldwell PDS. In contrast with principals who sought involvement, Caldwell principal, Martinez, had the PDS role
imposed from the district. Although Caldwell had student teachers assigned there before, entry into the CPDT was somewhat abrupt. Martinez explained that "We just got called to a meeting one day and told that is it. Your school has been selected to be a PDS."

Martinez believed that Caldwell was selected "...because it was a low-performing school. We have a higher ethnic diversity here." She added that "the district looked at it in terms of these schools may need a little extra help... let's put some teacher training-students who are learning to be teachers, and maybe this might be able to eventually help our students." Martinez indicated that her district initiated the process for Caldwell to become a PDS because it was a low-performing school with ethnic diversity.

Shaffer, University liaison, explained a somewhat different point of view as to how Caldwell became a PDS. She reported, "When the districts were initially approached about becoming partners, they were asked to identify schools which might be interested. When the call went out in the district, those principals said 'yes, we want to be involved in this.'" Shaffer indicated that the university initiated the process with the district, which in turn issued an invitation to the schools for volunteers.

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, confirmed comments by both Martinez and Shaffer. Williams reported that "[The university] targeted schools that showed interest, but I
think our socio-economic population was one of the determining factors in the grant that was written for funding for this program." Williams indicated that Caldwell was considered because the principal showed interest and there was a diverse student population.

**Gibson PDS.** Gibson principal, Summers, commented on how Gibson became a PDS. His view of the process supports Dr. Shaffer's understanding of the Delta CPDT selection process. Summers reported, "Our school district collaborated with [the university]; then as a faculty we were given the opportunity to volunteer to be a part of it." He added, "So in our district it is only those schools that want to be a part of it." Of the schools that became PDSs, all are still involved.

Summers mentioned other factors that contributed to Gibson becoming a PDS. He stated that the school was selected "because it meets every person's needs....We have [all types of children] here, so this is representative of the world." Summers added, "We were also selected because we are a most professional staff."

**Principal Selection Summary**

All of the principals reported that they were already involved with the universities in some capacity when the CPDT opportunity came up. Interviewees reported that 4 principals initiated involvement of their campuses in the CPDT while districts initiated involvement for the other
Table 2

**Responses to How PDS Principals/Sites are Selected**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Adair</th>
<th>Starnes</th>
<th>Dreskin</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Martinez</th>
<th>Summers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of Involvement</td>
<td>Principal initiated</td>
<td>District initiated</td>
<td>Principal initiated</td>
<td>Principal initiated</td>
<td>Principal initiated</td>
<td>District initiated</td>
<td>District initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior University Involvement</td>
<td>Already involved with university on project</td>
<td>Already involved with university partnership</td>
<td>Already involved with university as adjunct</td>
<td>Already involved with university students observation</td>
<td>Already involved with university on another project</td>
<td>Already involved with university student teaching project</td>
<td>Already involved with university student teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Selection of principal/school</td>
<td>Principal sold school; location; student diversity; space; willingness</td>
<td>District direction; willingness innovation; student diversity; access; low scores</td>
<td>University wanted minority, high-risk student population; willingness innovation</td>
<td>Principal and teachers sold school to university, willingness innovation</td>
<td>School chosen for principal and faculty interest; to university, student population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 campuses. Principal and faculty interest, student diversity, school location, and professional staff were other factors that impacted schools becoming PDSs.

**Role Expectations for the PDS Principal**

Role expectations for PDS principals included formal statements in the CPDT grant application and implicit expectations held by participants who worked with them. Principals, site coordinators, and mentor teachers responded to interview questions concerning the written job description, and expectations for the PDS principal.

Interviews, meetings, and other documentation were analyzed. Table 3 summarizes the role expectations for each principal. The expectations are grouped into 5 major categories:
Liaison/Coordinator, General Management, Staff Development, Student Learning, Improve Profession-Student, and Improve Profession-Other.

**Alpha CPDT**

The Alpha CPDT plan did not provide a formal job description for the PDS principal even though it listed and described the responsibilities of the intern, resident, mentor teacher, and University faculty. Interviewees, however, expressed their expectations of the PDS principal.

**Nelson PDS.** Flowers, Nelson Intermediate school principal reported, "I have not seen a formal list. We are right now rewriting the principal's guidelines for the district...but it doesn't specifically say PDS." He added, "As far as criteria for me to be a principal [of a PDS] other than what I'm expected to do in my building is just an added on thing." Flowers confirmed that there was no specific PDS principal job description. Tiffin, University site coordinator, confirmed this.

Flowers reflected that a written job description "wouldn't be a bad idea. I think writing down expectations of what I would expect from the program should be part of the selection process...." Flowers added, "If I was going to select principals for this program, I would want them to have a vision, be able to set goals for what they want to see their student teachers accomplish." Flowers was in favor of a formal list of expectations for PDS principals.
However, Flowers was aware of expectations for the PDS principal. He stated that expectations were "to manage the building so my kids learn....to maintain security and safety for everybody on this campus....to provide information that our curriculum is being followed....[and] to have good communication skills with the college. Flowers focused on liaison/coordinator, general management, and student learning.

Tiffin expressed his expectations. He stated, "I guess I see him mostly as a facilitator, as the person who established the guidelines under which we operate...." Tiffin's expectations for the PDS principal fell into the category of liaison/coordinator.

Stewart, Nelson mentor teacher, discussed her expectations for the PDS principal. She stated that "he needs to be totally involved with us, not so much as throwing out information at us as modeling and being with us." Stewart added, "I see him as a facilitator, but I also need to see him as someone who will step in and say this isn't the way this needs to go." Stewart's expectations fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, and improving profession-other.

There was no Alpha CPDT or Nelson PDS written job description for the PDS principal. However, interviewees expressed clear expectations for the PDS principal.
Flowers described his actual role and specific behaviors as a PDS principal. He stated, "The principal is the key vision setter for the program. You can kill it or you can make it. I've seen both things." Flowers added that he and the site professor "assign interns to mentor teachers and do those kind of things to help....I can coordinate with the site professor....that's why the principals do more. It's a partnership, it's not a me or thee."

Tiffin commented on the principal's role and behaviors to implement change in the PDS. Tiffin stated, "That's one of the reasons he has us here. He wants to implement change, and he feels like bringing in the interns has helped his teachers be more conscious of what they are doing."

Tiffin indicated that Flowers was an initiator of change because he implemented the PDS program as a means of motivating teachers to grow.

Stewart commented on the principal's role and actions in implementing change. She stated, "He needs to know how to approach the teachers with this [PDS program]....You have to be careful....His role is introducing it in a way that doesn't turn people off, gets people excited, makes you want to do this." Stewart commented that the principal's role is to introduce change, and to help teachers embrace it.

Principal Flowers and participants discussed the role and behaviors of the principal in implementing change. The
principal described himself as the key vision setter. Actions of the principal included setting the vision, and introducing and coordinating programs for growth.

**Mason PDS.** The absence of an Alpha CPDT or district job description for the principal was confirmed at Mason Elementary. Interviewees discussed their expectations for the PDS principal.

Adair, Mason Elementary principal responded to a question about a written job description for the PDS principal. Adair reported, "I don't know that there really is a job description. If there is, they've never shown it to me, and I have been here from the beginning."

Adair reported that she had expectations for herself as the PDS principal. She stated that she would "continue to be the instructional leader-completely-in the school....to make sure that coordination is made between the university and the teachers at this school....[and] to make it work on this campus." Adair's expectations fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, and student learning.

Brown, University site coordinator, expressed her expectations of the PDS principal. She reported that "the principal is the contact person with the site coordinator. It's up to the principal to work with the site coordinator in placing a student." Brown added, "The principal normally meets with our interns and sets the standard for behavior
expectations....They allow us to have meetings...with the mentor teachers. We also work together on what types of activities are appropriate on their campus." Brown expected the PDS principal to be the liaison and a facilitator of the PDS program.

Grimms, Mason mentor teacher, commented on her expectations for the PDS principal. Grimms reported that the principal "makes the assignments of the interns....[and] helps set up meetings between the teacher, student, and university site professor." Grimms added, "I think she was very instrumental in setting it [PDS program] up when we first started implementing it." Grimms indicated that the principal should facilitate, and be involved in the program.

The Alpha CPDT listed job descriptions for the other PDS participants, but not the principal. Though the CPDT may have relegated PDS principals to a peripheral position in the beginning, it was revealed that participants expected the PDS principals to play a pivotal part in PDS operations.

Adair commented on her role and actual behavior in implementing change in the PDS. Adair described her role, "[M]y role as an instructional leader has increased... because there are more people in and out of those classrooms who are seeing what types of instruction are going on." Adair added that her role was "to make sure that coordination is made between the university and the teachers
at this school." Adair indicated that she was actively engaged in leadership and coordination activities.

Brown discussed the role and actions of the principal in implementing change. She stated that "the principal is a major player, a key player. The principal is actually the person that says 'okay, I'm interested in x kind of change and what can we do together to implement this kind of change.'" She added that principals determine "how many times you can meet....whether or not certain types of staff development will be done...or their teachers will be involved in. I think they are really the key with any kind of change on campus." Brown confirmed that the principal was the leader, and engaged in making decisions, initiating and implementing change, and allowing teacher meetings and staff development to take place.

Grimms described the role and actions of the principal in implementing change. She reported, "Most of her role in that would be more like making us aware of the changes that they [the CPDT] had done." Grimms indicated the principal’s role involved informing teachers about changes in the PDS program.

Three Mason interviewees described the role and actions of the principal in implementing change. Adair indicated her role involved leading and coordinating; the other participants concurred.
Beta CPDT

Crawford PDS. The Beta CPDT handbook listed job responsibilities for building principals as well as interns, mentor teachers, site coordinators, and university facilitators. The list of building principals’ responsibilities, 4 of which emphasized direct responsibility for the interns in his building, were:

1. Establish a campus environment that supports the [CPDT] and promotes campus-wide professional development;
2. Help the mentor provide assistance to the intern;
3. Be certain that the Mentor Team and the intern have time and support for regularly scheduled meetings;
4. Maintain contact with the university supervisor and site coordinator about the progress of the intern;
5. Serve as a professional role model and instruction leader to the intern.

However, these had not been communicated to the principal. When asked about a written job description for the PDS principal, Crawford principal Starnes responded, "I can’t tell you that....I can’t even tell you if I have seen such a thing....Nothing comes to mind that I have seen." Starnes recommended contacting the university based CPDT director for that information.

Starnes elaborated on the expectations for his role in the PDS. He explained that because his district contributed 5% of his salary to the collaborative, the "expectation is
that about 5% of my time will be spent with this program."

He stated that "I am on standing committees....I have to
deal with all these interns as an instructional leader the
same way I deal with my teachers....I have to cooperate with
[the site coordinator]." Starnes indicated that his role is
like a "balancing act that is involved with are we doing the
best thing for kids...[and] doing the best thing to train
future teachers." Starnes' expectations were classified as
liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development,
student learning, and improve the profession-other.

Johnson, Crawford Site Coordinator, confirmed that
there was a written job description for the PDS principal
and supplied the researcher with a copy of that job
description from the CPDT program handbook. Johnson
commented on her expectations of the PDS principal, "I
expect the principal’s role to be one of the liaison between
the public school site and the administration and the
university....To also be an advocate for the other
elementaries or schools within the district." She confirmed
that the principal serves on many committees and accepts the
interns as part of the faculty. Johnson’s expectations fell
into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general
management, and improve the profession.

Hansen, University facilitator, saw the principal as
subordinate to the site coordinator on PDS related issues.
She explained that he needed to "support, to be open, to be
able to be the leader, but take direction from the site coordinator...who really runs the program." Hansen added that "He needs to be involved...to periodically meet with me....[and] to be a good facilitator for the program."

Hansen's expectations of the PDS principal were grouped into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

Raines, Crawford mentor teacher, reported no PDS principal job description, but commented on her expectations of him. Raines stated, "He has to understand what the program is going to be. He has to approve that it take place. He has to make sure that the funding is in line, and that it is approved by the school district." She added that "he has to be a part of the planning and validate what he thinks is right and call attention to what he does not think will be right for our particular school. Raines commented on specifics, "He helps in the selection of the interns....supervises the mentor teachers....[and] oversees everything." Raines' expectations were grouped into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, student learning, and improve the profession.

Interviews with participants and analysis of PDS documentation indicated that there was a description of the PDS principal's responsibilities. However, Principal Starnes did not remember ever seeing it. Participants' responses were categorized into liaison/coordinator, general
management, staff development, student learning, and improve the profession.

Starnes, Crawford principal, commented on his role and behavior in implementing change in the PDS. Starnes stated that CPDT partners want him to serve on committees because they "believe that there is a real connection with the public school and the input of the public schools is extremely important if the PDS is going to get done what it needs to get done...in terms of teacher education." Starnes described his role as a liaison, and his actions as attending meetings and giving input from the schools' point of view to help make the program successful.

Hansen, University facilitator and professor, discussed the role and actions of the principal in implementing change by giving an example. Hansen commented that the principal had indicated to the site coordinator that she had assigned the interns too many changes, and that was disrupting the kids and making them antsy. Hansen reported, "He felt that they needed more stability....Now we are not moving them as much ...that is a change that directly came from the principal. Hansen indicated that the principal acted as a liaison, and gave input that brought about changes for improvement.

Johnson, Crawford site coordinator, described the principals' role in implementing change in the PDS. She reported, "I think the principal has to be willing to give
of his time and whatever resources he can from the school to help with the change, with new ideas that come in or technology that we have." She added that the principal gave "financial resources....has helped in seeking grant money ....has been supportive of offering of space....has always been very supportive in helping us to implement those and allowing the teachers the freedom to try out things."

Johnson described the principal as a facilitator and supporter, and discussed specific actions of the principal to facilitate change.

Raines, Crawford mentor teacher, discussed the principal's role in implementing change. Raines stated, "He is supposed to be a leader in doing that. He is supposed to make sure his change is right. Change is good when change is the right change to make. He is right out in front."

Raines described the principal's role as being the leader in bringing about change.

Four Crawford participants described the role and actions of the principal in implementing change. Starnes described his role and involvement in activities such as facilitating, attending meetings, and giving input. The others described his role as giving input, providing resources, supporting, and leading.

**Bryson PDS.** Bryson Elementary principal, Dreskin, commented on a written job description for the principal. Dreskin reported, "We have job descriptions for all
classifications. I do have a written job description.... It's kind of a generic job description." Dreskin was aware of his PDS job description.

Dreskin stated that his district job description and expectations for the PDS principal are tied together. Dreskin reported that there is "a written job description that basically makes the principal the manager...or facilitator of the campus....[and] the time that I spend on this...add[s] to the campus in a lot of ways that fit into my job description." For example, "Staff development...fits in to my existing job description: providing training and staff development, hiring our staff and setting up our schedule, facilitating communication with parents, and being part of a district level management team." Dreskin's expectations for the PDS principal fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

Banks, University facilitator, did not refer to a written job description for the PDS principal, but she reported, "My expectations are to collaborate and help smooth the way with the attitude of acceptance of the CPDT. He sets the tone and he is cooperative in the activities." Banks' expectations for the principal included liaison/coordinator and improve the profession.

Drew, site coordinator, also made no mention of a formal job description, but commented on her own
expectations for the PDS principal. Drew stated that his role is "a very supportive one: to help me as a site coordinator, to facilitate the changes on the campus, to keep the teachers interested and motivated, to give them his perspective of the PDS...." She added, "I think he should be enthusiastic; he should believe in the program...." Drew's expectations for the principal fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, and improve the profession.

Binning, Bryson mentor teacher, did not mention a formal job description for the PDS principal, but commented on her expectations. Binning reported that "he gives you the freedom to go the direction that you think it needs to go....He left it up to us but he kept track of it all....You bounce ideas off of him, he is there for us." Binning's PDS principal expectations were grouped into the categories of school-university coordinator, general management, and staff development.

Dreskin was the only Bryson participant that mentioned a PDS job description. Expectations for the PDS principal were included in the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

Beta CPDT considered principals important participants and documented their responsibilities along with those
of other PDS participants. Dreskin was aware of his job description while Starnes, however, was not.

Bryson principal, Dreskin, described his role and behavior in implementing change. He reported that "the role of the principal is to be an encourager and to create an environment that's risk free, if you will, that has enough trust where people will be willing to do this...." He added that "creating that interest in professional growth, helping people to realize that there are some positives involved with it that make the extra work worth it, selling a little bit, and being encouraging are the main roles." Dreskin visualized his role as encourager and supporter, and described his actions as creating an environment for change and encouraging people to get involved.

Banks, University facilitator and professor, commented on the principal's role. Banks stated, "I just see him as a colleague to work on things together....having ideas but also supporting ideas, coming up with things that will need to be changed, or better ways of doing things. Like a partner in it." She added, "Some of the things he will have responsibility for in changing and then some things he will just help support other people in making changes...." Banks indicated that the principal was a colleague and partner, and engaged in activities to bring about change.

Drew, Bryson site coordinator, discussed the principal's role in implementing change. She stated that
"the principal’s role is to look at the big picture and how we can improve education for these kids in our school. She added that the principal had "to be a visionary and to say 'okay this is where we want to end up; this is what we want to become. How can I get the staff...to that ending point?'" Drew indicated that the principal’s role in implementing change involved looking at the big picture and communicating a vision.

Binning, Bryson mentor teacher, discussed the role of the principal in implementing change. Binning stated, "Being the face, being the public speaker, supporting his mentor teachers, supporting his school, being there for the parents when they show up with their concerns" were important responsibilities for the principal. She added, "Watching the interns is important, he needs to be there for them to a certain extent. He needs to be there to provide change, to be willing to change in his school and accept different things." Binning indicated that the principal’s role included a variety of actions and behaviors to bring about change.

Four participants described the role of the principal in implementing change. The principal commented that his role was to create an environment for change and encourage people to get involved. The others commented that the principal’s role involved a variety of behaviors.
Barnett PDS. Gamma CPDT listed the responsibilities of the PDS principal along with those of the other participants. The responsibilities were to:

1. Inform faculty of pertinent information for the successful functioning of the CPDT;
2. Provide necessary support and time for Instructional Leaders and Instructional Leadership Teams;
3. Provide materials/resources/training time;
4. Interview interns/residents and match with appropriate IL or ILT [instructional leader or team];
5. Select and monitor ILS;
6. Provide recognition, support and contribute to the positive morale of participants;
7. Be responsible for logistical arrangements of the CPDT space and facilities;
8. Provide relevant staff development.

Dutch responded to a question about a written PDS principal job description and expectations. He reported that "as far as the formal job description goes I would have to look back at the [grant]." Dutch recited from memory some of the expectations for the PDS principal, "[I]t’s pretty much to be the liaison, the person selecting the mentor teachers, to be the bridge between the university, campus, and the district....I’m providing a site for classes on campus. I’m providing access to the classrooms."
Dutch's expectations were grouped into the categories of liaison/coordinator and general management.

Jeffers, University site professor and former site coordinator, did not comment on a formal job description for the PDS principal, but did discuss expectations. Jeffers stated, "I suppose you have to want it [the PDS], desire it, have the philosophical background that it is an okay thing to do." He added that "it is the professional responsibility of all educators to help in preparation of the profession." Jeffers' expectations of the principal were to want to be involved and philosophically in tune with the PDS program.

Kelly, mentor teacher and site coordinator, commented on the PDS principal job expectations, but not on a formal job description. Kelly stated that "he has been very supportive....He has been there for meetings when we have questions....He gives us information...." She added that "if there have been problems...he is an excellent counselor to come to and find out how to work things through. He has been very involved and a big support." Kelly's expectations of the principal were categorized as liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

The Gamma CPDT plan listed the responsibilities of the PDS principal. Barnett Principal Dutch stated that he was aware of the job description and understood his PDS duties.
Although other interviewees gave no indication of a formal job description, their expectations included liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

Dutch, Barnett principal, described his role and actions. He said he was expected "to provide mentor teachers to the program who are flexible and open to trying some different things, to help in staff development opportunities— to make sure to provide those for all the staff not just the participating teacher." He added that it was important "to be flexible, to allow some innovation and be able to take some risks, to be able to take a little criticism for what you are allowing to happen on that side of the building from others...." Dutch described his role in terms of behaviors designed to foster change.

Jeffers, University site professor, discussed the role and action of the principal in implementing change. The role of the principal, Jeffers stated,

[W]ould be to rally the staff around that idea through maybe visits to sites, reviewing the literature, starting discussions in faculty meetings about the idea, talking about the pros and cons, bringing up issues of professional responsibility, our role as educators, what we might gain as a school by having students and professors coming into our building, how
that would benefit us (by us I mean teachers but more importantly the children in our school).

Jeffers described an extensive list of specific principal behaviors to bring about change.

Kelly, Barnett mentor teacher, commented on the role of the principal in implementing change. Kelly stated, "Again, he has given us the empowerment. We have our campus committee meeting. Unless it is something that really goes against district policy he is very supportive on whatever the teachers decide is best for the campus." Kelly indicated that the principal’s role involved empowering the teachers and being supportive of their decisions.

Three Barnett interviewees discussed the principal’s role in implementing change. Dutch indicated that he provided the teachers, staff development, and flexibility for the program, and was able to take the initiative and risks. One added that the principal needed to share his vision and help the teachers embrace change while empowering and supporting teachers.

Delta CPDT

Caldwell PDS. The Delta CPDT original grant did not list the job responsibilities of the PDS principal. No other Caldwell data included a principal job description.

Caldwell principal, Martinez, reported that there was no written PDS principal job description, but commented on the expectations. She reported that major expectations were
"to play a facilitator in carrying out the job of the CPDT which is developing teachers, and to encourage mentors, and to be there for the mentor teachers should they have questions." Martinez's expectations for the principal were included in the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

Shaffer, University site coordinator, commented on the expectations of the PDS principal, but did not indicate there was a formal job description. Shaffer stated, "The principal essentially becomes a part of that level ground concept and works very closely with many of the instructional leadership teams." She added that the principal "is involved in the campus meetings...[and] in the interviews when they interview interns....They have worked with them [interns and residents] as far as improving their skills, giving them constructive feedback." Shaffer's expectations fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, and improve the profession.

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, did not mention a formal job description, but described what her principal did. Williams stated, "We have monthly meetings which she attends....She is actively involved in participating in the initial intern meetings....and she is very open to shifting things as we need it....she has been a strong support with the program...." She added, "If there is a situation where we need a growth plan for a student...she becomes part of
that support team to help the mentor teacher as well as the intern." Williams' expectations were categorized as liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession.

Caldwell participants discussed their expectations of the PDS principal. Interviewees' responses were grouped into the categories of school-university collaboration, general management, staff development, and future teacher preparation.

Martinez, Caldwell principal, discussed her role and actions in implementing change. Martinez stated that "being able to communicate the purpose of the program...to give the teachers the information that they need to be better teachers, [and] to encourage them to improve themselves through professional development..." is an important part of her role in implementing change. Martinez commented that the principal's role involved behaviors such as communicating and encouraging teachers to improve themselves.

Shaffer, University facilitator, discussed the role of the principal in implementing change. Shaffer stated, "The role is really the same as any member of the team. The ideas and concerns are brought forward at the campus meetings and then things are changed at the campus level...." She added that it is that "level ground concept where if someone has a concern...he or she communicates it
and we talk it through." Shaffer described the role of the principal as being a team member who works with the team to implement needed change.

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, confirmed the principal's role in implementing change and the level ground concept. She stated, "From square one she was interested in this program and to see if it would work...." She added, "Any decisions we make are brought before the whole group in our monthly meetings. She is just there with us to brainstorm, to talk about what worked or did not or how we could make it better." Williams described the principal as an active part of the team who met regularly with them to implement change.

Delta CPDT

Gibson PDS. No Gibson PDS data documented a written PDS principal job description. Gibson principal, Summers, indicated that there was no principal job description, but there were expectations. He stated, "My job, first and foremost is to be an instructional leader. But that is just on paper. I have to be a little bit of everything... cheerleader, encourager, counselor, motivator, sometimes I have to be the bad guy." He added, "My expectation for myself is to always be the person that is confident that anything will work as long as we are doing what is best for kids. My job is to be here for everyone..." Expectations fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator, general
management, staff development, student learning, and improve the profession.

Evans, University site coordinator, did not mention the formal job description or expectations for the PDS principal. Evans stated, "He comes to seminars occasionally and will speak especially on multiculturalism because he is black." Evans expectations fell into the categories of liaison/coordinator and teacher preparation.

Slavin, Gibson mentor teacher, did not mention a formal job description or her expectations of the PDS principal. She felt that the principal was not really expected to be involved unless the teachers had questions or problems. Slavin stated, "If we ever have any problems, he will always talk to us about it. Basically it is the teacher's responsibility to teach the students [interns and residents] and he is real supportive on any questions we have." Her expectations were grouped into the categories of liaison/coordinator, staff development, and improve the profession.

The Gibson PDS principal commented that expectations for him were included in the categories of liaison/coordinator, general management, staff development, and improve the profession. Others' responses confirmed this.

Principal Summers commented on his role and behavior in implementing change in the PDS. He reported that the CPDT partners "have listened to me....If there is any change I am
free to make it as long as it meets the concept of the CPDT—
that they are having a semester of internship, their
semester of residency." He added, "It is up to us how we
want to facilitate them...." Summers indicated that his
role was primarily giving input as to what he and his
teachers want to do on their campus, and then empowering his
teachers to make the change.

Evans, University liaison, commented on the principal's
role in implementing change in the PDS. Evans reported that
"[Summers]...empowers the teachers to do whatever is
necessary that will benefit the children that they teach as
well as the interns and residents." Evans stated that the
principal's role is to empower the teachers to make changes
that benefit school and university students.

Slavin, Gibson mentor teacher, discussed the
principal's role in implementing change. Slavin stated,
that the CPDT program brought changes the "administration
office set forth for us." She added that the principal "is
always very encouraging about change. He will talk to us
and listen to our suggestions and ideas....He is doing the
best he can to help change and keep everybody satisfied."
Slavin indicated that since the district brought forth the
PDS concept, the principal's role has been to facilitate
change by informing, encouraging, and supporting the
teachers while smoothing the way for the PDS.
Gibson interviewees described the role of the principal in implementing change in the PDS. Summers indicated that he primarily gave input and empowered the teachers to change. Others indicated that he facilitated the process by informing, encouraging, supporting, and empowering the teachers to make changes to benefit public school and university students.

Principals' Role Summary

The university-based professional development school staff and the school districts appeared to have given little thought to the job description or expectations of the PDS principal. None of the districts changed the position descriptions of the PDS principals. Participants seemed to agree about expectations for the principal. Only 2 principals reported that they were aware of their formal PDS duties. The lack of a formal set of expectations was not particularly troublesome for the principals, as they were allowed to conceptualize their job as PDS principals in their own way.

Participants' job expectations or perceptions of the role of the principal were very similar to actual behaviors or actions performed by the principals. This suggested a high level of congruence between job expectations and job behaviors. In the absence of a formal job description or PDS principals as role models in most cases, principals conceptualized and described their roles based on the
behaviors and actions they were required to perform to actually implement and maintain the PDS program in their particular school context. Table 4 displays the 6 categories included in the PDS role, summarizes frequency of action required by the principal in a given category, and reports frequency as levels of concern in each aspect of the principal's role.

Analysis of their reflections on their PDS role shows that all principal linked the PDS to the pre-existing expectations for the principalship. In some cases the PDS tasks were defined as additives to the job. At a minimal level, all principals identified liaison responsibilities, seeing themselves as a link between the university and their teachers. Other principals saw the PDS as a resource to help them achieve their goals of improving student achievement and staff development. While some remained focused on their building-level responsibilities, 2 principals had begun to see their role as having an impact on the teaching profession itself.

The concerns PDS principals raised in describing their role can be classified into 6 categories. Principals differed in the degree to which they emphasized them.

**Liaison/Facilitator**

All principals identified a role as "liaison...to be the bridge between the university, campus, and district," and engaged in activities to ensure coordination between
teachers and the university. Martinez explained that her "major role is to play a facilitator...and to encourage mentor teachers, and to be there for the mentor teachers should they have any questions, or need some clarification ...." Starnes, whose district contributed 5% of his time to the grant, explained that he spent much of this time serving on standing committees such as the steering committee for the CPDT and the professional development committee.

**Instructional Leader**

Principals identified themselves as the instructional leader of their school, and considered that part of the PDS role. Adair felt the expectations were that she "continue to be the instructional leader" in her school, expectations present whether or not the school participated in the CPDT program. For example, Summers defined his role in terms of emotional support for teachers and kids while doing what is best for kids. The PDS was barely mentioned in his reflections: "My job...is to be an instructional leader. But that is just on paper. I have to be a little bit of everything...cheerleader, encourager, counselor, motivator. Sometimes I have to be the bad guy." He explained that he attempts to determine what individual teachers need from their principal and their preferred type of interaction, then, "I try to make sure I fit everyone’s needs..."I have to be able to meet everyone at his level, and validate him as a person, and make his feel worthwhile."
Other principals saw the PDS as a vehicle to support the regular expectations for instructional leadership. For example, Dreskin linked the PDS to his existing job description, explaining that he spent time on the PDS, but: "From the beginning it was my perception that the time that I spent on [PDS] is time that will add to the campus in a lot of ways that fit into my job description." He explained that staff development is probably the biggest area that fits because the university facilitator who visits weekly interacts with the staff and acts as a resource, and his school's site coordinator is involved with helping to set training opportunities and in-service opportunities for teachers constantly. Dreskin indicated that being a part of the PDS program helps the school get more things accomplished than before.

Starnes even expanded his instructional leadership role to include university professors and staff and other professionals in his district. He formed a study group of professional staff from the university and district, teachers in his school and interns that met on Sunday nights to discuss articles about professional issues. He counted this group as part of the 5% time contributed to the PDS.

Flowers explained: "If a teacher says, 'I need help,' it is my responsibility—not by job, but my responsibility—as a service to this campus to provide that teacher with somebody that can help them." The PDS was a resource to
help carry out that responsibility: "Having professors come in and do things with teachers...[and] be with the kids, lots of stuff like that...If I want a teacher to become a better teacher, then I have to teach her to teach kids and teachers."

**Instructional Leadership—Working with University Students**

Starnes did not differentiate between his instructional leadership role with his own teachers and interns:

"Obviously, I have to deal with all these interns as an instructional leader the same way I deal with my teachers....I treat the interns very much like I treat my teachers, and that's my responsibility to them." Flowers also directly involved himself with interns. He developed an intern handbook to orient the students to his school.

**Improving Student Learning**

Districts typically expected principals to be responsible for improving student learning and achievement. Flowers most articulately linked the PDS resources to accomplishing these goals. "From the principal's standpoint, what I wanted to see is, I want to turn out good students of my own, and then I want to turn out good teachers [in the PDS]." He noted the advantage to PDS participation included the technology he was able to get for his school and other opportunities. He pointed out that his was the only school in the district that got to use the stadium for field day.
However, while the PDS brought resources to the school, it had the potential to work against his goals for students as well. Starnes had to balance the expectation that the PDS provide many opportunities for university students to observe, work with, and teach children in his school with his own concern for maintaining a stable setting for those children who came from unstable home and community settings. "I'm involved in the evaluation of [student teacher/intern] experiences, and the kind of in the balancing act that is involved with are we doing the best thing for kids. But we are also doing the best thing to train future teachers."

Flowers linked this responsibility to his role in managing the interns. "If an intern is doing something wrong with a student, immediately it has to be reported by the mentor teacher to me and to [the university site coordinator]. We had one instance where a person was not functioning like they were supposed to, and we just asked them to leave." The interns' needs for school based experiences were subordinate to those of his elementary school students.

Adair also expressed anxiety about the possibility that PDS goals might conflict with student needs:

Probably one concern I have, and it's not been a problem yet, is making sure that the things that we are doing are best for kids....I can foresee some students that we might have that just aren't best to work with
kids...We've been able to work with them in discipline, but I perceive that as being a problem one of these days.

**Development of the Profession--Preparing Future Teachers**

In addition to working with student teachers as another staff member, some principals saw their role as improving the teachers of the future. They made an active effort to imbue student teachers with their own professional standards. They also served as gatekeepers to counsel student teachers out of the profession.

Summers felt accountable to the individual student teachers and the profession. He believed that their experience in his school could affect interns' desire to enter the profession as well as their view of the profession.

[Participation in the PDS] gives us a greater sense of accountability, because we know that we can make or break someone's desire to teach. There are very few interns that have come to us that haven't wanted to teach since they were little girls or little boys. That's been their life-long dream--to teach. It is our responsibility to let them know that life is not like those cute little films that they show at [the cooperating university] with those cute people in the rows and the hands all going up....It's our responsibility to let them know that discipline happens
every day...We have a strong sense of obligation to these people [student teachers], and it’s helped us to become more professional. There’s just something about someone being in your room that you don’t want them to think that you are not professional. So it has made us become even more professional, because we are aware that not only are our kids watching us, but there is somebody who is getting ready to graduate from college, and when they leave, I want them to say, ‘I want to be just like this teacher.’

Consequently, he felt responsible for their professional attitudes and behavior as well as their teaching skills. Our goal is to turn [PDS interns] out as well-heeled people who dress professionally, who act professionally, who look professionally, who think professionally. We want them to leave here professionals with the confidence that I can get any job that I go after...We want them to leave here with a strong love of kids....We want them to leave here understanding is this the age group I want to work with?...Be true to yourself. We are in this because we love it, so be true to yourself. If you are not going to love it, don’t do it.

Flowers also expressed concern with individuals who enter the profession, but are not suited to teach. "Some have only taught one year and say, ‘to hell with this, this
is no good.' They don't need to be here." The internship gives prospective teachers a chance to decide that teaching is not for them.

**Improving the Profession**

Only 2 of the principals were able to look beyond the immediate concerns of their own schools to consider their own impact on the profession. Flowers considered the need to develop a generic job description for professional development school principals. He saw the description, not as a list of tasks, but as a kind of person. "If I was going to select principals for this program, I would want them to have a vision, be able to set goals for what they want to see their student teachers accomplish."

Flowers also saw his role as helping to change the professional preparation of all teachers in the state. He expressed a commitment to the PDS school model as the best way to train future teachers and to improve teachers in the profession, and he was frustrated when teachers and university staff expressed doubt about the approach:

...in teachers' minds, this [CPDT] sounds like a good idea, but it won't happen, it won't last. The professors said the same thing, 'We've tried that innovative crap a long time ago, and it won't last.' It's [the CPDT program] got to last....this is the correct [teacher] prep model....[Principals and staff who see the CPDT as] just another thing they are going
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to give me...have to be trained in order to understand it. That's what we are going to try. It is going to work. It is working. It is the way out of the tunnel. If they [the state by eliminating funding] just don't shut the door on us.

He also expressed the desire to contribute to the profession and felt the university could help him develop by showing him how to write articles. He also was helping his staff think about how to communicate to the profession. "I've had only two articles written about this site...We as a staff are beginning to say, 'How can we publish? What do we want to publish? How can we justify what we are doing?'"

Martinez spoke of her role in changing the way the university trains teachers and saw the professional development school principal as part of the university. She felt her involvement with the PDS gave her the opportunity to serve on the search committees for 2 new faculty members. "I think that's a wonderful role that I play as a principal. I think that, at the same time, I represent the district in selecting these professionals that will be working with these future teacher." She also enjoyed the opportunity to be "part of the university setting" by attending the annual Association of Teacher Educators conference where she attended mini-conferences and workshops. "It improved my professionalism."
Most principals felt that PDS activities contributed to staff development, both formally through planned seminars and programs, and informally through their interactions with university students. They also believed the PDS contributed to student learning through such benefits as having "more hands" and more flexibility in scheduling and training. However, Martinez saw more to teacher staff development than the opportunity to acquire skills. She felt the PDS gave her teachers opportunities to grow and develop as leaders and decision makers:

I think we as a PDS have the ability to train mentor teachers to become the leaders they really can be...they are placed in situations where they have to make decisions other than just regular classroom decisions. They become true professionals. [Emphasis added]

As noted above, Martinez also identified opportunities to attend professional conferences and be a part of the university as opportunities for her own growth. Starnes pointed out that "it gives us a lot more opportunities to network with other professionals."

Additional Management Concerns of PDS Principals

Along with the basic management concerns that all principals face when running a school (i.e., student learning, teacher supervision, curriculum, community involvement, etc.), the PDS principals indicated that there
were additional management concerns and problems unique to PDS. Participants' responses will be discussed on a site-by-site basis to provide contextual relevancy.

**Alpha CPDT**

**Nelson PDS.** Three Nelson interviewees responded to a question concerning additional management concerns or problems that are unique to the PDS. Flowers, Nelson principal, mentioned "jealously of other schools", and lack of vision of the university and school. Flowers stated that there "is the lack of vision of the university on how far this can go. They are so into their mind set of what they think it could be that they do not necessarily listen to what it could be." He added, "Since I am not a doctor, I have to go in the back door and say 'look I'm just a principal, but this is what we had happen.'" Flowers indicated that he was concerned about the lack of vision of both the university and the public school to see the potential of the PDS to train successful teachers.

Flowers stated that another problem with the university was that the faculty had failed to resolve their internal political squabbles. He reported that "[T]hey still have political infighting among college personnel of who can do what, when, and where...." Flowers further indicated that when the university personnel do not come out to his campus, they do not communicate with each other as effectively. He stated, "The further they are from school, my site, the less
we can communicate....But I can’t be there. As principal, I need to be here." Flowers commented that lack of vision, political infighting, and lack of communication were problems.

Tiffin, Nelson site coordinator and professor, commented on management concerns of the principal. Tiffin stated, "Collaboration is one of them. How do you get the teachers and university together to agree on things and to work out differences. And it hasn’t always been handled real well." He explained that science and math are taught on the university campus, and the lab is taught on the school campus. The teachers here were not happy with that arrangement because they were having to interrupt the normal classroom activities to allow university students to do assignments. As a result, those professors go to other schools instead because the teachers were so vocal. Tiffin commented, "It set us back a little bit in terms of collaboration, because the teachers feel like 'hey, if you don’t agree with us, you just pull away. That’s not collaboration."

Stewart, Nelson mentor teacher, addressed the complex task of working with a diverse staff. She stated, "There are so many different levels of teachers....you have got to be careful how you throw it out at them without insulting some, boring some, turning some off. I think it is a very complex role...." Stewart indicated that a concern of the principal
would be introducing the PDS concept to his teachers appropriately.

Nelson participants discussed management concerns of the PDS principal. Flowers indicated that jealousy of other schools, university political infighting, communication, and lack of vision of university and school personnel in seeing the potential of the PDS to successfully train teachers were concerns. Others concerns were school-university collaboration and introducing the teachers to the PDS concept.

Mason PDS. Three participants responded to question concerning management concerns or problems of the PDS principal. Adair, Mason principal, commented that concerns involved working with interns, professors, teachers, and doing the best thing for kids. She stated, "Planning when all of these students are going to be here and what teachers they’re going to be with. I do a lot of that. There’s lots of problems there." Adair indicated that because of the high number of university students in relation to the teachers scheduling was difficult.

In addition, the university faculty turnover placed a greater burden on the principal. Adair reported that the main problem "is revolving door site professors. So the unity has been left up to me. I’m the 1 that had to hold it together, and keep the teachers going, and do all of the planning and scheduling and everything." Adair indicated
problems were the time management of planning and scheduling interns, working with professors, and maintaining unity.

Adair mentioned her concern about doing what is in the best interest of the children. Adair reported that one concern that she had "is making sure that the things that we are doing are best for the kids....I can foresee some students that we might have that just aren't best to work with our kids. Although it had not happened yet, Adair was concerned that some university students might not be suited to work with school children.

Brown, University site coordinator, discussed the management concerns of the PDS principal. Brown reported, that "they have many things to deal with....working with me, as the site coordinator, in placing our student with the teachers on their site." Brown added, "They also have to figure out parking, and the scheduling, how many people can they have extra on their campus, what kinds of behavior expectations do they have of our students."

In addition, principals have to deal with problems that arise with the students on the school campus. Brown stated that things come up such as "do we have students that are parking in the wrong places, do we have students that aren't showing up? If for some reason that communication hasn't gotten to us..., then the principal often lets us know that...." She added, "They are the leader of the campus....They have a key role, as far as I'm concerned, in
placing [interns] and the success of the program." Brown confirmed that the principal were concerned with placement, coordination, scheduling, and supervision of PDS interns.

Two Mason interviewees commented on the management concerns of the PDS principal. The mentor was not sure of the principal's concerns. The principal reported that the time involved with planning, scheduling, and supervising interns; working with professors; maintaining unity; and doing the best thing for kids were concerns. The site coordinator confirmed the principal’s concerns about interns and making the program a success.

Beta CPDT

Crawford PDS. Four Crawford participants responded to a question on the management concerns of the PDS principal. Starnes, Crawford principal, previously commented on the intern rotation causing problems with children and student discipline. Starnes discussed other concerns: "Yes, there is more paperwork. There are more meetings. I have to meet with the site coordinator—we have to go over schedules. We sometimes have to coordinate."

In addition, Starnes reported having difficulties with 2 interns that created stress for everyone. He stated that this year a teacher "was not successful in the mentoring relationship with the intern and we had to move that person off the campus. Last year we had to phase an intern out of the program because they weren't meeting expectations...."
Starnes felt that the PDS involved more paperwork, meetings, coordination, and stress when interns were not successful.

Hansen, University facilitator, discussed the management concerns of the principal. Hansen remarked, "I think one of them might be the relationship to the school district with the [CPDT] because monetarily wise they are always worrying. They have gotten a new superintendent who came up through the ranks...." She added, "They're kind of concerned year to year how much they [the district] will support the [CPDT]...Our funding each year of course is cut in the [CPDT] from the state." Hansen indicated that the principal is concerned that when state CPDT funding runs out the district will not support the PDS.

Johnson, Crawford site coordinator, commented on the management concerns of the principal. She stated that Starnes "lets me do the management and leadership areas with the interns and the programs that are going. I don't know what concerns he has....He just pretty much lets me do it. I keep him informed...." Johnson indicated that she took care of most of the PDS management aspects, and she was not aware of any management concerns that the principal had.

Raines, Crawford mentor teacher, commented on the management concerns of the principal. Raines indicated that management concerns of the principal included supervising the intern program and working with the university.
Four participants discussed the management concerns of the PDS principal. The principal's concerns included more paperwork, meetings, coordination activities, and stress with the interns on campus. Others confirmed that supervising the intern program and working with the university were additional management concerns. While the site coordinator indicated that she handled most of the PDS management concerns leaving the principal to concentrate on other things, the University facilitator indicated that another major concern was state funding.

**Bryson PDS.** Four Bryson participants responded to a question on the management concerns of the PDS principal. Dreskin, Bryson principal, commented, "We've got to figure out how to do all of this and pay for it. And with school budgets like they are, it's real difficult to get a commitment from your school board and your superintendent" to fund the program. He added, "The other part of the financial commitment is figuring out a way to recruit interns...." Dreskin's concern was that university students who were working to support themselves or had families found it difficult to work and complete the full time internship, so they were trying to find ways to attract interns. He was also concerned that without state and district funding there would be no way to continue the PDS program.

Dreskin reported other concerns about implementing the PDS. Dreskin stated that starting a PDS program "places a
little bit of stress on the system. We had to get our teams together....[and] ask teachers who were a part of these teams to give up a Saturday to go to mentoring training."

He added, "We had some distress over assigning which intern to which team...." Dreskin indicated that PDS involvement can be stressing and time consuming.

Dreskin voiced his concern that PDS involvement opens the school up to scrutiny and possible criticism. He explained that with more people visiting the campus "you never know how...you are going to be perceived...you have to be prepared to deal with those people that go away and say something not very pleasant." He added, "When you open yourself up for scrutiny...you are not going to please everybody...you have to realize that's part of the ball game." Dreskin reported several management concerns which include time consumption, additional stress from scrutiny of the program, and budget issues.

Banks, University facilitator, commented on the management concerns of the PDS principal. Banks stated, "He has got to maintain a school and let the CPDT enrich and guide. It can not take over or be in conflict. It has got to work in a cooperative fashion." Banks added, "He has done a good job of integrating it where it is not staying over on the side. He is thinking of ways to make the best use of it for....growth and development for his school." Banks indicated that Dreskin was concerned with growth and
development in his school and considered the PDS program as a means to that end. With Dreskin's careful leadership, the program was meshed cooperatively.

Drew, Bryson site coordinator, commented on the management concerns of the PDS principal. She stated, "We have a wide range of teachers....[He has] to keep that group cohesive and work together and not create a situation of jealousy-that the multi-age programs get more than us, that type of thing." She added, "I think that he does a good job of making sure that everyone gets equal things, but I think that would constantly be a juggling act to make sure that everyone was...working together for the better of the whole." Drew reported that Dreskin was concerned about maintaining group cohesiveness and equality among teachers which was a balancing act, but Dreskin involved them in decision making.

Binning, Bryson mentor teacher, concurred with Bank's comments regarding the management concerns of the principal. Binning stated, "I think it is keeping all of the teachers happy and that is tough....there are clashes and there are different needs from those teachers...." Binning indicated that a concern was to keep teachers happy by dealing with conflict and different needs.

Four Bryson interviewees discussed the management concerns of the PDS principal. The principal commented that his concerns included budget, stress, and time. Other
concerns involved teacher growth and development, group cohesiveness, equality, needs, conflict, and differences.

Gamma CPDT-Barnett PDS

Three Barnett interviewees discussed the management concerns of the principal. Principal Dutch stated, "The management concerns for the principal are basically personnel concerns. It's important to me that I select who comes on the campus." He explained, "It's a little different than the student teaching experience because it is such an immersed environment. They are in class so much that it is very important to me that you have positive personalities." Dutch reported that selecting and screening interns is one of his concerns.

Dutch reported increased personnel management issues. He stated that he had been "involved in disciplinary actions with mentors who get into it with residents and interns if things are not working well, [as well as]...clashes between the mentors and the university professor. For an additional duty, it's time consuming." Dutch indicated that personnel management was time consuming when he dealt with conflicts between mentors, university students, and professors.

Dutch reported other problems as well. He mentioned that the "physical requirements of the building" presented a problem when they "didn't have enough tables in the lounge for everyone to eat....[or] enough space in the parking lot for the cars." Dutch also mentioned the "danger of the
haves and the have nots, a little bit of elitism between the teachers....[and] there’s a burnout factor because of constantly having student teachers."

Dutch reported 5 management concerns. They included selecting interns, personnel management issues, physical requirements of the building, teacher elitism and burnout.

Jeffers, University professor, commented on the management concerns of the principal. Jeffers stated that the principal’s first concern in implementing the PDS was "that the K-12 children’s education is not compromised..... The second would be that a new burden is not placed on the teaching staff that will lead to the failure of the first." Jeffers described the management concerns of the principal as making sure that the school children learn and teachers are not burdened.

Kelly, Barnett mentor teacher, concurred with the principal on one of him management concerns. She reported, "One of his concerns would be if there are personality conflicts or if there are any kind of conflicts between interns, residents, or mentors." Barnett confirmed that one of the principal’s concerns was conflicts between interns, residents, or mentors.

Three Barnett participants responded to a question on management concerns of the principal. The principal indicated that personnel management was a major concern and the mentor teacher confirmed that. The university professor
indicated that the school children's education and burden on teachers were also concerns.

**Delta CPDT**

**Caldwell PDS.** Participants at Caldwell discussed the management concerns of the principal. Principal Martinez commented that the program "is a little bit more time consuming," and there are difficulties scheduling meetings. She added that "what is the most difficult is trying to get everybody on track. Trying to be the facilitator, trying to be the encourager, trying to get teachers to know that....if you make a mistake it's okay...." Martinez indicated that the program is time consuming, and that is was difficult to get people on track in the program.

After her third year as a PDS principal, Martinez's major concern was "guiding [and] making sure everything is going alright." Martinez commented, "When interns or residents are not meeting expectations or....there is conflict going on between the mentor teacher, interns, or residents, then I try to step in in those situations."

Martinez listed her concerns as facilitating and supervising the PDS program, and mediating conflicts when necessary.

Martinez indicated another concern regarding new mentors. She commented when "new mentor teachers do not exactly know what exactly to expect out of the program....they may tend to be a little bit hard on the student teacher."
Shaffer, University site coordinator, commented on the management concerns of the principal. Shaffer stated, "It is making sure that the needs of the public school students are being met first and then the needs of the teachers...." She added, "It's making sure there is a good fit between interns and their mentors, being sure that interns are blending into the campus environment or becoming a part of it-they are viewing it as their school." Shaffer indicated that helping the university students blend into the school environment, and meeting the needs of the school students and teachers were major concerns.

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, stated that "being able to keep up" with the program was an additional management concern. She explained, "The way the program has grown here, probably being able to touch bases with every team and making sure that things are running.... finding time to check with people and their needs would be a leader concern." Williams confirmed that management concerns of the PDS principal were supervising the program and meeting needs.

Three Caldwell interviewees discussed the management concerns of the principal. The principal reported concerns such as finding time, getting people on track, supervising, mediating conflicts, and uncertainty of mentors. The site coordinator and mentor teacher confirmed that helping
university students blend in and meeting participants' needs were concerns.

**Delta CPDT**

**Gibson PDS.** Three Gibson interviewees discussed the management concerns of the PDS principal. Principal Summers commented on the length of the program and the commitment required: He stated "that there are some people who can not devote a year of their life to coming to school....[and] sometimes interns and residents don’t realize that we work here everyday of the year so that is a commitment...."

He added, "We had one that was just absent too much and I’m sorry we had to let him go because he is not committed to his job." Summers indicated concerns were the full year internship and student commitment.

Evans, site coordinator, commented on the concerns of the principal. Evans stated "that the principals are much more involved. They know a whole lot more about these interns and residents than they used to know about the traditional student teachers. They have a lot more voice also in the performance." Evans indicated that the principals' concerns are giving input and supervising university students.

Slavin, Gibson mentor teacher, discussed the management concerns of the PDS principal. Slavin stated "that it is the actual teacher/intern/resident relationship. There have been instances of the regular teacher just not getting along
with the resident, personality conflicts that will arise in any situation....he has to mediate quite a bit...." Slavin indicated that PDS personnel conflicts have been a management concern for the principal.

Three Gibson interviewees commented that the management concerns of the principal involved working with university students. The principal indicated that the internship could be a hardship for some students and took a commitment to make it in the program. The site coordinator stated that the principal had more input and supervision over the university students while the mentor indicated that the principal was involved in intern/mentor conflict resolution.

**The Impact of Pre-service Teachers on the PDS**

When the management concerns of the PDS principal were discussed, the effects that pre-service teachers had on a campus become an important issue. Even though most of the principals brought up the subject themselves, they were asked to elaborate concerning the effects of the university students on the school. The site coordinators, university facilitators, and mentor teachers were not asked this question directly. If they brought up the topic themselves, their responses were included. The principals' comments are included in the following discussion.

Nelson interviewees discussed the effects that the presence of large numbers of pre-service teachers had on the school. Flowers, Nelson principal, commented that the
university students affected the school "In a positive way from the stand point that it allow us to have more people to help the teacher. Thus, Flowers stated that the university students had a positive effect on the school because they helped the teachers.

Tiffin, professor and site coordinator, had a different view point of how large numbers of university students affected the campus. Tiffin commented that Nelson ended up taking approximately 70 new interns during the spring semester, a number well over their comfort level of 30-35, when another school did not become a PDS as scheduled. Tiffin reported, "We are already finding that accrues problems too. The larger your number the more likely you are to find the interns who do not have positive attitudes. It's more difficult to keep up with them." Tiffin added that "most of them are young and inexperienced; they are not fully aware of all of the ins and outs of schooling, what has to be considered when making decisions; they don't always see why decisions are made."

Tiffin gave an example of how the attitudes of inexperienced interns concerning the dress code affected the school. He stated, "It is not that the principal is saying 'this is what I want,'...in this situation, this is what is expected of you because that's what the community expects and they would be offended by some of this." Tiffin indicated that large numbers of university students-
sometimes 3 in a classroom—are harder to supervise and added to the management concerns of the principal and staff.

Tiffin brought up another issue related to having large numbers of pre-service teachers on campus. Tiffin pointed out that when there are so many interns it forces the choice to use teachers that would not normally be used as mentors which brings into question the quality of the program. Tiffin reported, "You are more likely to take the teacher you really would not have used this year if you had a choice...." Tiffin indicated large numbers of students causes you "to extend beyond where you should in terms of selection of teachers" to possibly using teachers that are not ready or those with personal problems such as going through a divorce.

Stewart, Nelson mentor teacher, reported that at 1 time a teacher had to apply and meet certain criteria to become a mentor teacher, but when the large number of pre-service teachers came to the campus things changed. She stated that "the flood gates came open and there were so many interns... everyone could be a mentor teacher....And I’m not sure every teacher needs an intern. So we started out right, but we didn’t stay with it." She added, "I know interns sitting in the classrooms bored to death, but they are getting to see how they don’t want to teach." Stewart felt that large numbers of pre-service students resulted in abandoning the
selection criteria for mentors which affected the quality of the program.

The presence of large numbers of pre-service teachers was considered to have both positive and negative affects. Flowers considered the university students a help to the teachers. Tiffin saw them as harder to supervise and coordinate on the campus. Both Tiffin and Stewart had concerns about the quality of the program when teachers who were not ready or had personal problems became mentors.

Alpha CPDT

Mason PDS. Adair, Mason principal, discussed the effects that the large number of pre-service teachers have had on her campus. Adair reported that there had been "positive effects." Adair explained that the university students cause you to "be on your toes, as far as your teaching style, how you handle the children, your discipline. It has made our own staff more aware and able to do more of a self-evaluation." Adair considered the university students’ presence desirable because it caused the school faculty to be more aware of their performance.

Brown, University site coordinator, commented that logistical arrangements have to be made for a large group of university students at the site to avoid problems. Brown stated that "we do have students parking in the wrong places, we do have students that aren’t showing up."
Planning, scheduling, and supervising university students require time and attention by site personnel.

Grimms, Mason mentor teacher, discussed the impact of the large number of university students. Grimms stated that to become a mentor in the beginning a teacher had to go through an application process. When they got so many university students, each mentor received 2-3 interns. Grimms reported, "[T]hree is a lot for me to handle right now. It's hard for me to get them all [interns] to do what they are required to do in their classroom as well as me have enough time with the kids...." Grimms indicated that 3 interns, 1 student teacher, and 6 early childhood students, in addition to her own class, makes her job difficult to handle.

Mason interviewees commented on the effects of large numbers of university students on their campus. The principal indicated they made her staff more aware and kept them on their toes. The site coordinator discussed logistical details such as student parking and supervision that were necessary to plan to avoid problems on the site. The mentor teacher confirmed the difficulty in supervising a large number of university students.

Beta CPDT

Crawford PDS. Starnes, Crawford principal, was asked what effects the university students have on his campus. Starnes stated, "It affects it in good ways and bad ways and
you just have to balance those things out." As was previously mentioned, Starnes had a concern that rotating the interns in and out of classrooms so much during the internship caused the children to experience instability that was disruptive and resulted in increased student discipline problems. On the other hand, he commented that having the interns created "flexibility in your scheduling, in your training, and what you can do with kids."

Hansen, University coordinator, discussed the effects of university students. She confirmed Starnes' view that the interns were beneficial by stating that the school "gets a lot more people to help out with the kids." Hansen also confirmed that the intern rotation caused a disruption among the children by commenting "I had said this to [the site coordinator] before but she did not believe me. She said 'No, they [the interns] have to go around' and I said 'Oh, alright.'"

Johnson, site coordinator, discussed the effects of having interns on site. Johnson confirmed the benefit of having the interns on campus by stating "that instead of it being 1 teacher to 22 children, there are now 2 in there able to help."

Three Crawford interviewees discussed the effects of interns on the campus. The principal indicated that the interns' presence had the positive affect of creating flexibility and the negative affect of disrupting the
children when they rotated too frequently. The university facilitator and site confirmed the principal's comments.

**Bryson PDS.** Dreskin, Bryson principal, discussed the effects that the presence of interns have on the campus. Dreskin commented that it takes effort "getting those people [interns] assimilated in the campus, to feel comfortable, talking, doing their job, knowing that they're here and they are able to see and observe a lot of things that you [the mentor] are doing." Dreskin indicated that the teachers "have to feel comfortable having those folks around."

Dreskin also mentioned two positive effects of the presence of the interns. First, Dreskin stated that "it would be a personal and professional growth opportunity for all the mentoring teachers involved. You can't help examine your own methods, your own effectiveness, your own professionalism when you are trying to model it for someone else." Second, he commented that "the extra hands that the interns can play in like being an extra staff member" also has a positive affect. Dreskin indicated that the interns' increases professionalism of and support for teachers.

Other interviewees confirmed the principal's comments. Banks, University facilitator, reported, "I am seeing the faculty open up and that the opportunities for professional growth are here for the faculty...." Drew, site coordinator, stated "It is not a one way relationship, it is benefiting both. We are willing to look at the interns and
how they are teaching and maybe change a little bit of our
teaching."

**Gamma CPDT**

**Barnett Elementary.** Dutch, Barnett principal, responded to a question concerning the affects of pre-service teachers on his campus. Dutch stated, "I think that’s one of the benefits, the extra hands, the extra individualization in the classroom. That’s one of the primary reasons why I continue to support it so much because I feel that it is mutually beneficial."

Two Barnett interviewees confirmed that having the interns on campus is beneficial. Jeffers, University professor, commented that having the interns on campus is "a way to get help, reducing the load." Kelly, site coordinator and mentor teacher, stated that "the children benefit from it. We have more people in our classroom."

**Delta CPDT**

**Caldwell PDS.** Three Caldwell interviewees discussed the affects of pre-service teachers on the school. Martinez, Caldwell principal, commented that their presence had a positive affect on school children. Martinez reported, "Having more adults here, having kids just be exposed to this learning process, being part of the ongoing action research. That’s how it has affected our school...it has all been positive".
Shaffer, University site coordinator, confirmed Martinez's comment that having the interns on site has a positive affect. Shaffer reported that the Caldwell staff "want the best for their public school kids. They see it as a way of really having an impact on the future. They also see it as a way of getting extra adults in the classroom."

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, commented on the effects of having pre-service teachers on site. She stated that "we have much more support in the classroom with having other adults in the room working on the more small group situations, we have more of a team teaching atmosphere in our classrooms....I love the adult-student ratio..."

Williams confirmed Martinez's opinion that the university students have a positive affect on the school in that the extra adults help the school children.

Gibson PDS. The principal was asked to respond to a question concerning the effects that pre-service teachers have on the school. Summers, Gibson principal, stated that the effects have been positive. He explained that "it's amazing how when they become residents, then they can sub in the building when we need them to. They can watch classes. If a teacher needs to leave, it is just so good to know we have people...." Summers reported that university students were very helpful and had a positive affect on the school.

One other participant confirmed that the presence of pre-service teachers had a positive affect. Slavin, mentor
teacher, commented that with the university students, "We have more helpers."

Seven principals were asked if the presence of large numbers of university students affected their school. All of the principals responded that the students had positive effects. However, 1 principal reported some negative effects associated with the presence of the university students. Principals' responses are categorized into three groups: university students help teachers, university students help children, and negative effects of university presence. See Table 4.

**University Students Help Teachers**

Six principals indicated that the university students helped the teachers. Flowers remarked that the students affected his school "[i]n a positive way from the standpoint that it allows us to have more people to help the teacher...." Adair stated, "There have been positive effects....It has made our own staff more aware and able to do more of a self-evaluation."

Two principals reported that the university students created flexibility for the mentor teachers. Summers stated, "When we need help...then they can sub in the building when we need them to." Starnes remarked that his teachers "love the interns, they create a lot of flexibility for teachers...."
Table 4

Principals’ Responses to the Effects of the Presence of Large Numbers of Pre-service Teachers on the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Adair</th>
<th>Starnes</th>
<th>Draskin</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Martinez</th>
<th>Summers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Students Help Teachers</td>
<td>Allows more people to help teachers</td>
<td>Keeps staff on toes; Staff does more self-evaluation</td>
<td>Creates flexibility in schedule for teachers</td>
<td>Extra hands; Mutually beneficial</td>
<td>Have more adults on site; Extra help as substitute teachers</td>
<td>One-on-one in classroom</td>
<td>Kids see adults as learners; Exposure to action research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Students Help Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Effects of University Presence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intern rotation disruptive to kids</td>
<td>Opens school to scrutiny; Have to assimilate them into site; Have to feel comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blank=No answer

University Students Help School Children

Two principals reported that the university students helped the public school children. First, it helped them by letting them see adults in different roles. Martinez stated, "It affects our kids. It lets them see adults as learners. It lets them see their own teachers as teachers of adults. It helps them to know that learning is a life long thing—you never stop learning."
Second, it helps children by providing individualized instruction. Dutch reported, "I think that that’s one of the benefits, the extra hands, the extra individualization in the classroom. That’s 1 of the primary reasons why I continue to support it so much because I feel that it is mutually beneficial."

**Negative Effects of University Students Presence**

One principal reported that there are some negative effects associated with the presence of university students on the public school campus. As Starnes pointed out above, the frequent rotation of interns and residents in and out of classrooms tended to have a disruptive effect on the school children. He stated, "I’m kind of pleased that next year we are going to be back down to four or five interns because I just think that that will be a calmer situation for my kids."

Though Dreskin stated that having the university students around had positive effects on his campus, some of his comments hinted at possible negative effects. Dreskin remarked, "Again you have to feel comfortable having those folks around...just getting those people assimilated into the campus to feel comfortable." His comments indicated that there might be a period of discomfort when the school staff must grow accustomed to having the university students around observing them while the university students must get acclimated to the situation as well. Since this was the
he may find that everyone adjusts quickly to the university presence as they gain experience as a PDS.

**Teachers’ Role in Decision Making in the PDS**

Teacher empowerment and shared decision making have been identified as strategies for school improvement. To determine the effects that teacher decision making might have on the PDS principal, the participants were asked if the teachers have a different role in decision making the PDS than in a non-PDS.

**Alpha CPDT**

**Nelson PDS.** Principal Flowers, commented on the role of teachers in decision making in his school. Flowers stated, "We have a site based concept in this district, we all participate." He added that "they’re all on committees, budget committees, staff development committees."

Flowers reported that the teachers had decision making authority concerning PDS issues. Flowers stated that "the mentor teachers...work on any changes we want to make on what the interns do or don’t do. They work with the site professor and myself." Flowers explained, "They set the schedule of when the interns are going to be here....They coordinate the activities they want their interns to go to...." He added that "if that intern is not functioning or saying 'this is not what I want to do', then the mentor teacher needs to counsel with them...." Nelson teachers are
involved in general site based decision making as well as
decision making concerning the mission of the PDS.

Tiffin, university site coordinator, confirmed that
teachers had a role in general decision making as well as an
additional role in PDS decision making. As an example,
Tiffin stated that "teachers here also have decision making
power in terms of what they can do about discipline for
students....A group of teachers meets with that child and
the parents and so forth and makes a decision on it." As
for PDS decision making, Tiffin reported that "initial
planning or suggestions and so forth will probably go to the
CPDT group, and then if it was a decision that affected the
whole school, it might go to the site based committee."

Stewart, Nelson mentor teacher, confirmed the teachers' role in general and PDS decision making. Stewart reported
that they have input into "Budget, curriculum, job
descriptions, hiring. I have sat in on the hiring of new
teachers....We have input into just about everything now.
In fact almost to the point of 'help, leave us alone, let us
just teach.'" Stewart added, "I do go to the meetings where
the intern program is discussed and I have input in the
intern program."

Three Nelson interviewees discussed the role of the
teacher in general and PDS decision making. All 3
confirmed that the teachers have an active role in both
general and PDS decision making.
**Mason PDS.** Mason participants agreed that teachers have an active role in campus decision making. Mason principal, Adair, commented that all teachers have a role in decision making because "everybody works on everything." She explained, in addition to "our Campus Advisory Council, we have study teams for school climate, staff development ....Curriculum....[and] Technology."

As far as PDS decision making, Adair reported that "we’ve built interns into every classroom now" so all teachers are "mentor teachers." Adair stated that the mentors decided how to manage the internship on their campus and in doing so "came up with a checklist of experiences" Adair stated, "We fine-tuned it so that most of the responsibility is on the intern. They are responsible for filling all of this [the checklist] out, and all we ask for the mentor to do is initial things...and then suggest experiences." Adair also commented that the mentors decided how often they would like to meet with the site professors: "so now it’s just about once a month."

Brown, site coordinator, commented that the principal’s leadership approach rather than PDS expectations explained the teachers’ active role.

I’m not sure that has any bearing directly on being part of a PDS. I think that has more direct bearing on what kind of principal leader that school has. One of the campuses I am working with is very heavily into
shared leadership and the teachers have a large say in budget and everything else and then in the other one I am not quite sure. On the surface it looks like the teachers are heavily involved in it. Then I find out "well, we didn’t know about that—that was the principal’s decision."

Brown commented that Mason teachers were involved in making specific decisions regarding staff development and curriculum, whereas the principal assigned interns to mentors.

Grimms, Mason mentor teacher, commented on the role of the teacher in making general and PDS decisions. Grimms reported, "We have an advisory council and our advisory council makes all the decisions that the administration will allow us to....They are very active....it’s all over the district like that." Grimms stated that they make budget, staff development and curriculum decisions.

As far as PDS decision making, Grimms remarked that all mentor teachers are involved in meetings just 3 times a year and "most of the decisions that we make would not really affect her [the principal]. Most of them are in scheduling problems and problems that we were having...about the students not knowing what was expected of them."

Three Mason interviewees discussed the role of the teacher in making general and PDS decisions. The principal reported that the teachers had an active role in all
decision making. The site coordinator and mentor teacher confirmed that the teachers had an active role in making decisions concerning budget, staff development, and curriculum as well as some decisions concerning interns that affected them as mentor teachers.

**Beta CPDT**

*Crawford PDS.* Four Crawford interviewees discussed the teachers’ role in making general and PDS decisions. Crawford principal Starnes commented that while PDS teachers did have a role in decision making, "[the site coordinator] and I do a lot of decision making—just the two of us without taking it to the [SBDM] committee....we do a lot of procedural and management types of decision making."

Starnes reported that the teachers do have an active role in PDS decision making. Starnes stated, "First of all they get training in mentoring so they are involved a lot in planning and having the extra hands in planning. The mentor teachers are very much involved with the evaluation of the interns."

Starnes indicated that CPDT funding has given the teachers the opportunity to be even more active in decision making "because grant money makes more things possible to us." For example, 1 teacher got other teachers interested in the Michael Eaton Reading Project. After they did the training they said "'hey we ought to do this for the whole
school.' You know it kind of shapes the direction of curriculum for this whole school year in reading."

Hansen, University facilitator, discussed the role of the teachers in general and PDS decision making. Hansen reported that "a lot of the schools here in [the city] are site based. I do know that at [Crawford] they were doing a lot of that [general site based decision making] before we even got there, so that just carried on." As far as PDS decision making, Hansen stated, "[Teachers] are sitting in on committees at the university. Our whole thing [CPDT] was planned with teachers. The teachers sat in right from the very beginning on the planning." Hansen confirmed that the teachers are involved in general and PDS decision making.

Johnson, Crawford site coordinator, confirmed that the teachers have a role in general and PDS decision making. Johnson reported that her school has an "instructional leadership team. One representative of each team serves on that and they make the decisions for the whole school. For the internship program and as a PDS we have...a site committee....We meet together to make decisions." Johnson stated that the ILT "is supposed to have most of the say in budget and staff development", but sometimes the district "dictated" the staff development to them.

Raines, Caldwell mentor teacher, confirmed that the teachers had a role in general and PDS decision making. Raines commented that "we are doing the Michael Eaton
program, and the decision was made by committee", a decision which impacted budget, staff development, and curriculum. Raines stated that the intern "guidelines were pretty much written by us working with the university."

All 4 Caldwell participants discussed the role of the teachers in PDS decision making. The principal reported that the teachers were active in general and PDS decision making. The university facilitator, site coordinator, and mentor confirmed his statements.

**Bryson PDS.** Three out of the 4 Bryson interviewees discussed the role of the PDS teacher in general and PDS decision making. Bryson Principal Dreskin commented that whether the school was a PDS or not, "We still would be involved in site based decision making and teacher input." Dreskin reported that staff development, curriculum, and budget issues "are things that are a part of our regular monthly meetings....that we came to some consensus on."

As far as PDS decisions, Dreskin reported that "our campus coordinator is on our campus management team. Issues that would come out of being a PDS that would effect the campus as a whole we would discuss at campus management team." Dreskin reported that the teachers have an active role in both general and PDS decision making.

Drew, Bryson site coordinator, confirmed that, "We have a lot of decision making power at our school....I think that most every major decision that goes on on that campus we
have a say in." Drew specifically mentioned teacher involvement in budget and staff development.

Binning, Bryson mentor teacher, elaborated, "They [administrators] send out surveys to us" to get teacher input into budget, curriculum and staff development." As far as PDS decisions, Binning stated, "When we go to retreat tomorrow and the next day, that is when we can start to work on those [PDS concerns] and deal with those issues."

Three out of 4 Bryson participants reported that the teachers had a role in general and PDS decision making. The principal stated that the teachers were involved in all major decisions. The site coordinator and mentor teacher confirmed that teachers were actively involved in decision making concerning campus and PDS issues.

**Gamma CPDT**

**Barnett PDS.** Three Barnett participants discussed the role of teachers in making general and PDS decisions. Dutch, Barnett principal, commented that "in addition to the site based committees that we’re running, we do have the entity of the PDS where we are also working collaboratively. So it’s almost like a second site based decision making committee on the campus, but it is the [CPDT]." Dutch commented that teachers make site based decisions concerning issues such as budget, staff development, and curriculum.

Dutch reported that teachers have an active role in PDS issues. Their PDS committee handles a wide variety of
issues brought forth by school or university personnel. Dutch stated that committee members "review campus level issues....brought from the general faculty concerned with what's happening with the [PDS] program....[or] from the university. It's a communication committee, sometimes a decision making body, sometimes a consultative body." Dutch commented that he would go along with PDS committee decisions as along as they are "good for children, fair, and legal," but reserves the right to veto if needed.

Jeffers, University professor, discussed the role of teachers in general and PDS decision making. Jeffers stated, "All of our decision making is done at site based [committee meetings]." Jeffers reported, "Any issue that is of importance to [the PDS] at [Barnett] is brought up at that meeting" of mentor teachers. Jeffers confirmed the existence of both the site based and PDS committees and added that the principal "pretty much goes with the teachers" when they reach a consensus.

Kelly, Barnett site coordinator and mentor teacher, commented on the general and PDS decision making role of the teachers. Kelly stated, "We do have a site based team.... [and the principal] has really allowed the committees to make a lot of decisions." As far as PDS decision making, Kelly reported that "he [the principal] had been real instrumental and helpful in letting us [mentors] come up with a proposal" to address the intern rotation problem.
Kelly confirmed that the teachers had an active role in general and PDS decision making.

Three Barnett interviewees commented on the decision making role of the PDS teacher. The principal indicated that the teachers were involved in the site based committee that made general decisions as well as the PDS committee that dealt with PDS concerns.

**Delta CPDT**

**Caldwell PDS.** Three Caldwell participants discussed the role of the teachers in general and PDS decision making. Martinez, Caldwell principal, commented, "I think all of our schools are site-based decision making, of course, it is by the state. I believe that in a PDS our teachers make more decisions than in a regular school." When asked if the teachers make general decisions about budget, curriculum, and staff development, Martinez reported, "Most definitely." As far as PDS decision making, Martinez stated that she is very confident the teachers "are going to make the right decisions. I don't have to be there every single time and worry about the decisions that are made because I know that they are competent enough to make those decisions."

Martinez indicated that teachers have an active role in general and PDS decision making.

Shaffer, University site coordinator, confirmed that the teachers are involved in both general and PDS decision making. When discussing teacher decision making concerning
budget, curriculum, and staff development, Shaffer reported, "They are very, very active in all of those areas." She added, "There are not any top down decisions and so whether we are talking about staff development...evaluation, scheduling, intern placement...they’re involvement is critical. Their involvement is at the same level as any other player."

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, discussed the decision making role of the teachers. Williams reported, "Once again it feels like everyone is having input into the decisions that are being made....Our committees are all very active and we feel like we have a lot of direct input into decisions based on those committees."

Concerning PDS decision making, Williams added, "we do not have a PDS decision making committee. It is the whole group. It is all the leadership teams that get together and discuss things. Final decisions are usually made by majority vote if it comes to a decision." Williams indicated that the teachers have a very active role in both general and PDS decision making.

Three participants responded to a question concerning the role of teachers in general and PDS decision making. The principal reported that teachers were active in both general and PDS decision making. The site coordinator and mentor teacher confirmed the principal’s statements.
Gibson PDS. Three interviewees responded to a question about the role of teachers in general and PDS decision making. Summers, Gibson principal, commented on the decision making role of teachers. Summers reported that "teachers have a mightier role that I ever thought to have, but that doesn’t bother me because they are teachers and professionals, and they know what they are doing." He added, "To me they make better decisions than teachers who have never had an intern/resident." Summers indicated that teachers have an active role in general decision making concerns such as staff development, curriculum, and budget.

Summers reported that the teachers are the major decision making authority concerning PDS issues. Summers stated that "the teams decide what they are going to do. They let me know." Summers indicated that the mentors "assign them [interns]....They decide who’s room is this intern going to start in, when is he or she coming to my room, what am I going to work with this person on."

Evans, university site coordinator, commented on the role of the teachers in decision making. Evans stated that "I think each semester they [the teachers] have more power...Their suggestions are taken to heart and the college really does try to implement their suggestions." Evans stated that she was unaware of the role teachers played in
general decision making because she was a part-time university liaison and was not involved in that.

Slavin, Gibson mentor teacher, commented on the role of teachers in general and PDS decision making. She stated, "We are just totally empowered. He sees us as professionals. He feels like we can make decisions and implement the things that need to be done ourselves. We are pretty much given free rein." She commented that the teachers made decisions about staff development and the PDS, but not about budget or curriculum. Slavin reported, "My curriculum guide is 3 years old and it is with a textbook that is out of adoption so I do not have a curriculum guide for current books. Slavin seemed to contradict herself when she stated teachers have "free rein" in decision making and yet lack the resources or authority to get much needed curriculum materials and textbooks.

Three Gibson participants commented on the role of teachers in general and PDS decision making. The principal reported that teachers make all the general decisions. The site coordinator was unfamiliar with teachers' general decision making authority, but indicated they had an important role in PDS decision making. The mentor teacher's comments seemed contradictory.

The principals' responses can be grouped into 5 categories: teachers' role in decision making; teacher
input into curriculum, budget, and staff development issues; and examples of teacher decision making. See Table 5.

Site Based Decision Making Mandate

All 7 principals reported that since site based decision making was mandated by the state in Texas public schools, they had site based decision making committees on their campuses. Martinez confirmed that all Texas schools must have "site-based decision making, of course, it is [a law] by the state."

Three principals reported that they did not have a special site based decision making committee for the PDS on campus because they considered it unnecessary. Martinez commented that PDS concerns were handled by the campus SBDM team. Dutch stated that "we do not have a campus committee that meets just about being a professional development center [because]...Issues that would come out of being a [PDS] that would effect the campus as a whole we would discuss at campus management team." These three campuses effectively handled PDS issues without a special committee.

PDS Teachers' Role in Decision Making

Four principals reported that the teachers did have a different role in decision making in their PDS. Starnes thought his teachers were more involved in decision making. Starnes stated that his teachers "are involved a lot in planning and...are very much involved with the evaluation of
the interns....They sit on the panel that evaluates the portfolios that the interns have built."

Two principals compared teacher decision making in a PDS to a non-PDS. Martinez commented, "I believe that in a PDS our teachers make more decisions that in a regular school." Summers remarked that not only do they have a bigger decision making role in his PDS, they also make better decisions.

Two principals reported that their teachers did not have a different role in decision making in the PDS. Flowers stated, "We have a site based concept in this district, we all participate....They're [the teachers] all on committees, budget committees, staff development committees." Dreskin remarked, "I think that would not make any difference. We still would be involved in site based decision making and teacher input. Whether or not we were a PDS, we would still do that." It appears that both principals believed that teachers are empowered by state mandate to give input in any public school, and therefore did not differentiate between teacher decision making in the PDS and non-PDS.

**Teacher Input on School Issues**

**Staff development.** Seven principals reported that teachers make decisions about staff development. Martinez commented that staff development has been a very big issue at her school. She explained that the teachers "have played
a role in targeting what it is that we need rather than this is what you are getting."

Dutch remarked that his staff also was involved in staff development. He stated that the CPDT program has brought "a lot more opportunity for staff development with budget and connections with expertise. That's driven through faculty surveys and interest, and that's done with the entire faculty...." Dutch explained that the teachers decided if the money would be used for hiring substitutes for teachers that attend training, providing guest speakers, visiting other PASS, or attending professional conventions.

Curriculum. Seven principals reported that their teachers gave input on curriculum issues. Starnes remarked that one of his teachers found out from a professor in the collaborative about a Michael Eaton training program and got others interested. Starnes stated that the teachers "went to do some Michael Eaton training and came back and said 'hey we ought to do this for the whole school.' You know it kind of shapes the direction of curriculum for this whole school year in reading."

Budget. Six principals reported that their teachers were involved with budget issues; 1 reported that they do not have any real input into budget concerns except for staff development. Martinez remarked that they discuss their goals and budget accordingly. She stated that although some of the decisions have to be made by central
office, "teachers know what our budget is...[and] have a choice on where the amount of money is spent as far as instruction, travel, math, reading...." Dutch reported that wellness...[and] technology...." Dutch reported that his teachers have input into the initial screening and selection of university students for their PDS program. Dutch explained that both he and the mentor teachers do not have input into PDS budget decisions because "the grant director pretty much holds the strings, with the exception of the staff development money."

Examples of Teacher Decision Making

Five principals indicated that their teachers had input in additional areas. Adair mentioned that her teachers served on "study teams for school climate...health and interview prospective interns, "and develop a prioritized list of who we want or...don't want in the building." He added, "If any one of these teachers say there is one of these individuals that we do not want, then I will not bring them on the campus."

Though all of the principals reported that they had site based decision making teams per state mandate, it appears that some CPDTs and PDS included teachers in the decision making process more than others. Teachers were empowered to make staff development decisions more so than curriculum or budget decisions. Some PDS had special committees that dealt with specific PDS program issues such
Table 5

Principals’ Responses to Whether Teachers have a Different Role in Decision Making in the PDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Adair</th>
<th>Starnes</th>
<th>Dreskin</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Martinez</th>
<th>Summers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Role in Decision Making</td>
<td>All teachers have equal role in decision making</td>
<td>Everybody works on everything</td>
<td>Different role than non-PDS; do more planning and evaluation of interns</td>
<td>PDS doesn’t make difference in site decision making; TQM committee</td>
<td>Different role in trying to blend PDS with SBDM committee</td>
<td>Different role than non-PDS; make more decisions with PDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Input in Curriculum</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Input on curriculum</td>
<td>Input on curriculum</td>
<td>Input on curriculum</td>
<td>Input on curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Input in Budget</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Input on budget and grant spending</td>
<td>Input on budget</td>
<td>Little input on budget</td>
<td>Input on budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Input in Staff Development</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Input on some staff development</td>
<td>Input on staff development</td>
<td>Input on staff development</td>
<td>Input on staff development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Input on PDS Issues</td>
<td>Plan interns’ schedule, activities; responsible for interns’ behavior</td>
<td>Plan interns’ schedule, experiences and meetings</td>
<td>SBDM team makes major PDS decisions</td>
<td>Plan intern rotation; mentor teams; program operations; review PDS plan</td>
<td>Review campus PDS issues; make major decisions</td>
<td>Assign interns; determine intern rotation; make other PDS decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Teacher Input in Other Areas | All teachers serve on committees and make decisions | Input on Health and Wellness; technology; school climate committees | Teachers involved in regular monthly planning meetings | Screen university students for PDS program | | | | | Blank=No answer
as selection, placement, and evaluation of interns; whereas others incorporated PDS concerns into their site based decision making committee agendas.

Interaction Between University Faculty and School Personnel

An important aspect of implementing any new program on a campus is communication and cooperation between the major players. When a program is running smoothly, it is fairly easy to keep the lines of communication open and everyone interacting with one another toward common goals. However, when problems or disagreements occur maintaining unity is harder to achieve. The success of a program depends upon the participants’ willingness and ability to interact to solve or work through the difficulty for the common good.

Interviewees were asked to discuss how university and school personnel communicate, interact, and work through disagreements. Participants’ responses were analyzed on a site-by-site basis to provide contextual relevancy. Principals’ comments are examined in more detail in the following discussion.

Alpha CPDT

Nelson PDS. Nelson participants discussed how the university faculty interacted with the school staff to work through disagreements. Flowers, Nelson principal, stated that the university communicates with him through the site coordinator, Tiffin. Flowers reported, "We talk to each other every day. We both try to be available for each
other. And it goes back to I trust the guy. And I think he trusts me...." He added, "I don’t tell him what to do with his students and he doesn’t tell me what to do with my students or my building. We try to cooperate with each other." Flowers indicated that communication and cooperation with the site coordinator is very important to making the PDS successful.

Flowers commented on the interaction of the university and school staff when there is a disagreement and how it is worked out. Flowers reported,

If I have a problem or a teacher is having a problem, we talk first. If I need help, I’ve got help. That line of communication was designed before we started. If this doesn’t work, what’s next?...You can’t do anything without a plan, you have to know that this step leads to this step....If there’s a problem with the intern, that mentor teacher needs to go straight to that site professor because that is his/her responsibility to monitor the behavior of the interns. In a situation where that’s not going to happen, then I need to be the next one told....he’ll have first shot at that person. If it’s something that affects a kid in my class, I want to be responsible for that.

Flowers indicated that the school and the university staff have a plan of action for resolving conflicts.
When asked to give an example of a problem that they had encountered, Flowers reported that the school had "wanted to have interns here the first day of the semester" so they could experience the beginning of school activities. The university informed the school that the university students had not reported yet for their classes. They worked it out by contacting the interns who "agreed to come early" in exchange for "some days off later" in the semester. The PDS participants negotiated a solution to the problem. Tiffin, discussed the communication between the university and school staff and how they interacted to resolve problems. He reported that he had an open door type of communication with the principal. Tiffin stated, If there was a major problem...then there would have to be a sitting down of the teachers and the principal and the people at the university to discuss it. If it could not be mediated or worked out, then we'd have to go to some other site....I'm the first answer....If I can't work it out then obviously it involves a lot more people. I'll live by whatever decision they make. Tiffin described the process of working out a problem with communication and cooperation of those involved. Tiffin described 1 disagreement that had come up with a mentor teacher and an intern and how it was worked out. He reported that a mentor teacher complained to him "because an intern had been absent frequently from her class" and
wanted her removed from her classroom. Tiffin commented
"that this was a university class, and I didn't have the
right to dismiss a person from class simply because they
missed, if in fact that was a legitimate absence." Tiffin
reported that "the teacher calmed down, and we worked
everything out." Tiffin and the teacher worked together to
clear things up.

Stewart, Nelson mentor teacher, discussed the
communication and cooperation between the site coordinator
and the mentors. Stewart reported that problems are worked
out "through mentor meetings. When Dr. [Tiffin] meets with
us, he sets the stage where we can tell him anything."

Stewart described how they work together in the mentor
meetings to solve problems. She reported that when the
interns' schedule was changed from a 4 day a week schedule
"we had a little rift on that, and now it's Monday,
Wednesday, and Friday, and I don't think it's as good."
Stewart stated, "We didn't win that battle too well, but we
let them [the university] know what we thought of it...."
She added "that they had to work around so many schedules
....I don't think they just said 'no' to us because they
didn't like us, or didn't want to help us. They seemed to
listen...." Stewart acknowledged that the university was
willing to listen to their concerns even though the solution
was not totally acceptable to the teachers.
Three participants discussed the interaction between the university and school personnel. All seemed to value open communication and cooperation although not all solutions were considered entirely satisfactory to all.

**Alpha CPDT**

**Mason PDS.** Mason participants responded to a question about school and university personnel interactions. Mason principal, Adair, reported, "We have an open door and regular meetings...set up on Monday afternoon...it's just real open."

Adair described the procedure for resolving problems between the university faculty, interns, or mentors. She stated, "You go to the person you're having a problem with first. But, then you go to the site professor first, and if they can't work something out, then I'm called in." Adair continued, "If we can't work something out, then [the CPDT director] can be requested to be called in....And, as far as teachers, it's the university supervisor first, then me, and then [the CPDT director]." Adair commented that the CPDT director had only been called in once to help in a situation where an intern wanted to be placed where he could be involved in high school athletics.

Adair discussed a problem she had with the way the math internship was taught. Adair reported, "I had a real problem with the math internship because it was being handled the same way it was handled when I was in school 30
years ago. I didn’t feel like that met the needs of our kids...." She added, "We came to a compromise. We are still doing some things the same way, but then I’ve been able to convince him to change it and personalize it for our kids....It’s all worked out." Through communication and cooperation they were able to resolve difficulty with outdated math internship methods.

Brown, Mason site coordinator, commented on school and university communication and interactions. She stated that "I prefer face-to-face [communication] and I think [Adair] does too". Brown reported that "I have not experienced that [conflict with principal] problem, we have been able to see eye-to-eye on anything that has come up...."

Brown stated that if a problem did come up she could try to resolve it through "the chain of command...which is my immediate supervisor, the chair of the elementary education department...." She added that "in terms of public school, if the principal and I were not able to work it out, it would go to-in [this district] it is the assistant superintendent...." Brown acknowledged that conflicts could be worked out by communication and cooperation. However, the chain of command she described was different from what Principal Adair discussed.

When asked to describe a problem or difficulty that the university and school staff had to address, Brown indicated that they did have one situation that concerned a student’s
disability. She commented that "we worked through a
difficult placement with one of our interns, and we had to
figure out what would be the best for that student and for
the students in the classroom." Although Brown did not
elaborate on the intern's disability, it was clear that both
university and school staff communicated and cooperated to
resolve the problem.

Grimms, Mason mentor teacher, gave another example of
communication and cooperation. "There's one teacher who
had a problem with an intern. She did not have a problem
with a site professor...The site professor was very
supportive in getting that situation resolved."

Three Mason interviewees discussed communication and
interactions between university and school personnel. The
principal indicated that there is a chain of command by
which to resolve difficulties. Both the site coordinator
and the mentor confirmed that problems were worked out by
communication and cooperation through the chain of command.

Crawford PDS. Four Crawford interviewees responded to
a question on how university and school faculty communicate
and interact with each another. Starnes, Crawford
principal, described how the university communicated with
the school. He stated, "In the beginning they communicated
with us a lot in large group settings, came to our meetings,
talked with us. Now that they know us...there is a lot more
informal and direct communication with my staff." Starnes indicated that the university staff realizes that "I'm basically responsible for these kids so they are very good about working with me."

Starnes discussed how he tries to resolve problems. He stated, "We normally just like to sit down and talk about it. Sometimes I talk with the university people and I say look, here is what you have to understand, this is how our school runs...." He added that he might go to "the teacher and say I understand and appreciate what you are saying here but we bought into this program...and this is just one of those negatives that we are going to have to live with."

When asked to describe a situation in which the university faculty and school staff experienced conflict, Starnes reported, "There have been some situations like that with placement of interns or scheduling of interns, even some philosophical things like discipline in the classroom." He informed university faculty that, while he did not know everything, he knew that their philosophy was based on research that "is highly connected to white, upper middle class backgrounds and sort of mainstream American, and [Crawford] is not mainstream America. This is a different place and you are going to need to understand that...."

Although Starnes' main idea reflected efforts to work through difficulties in dealing with children of diverse backgrounds, it is interesting to note that he perceives
that he is negotiating with the university from a less than equal position.

Hansen, University facilitator, discussed communication and interaction between university and school personnel. Hansen reported, "We have a very, very harmonious working relationship at my school." She added, "We have never really had any disagreements....we get along real, real well."

Hansen was asked to describe a situation where there was a problem that had to be worked out by the university and school staff. Hansen reported that "we had a girl who had learning problems....She was a special ed major, but she had some major problems getting along with her mentor teacher. We all met and he [the principal] was very supportive of everybody...." She added, "We just switched her to a different mentor teacher." Hansen indicated that the university and school staff cooperated to arrive at an equitable solution for the intern.

Ms. Johnson, site coordinator, discussed university and school communication and interaction. Johnson reported that as far as having problems, "we haven’t had one yet. I guess we have been real fortunate in that manner." She commented that if they did have a problem "the principal would have to come in and say ‘this is my belief as the instructional leader of this school’ and some comprise would have to be worked out."
Ms. Raines, Crawford mentor teacher, discussed communication and interaction between the university and school faculty. Raines confirmed what the university facilitator stated about the intern with special problems. Raines stated, "I know that the problem with the little girl that I got, before it ever got to me, they all sat down together and worked through it....and then they came to an agreement. Raines added that since the intern was moved she was doing "better than a lot I have had."

Four interviewees discussed the communication and interaction of university and school staff. All four confirmed that they were able to communicate and cooperate to resolve problems.

Bryson PDS. Four participants responded to a question concerning communication and interaction between university and school personnel. Although Bryson is in its first semester as a PDS, Dreskin, Bryson principal, reported that "we are continuing to grow closer to those folks and to have that rapport that would allow us to sit down and talk about a serious problem or disagreement and probably come to some kind of solution...."

Dreskin described how they worked out a small problem concerning intern placement. Dreskin stated, "We weren’t able to give everyone their choice because we had a couple of teams that wanted the same intern....So we had to negotiate that deal and get that worked out."
indicated that the university and school staff have a good rapport which enables them to communicate to solve problems.

Banks, university facilitator, discussed university and school staff communication and interaction. Banks described her communication with the principal as open, "If I have something to talk to him about I will go talk to him. He is real accessible to me."

When asked to describe a problem situation that the university had with the school faculty, Banks stated "We have not had it yet. We have had a problem with an intern." She indicated that "we just all sit down and talk and fact find and turn purple talking about it." Banks confirmed that the university and school staff had a good working relationship, but they encountered a problem with an intern.

Drew, site coordinator, discussed the communication and interaction between school and university personnel when there is a disagreement. Drew stated, "I would assume that it would be talked about in a conference of the principal, the school personnel that there was a problem with, myself, [and] the university...." Drew indicated that there was a process for handling disagreements.

Drew confirmed that they did have a problem with an intern. Drew commented, "Basically she had a real negative attitude towards the program, the teachers, me, the university facilitator, the principal. She was bringing the other interns down with the negativism....Hopefully we have
that turned around and on the right track." Drew confirmed the good process for working out relationship between the university and school personnel.

Binning, Bryson mentor teacher, discussed school and university personnel communication and interaction. She stated, "I have not really encountered anything where there were teachers having problems with the university or vice versa or teachers having problems with each other." Binning indicated that the university and school staff had a good working relationship.

Binning reported that 1 team had a problem with an intern who was "telling traditional teachers that they do not do things right." Binning stated that the other interns mentioned it to the site coordinator, and eventually [the CPDT director] held a "meeting so they got some things ironed out." The university and staff were able to work out the problem with the intern through communication and cooperation.

Four interviewees discussed the university and school personnel communication and interaction. The principal reported that they had a good rapport that enabled them to work through problems. All 3 of the other participants confirmed the principal's remarks. Three reported having a problem with an intern that was worked out satisfactorily.
Barnett Elementary. Three Barnett interviewees responded to a question concerning university and school faculty communication and interaction. Dutch, Barnett principal, commented, "I’ve been able to work quite well with all the college people." When there is a problem, Dutch reported, "It’s done as a conflict resolution, trying to work through it to see if we can get some kind of agreement among them. That has happened."

Dutch discussed a difference between university and school philosophy concerning phonics instruction. Dutch reported that the district "designated daily time for phonics study" and that was "in conflict with some of the research and current techniques" advocated by the university. He pointed out that the district is focusing on ways to improve student TAAS scores, while the university is stressing process instruction. Dutch indicated that the disagreement concerning curriculum and goals will not be easy to resolve.

Jeffers, site professor, discussed communication and interaction between university and school staff. Jeffers reported, "There is a cordial relationship" between him and principal. Jeffers commented that if there was a disagreement, "It might come to [a] campus meeting; it might be a conversation in the principal’s office; it might be
just [the] professor and mentor meeting together and discussing...." A variety of interactions might take place.

Jeffers described a problem with "a mentor not having the philosophy or understanding of what [the CPDT] is all about, and therefore not being an effective mentor." Jeffers commented that "the situation is not resolved yet, but it has been handled in back room discussion." When asked if that was satisfactory, Jeffers stated, "No, because the mentor was selected without any of our input. [The teacher] was selected by the principal." He added, "Have I ever disagreed with [the principal]? Yes, but I have never disagreed to his face about anything....I have not gone to him, I have yet to do that—so come back next week and I will have the answer." Jeffers indicated that although the principal addressed the situation, it was not handled to his satisfaction and a meeting might be required.

Kelly, Barnett mentor teacher, discussed university and school personnel communication and interaction. Kelly reported that when there was a disagreement a meeting was called where the group sat down and the elementary coordinator did "some of the mediating." She added, "We have had [the CPDT director] and the professors come to meetings....[where] we all sit down and say this is what we feel is going on...and just lay it out on the table."

Kelly described a problem she had with an intern that was never worked out to her satisfaction. She stated, "I
had an intern/resident with whom I was having some major problems with in the classroom in professionalism with the children....I wanted her out of my room or out of the program...." She continued, "There was a lot of mediation that went on....[the university] will not do that because of the curriculum being integrated here on the campus....I just had to grin and bear it for a full year...." A variety of strategies were utilized to work out the problem with the intern, but it was not resolved satisfactorily from the teacher's point of view.

Three Barnett participants described university and school personnel communication and interaction. The principal reported that the intern rotation situation had not been resolved. The site professor stated that the mentor teacher problem had not been solved. The mentor teacher commented that the problem with the intern was not handled to her satisfaction. All participants reported three different situations that had not been resolved to the satisfaction of those involved which indicated a need for growth in the area of conflict resolution at that site.

Caldwell PDS. Three Caldwell interviewees responded to a question concerning university and school personnel communication and interaction. Martinez, Caldwell principal, reported that the university liaison who had worked at the site during the first three years was
fantastic....if you had a problem we could talk about it and we always worked it out. The new one coming in being trained by the old person did not fit....when I worked with her a little bit, I could tell this was not going to work."

Martinez described a problem between 3 mentors and an intern that turned into a negative situation for the intern. Martinez reported, "We did run into a situation with some mentor teachers. To me they were being very hard on an intern." Martinez explained that the situation "was blown out of proportion" because the new liaison, who should be trying to diffuse the situation,...just added fire." Martinez commented, "I called the other liaison who had been with us for a long time. She and I discussed the situation. That's when we worked with all of them."

Although they worked out the problem between the mentors and intern, Martinez felt that the university needed to make some changes to successfully fit on the campus. Martinez indicated that if the liaison does not improve "I will ask for someone else."

Shaffer, site coordinator (and original liaison), discussed university and school personnel communication and interaction. Shaffer reported, "I touch base every time I am on campus with the principal....I consider her a valuable colleague."

When asked how the university and school staff resolve differences, Shaffer reported that we "bring it to the table
to talk it through. It is critical that the communication lines remain open because we are all in this together. That is why it is critical that you are out there every week...."
She added, "It is that whole area of respect that the university is not the authority saying that it must be done this way. We are all in this together....It is that middle ground concept." Shaffer confirmed the problem that occurred between the mentors and the intern, acknowledged that she was the university support person that stepped in to lend support, and commented that communication and cooperation among players is critical to a successful PDS.

Williams, Caldwell mentor teacher, discussed school and university faculty communication and interaction. She reported, "We have summer retreats where we get together and brainstorm, the university and public school personnel,... strengths and weaknesses of the program and what we could do to make it better." She added, "If we have a concern we just bring it up to her [the site coordinator]. It is like solving the problem on the spot. If we can we try to work through it in house." Williams stated that university and school personnel work together to improve the program.

Williams discussed how she worked with the university to bring about needed change. Williams stated that the first semester was "too soon for them [interns] to be responsible for implementing their own behavior management system. I felt it would be better if they followed [a plan]
that was in place already and then expect that more in the residence semester." Williams indicated that communication and cooperation was important to improve the PDS program.

Three participants commented on the communication and interaction of university and school personnel. The principal reported having a problem with the current site coordinator. The original site coordinator confirmed the principal's comments about the problem with the intern. The mentor reported that she communicated a problem, and they all worked together to bring about change.

**Delta CPDT**

**Gibson PDS.** Three Gibson interviewees discussed the communication and interaction between university and school personnel. Summers, Gibson principal, commented on how the university faculty communicates with school staff. Summers reported, "They [the university staff] are always asking 'what can they do? How is so and so getting along?' They communicate in a variety of ways."

Summers discussed how university and school staff work out problems. Summers reported, "We meet with the teachers who had the disagreement; I relay that to [the site coordinator] and then she gets right on the problem....She has never treated it frivolously."

Summers stated that they encountered a problem with an intern that the university and school faculty had to work through. Summers explained that the university assigned "an
intern one time who was just not ready for life....We just had to let them know that she's not ready. To their credit they did talk to her....[and] we did try to give her a chance." Summers indicated that the school and university decided to remove the intern from the program because the intern was "damaging children."

Evans, site coordinator, discussed communication and interaction between the university and school staff. Evans reported that since she works part-time as a university liaison she usually handles most situations by first discussing them with Shaffer who is the Caldwell site coordinator and her immediate supervisor. In general, Evans stated that schools are encouraged "to work out their own problems. Of course we are right there to help out, but we feel like if we let them solve their own problems with our support that they will be happier with the program." The university encouraged the PDS to work out their own problems, but was there to lend support if needed.

Evans described a troublesome situation that she encountered at Gibson with one mentor who was "almost impossible." Evans reported that "there is at least one that I do not care what you do you can not please the person. I feel like she was having an extremely negative effect on my intern." She added, "A resident that had been with this woman said, 'please monitor this, do not let her do to another intern or resident what she did to me.' I
went back and forth to [Shaffer] and this particular student dropped out." Evans described the negative effect the mentor was having on the intern which caused the intern to drop out, but added the teacher would probably not be a mentor next semester.

Slavin, Gibson mentor teacher, commented on her communication and interaction between the university and school staff. Slavin reported, "The only people I have seen from the university are the liaisons and [Shaffer and the other professor]. [Shaffer] has probably come over 4 times this year and had the after school meeting on suggestions, dates, things like that."

Slavin was asked if she had experienced a disagreement with the university staff. Slavin reported, I would not be able to tell you—we have never had a disagreement. I am sure that [Summers] mediates."

Three Gibson interviewees discussed communication and interaction between the university and school personnel. All participants reported a good working relationship with university staff. The principal describe a problem he encountered with an intern. The liaison reported a problem with a mentor. The teacher did not report any problems.

Summary

Participants discussed communication and interaction between university and school personnel. All interviewees reported good communication and cooperation between school
and university staff in general. However, an analysis of participants’ comments indicated that conflict did occur, and at times was not worked out to the satisfaction of those involved. Barnett PDS seemed to have a number of unresolved conflicts.

At least 2 principals emphasized their expectations of the site coordinator in regard to open communication and positive interactions between university and school staff. One further commented that problems need to be resolved in a positive manner because it is in the best interest of everyone involved, especially the school children.

When participants were asked how they resolved disagreements between university and school personnel, all of them described an informal process of talking it out. Most reported that the parties having the disagreement were encouraged to sit down and come to an agreement. One principal described his strategy of conflict resolution.

However, if problems could not be worked through between the parties, participants reported that there was a process to follow. One principal described 1 such plan for solving problems, and commented that having a plan for dealing with conflict is necessary. As was stated earlier formal CPDT governance and authority structures are in place if needed.

Participants were asked to discuss the frequency of disagreements between university and school personnel. No one reported that disagreements occurred frequently. Three
Participants (1 site coordinator or facilitator; 2 mentors) stated that they had experienced no problems. Eight participants (3 principals; 3 site coordinators or facilitators; 2 mentors) experienced one problem. Twelve participants (4 principals; 5 site coordinators or facilitators; 3 mentors) reported that problems did not occur frequently.

Participants were asked to discuss an example of a disagreement between school and university personnel and if the situation was satisfactorily resolved. Participants’ responses in some cases confirmed the principals’ problem; however, in most cases they did not. Participants’ tended to discuss problems that had a direct impact on their job. Participants’ responses are discussed in Table 6.

Participants’ responses were grouped by participant’s position—principals, site coordinators and facilitators, and mentor teachers. Analyzing their responses in this manner allowed for a comparison among groups to identify common problems.

The responses of the 7 principals were in turn grouped into 3 categories of disagreement: university-school problems, internship program problems, and intern problems. Three principals reported having problems with the university faculty or philosophy.

One principal stated that the university did not understand the importance the district placed on TAAS test
scores. In essence, the district was concerned about student learning as documented on the TAAS test whereas the university was concerned about student learning according to the research.

Another principal was concerned about the teaching methods the professor of math employed. Adair commented that she had a problem with the math internship because it was being taught the same way it was 30 years ago. She was concerned about the professor updating teaching methods to meet the needs of the children.

A third principal reported that she had a problem with the site coordinator because she failed to inform her when mentors and an intern were having problems. Martinez believed that if she had been informed she would have been able to help avoid the humiliating experience of the intern.

Three other principals reported that they had problems with the internship program. Starnes and Dreskin mentioned that they had difficulties with the scheduling and placing of interns. Flowers had a problem with the interns not getting the opportunity to see the activities at the beginning of the school year.

One principal indicated that he had a problem with an intern who was not working out. Summers reported that the university and the school both tried to work with the intern to help her to become more successful. It did not work out, and the intern left the PDS.
Table 6
Participants' Responses to University-School Disagreements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Coordinator or University Facilitator Problem</th>
<th>Site Coordinator</th>
<th>UF - University Facilitator</th>
<th>SP - Site Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Teacher Problem</td>
<td>Scheduling intern time on campus; Not satisfied with result</td>
<td>No problem reported</td>
<td>No problem reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coordinator or University Facilitator Problem</td>
<td>Mentor wanted intern removed due to absences; Satisfied with result</td>
<td>First semester of assignment - no problem reported</td>
<td>SC - No problem; UF - No problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal's Problem</td>
<td>Interns not seeing start of school; Solution workable, but not satisfied</td>
<td>Math internship handled same way for 30 years; Satisfied with result</td>
<td>Intern scheduling and placing of one intern; Satisfied with result</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site coordinators and University facilitators responses to disagreements between university and school staff were grouped together. Responses were categorized into 2 groups: problems with mentors and interns.

Site coordinators reported problems with mentors. Tiffin, Shaffer, and Evans all stated that they had problems with mentors who were critical of interns. Jeffers reported
a problem with the selection of mentors without the input from university personnel.

Site coordinators and facilitators reported having problems with interns; others reported no problems. Drew and Banks discussed having a problem with the same intern who had an arrogant attitude toward everyone in the PDS program. Two site coordinators and one facilitator reported having no problems.

The mentor teachers responses to disagreements between university and school personnel were analyzed. Three mentors—Grimms, Raines, and Slavin—stated that they had no problems. Two mentors, Binning and Kelly, indicated that they had a problem with an intern. One mentor, Stewart, reported having a problem with scheduling interns on campus.

Supports Provided for PDS Principals

When beginning a new program, there are always costs associated with adding personnel or training existing staff; purchasing new equipment and supplies; and providing time for staff to attend meetings, seminars, and training sessions to get the necessary orientation and training that represent real costs to an organization. Many attempts to implement and maintain an innovation fail because organizations do not adequately budget resources for the endeavor (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978).

In the case of public schools, trying to cover expenses for a new program is next to impossible with budgets
stretched to the limit (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978). Therefore, it is critical that additional resources and support be provided for the program to ensure proper implementation and successful maintenance.

PDS participants were asked to identify the additional resources and supports that were provided for principals to implement PDSs. Participants' responses were analyzed on a site-by-site basis to provide contextual relevance.

**Alpha CPDT**

**Nelson PDS.** Three interviewees discussed the additional resources such as staff, training, and development opportunities given to the principals to help them with the implementation of the PDS program on their campuses. Flowers, Nelson principal, reported that he did not receive additional staff, training, or developmental opportunities to aid him in becoming a PDS principal.

He also received no development opportunities specifically designed for principals. He reported that he "was on the site team that went to San Diego and saw their program....[and] went to see the program at Utah State." However, the information gathered was to aid in "designing the program" rather than as specific growth opportunity offered to all Alpha principals.

Flowers pointed out that staff development and training was designed by the university for mentor teachers. Flowers reported, "For the principals there has not been any
training," but the teachers "are getting technology training" from the university.

Flowers reported that the school got technology resources from the university as a part of the CPDT grant from the state. Flowers stated, "They [the university] provided technology. Each mentor teacher got a computer in the classroom. We have access to broadcasts. We have access to all of the computer technology from [the university] so we can train teachers in Tenet." He added that as far as "software and technical assistance, there's not been a line drawn [or budget limit set]."

Tiffin, site coordinator, identified additional resources and supports provided specifically for principals. Tiffin reported that principals went "on trips to the other sites we visited....[and] they were involved in this planning....All of us are included and share equally in the opportunity to attend staff development." He confirmed that the principal was involved in visits to other PDS programs. Tiffin indicated that other staff development opportunities were available, but no supports were provided specifically for the principal to help him do his job more effectively.

Stewart commented on supports provided for the principal. She stated, "I don’t know unless it would be through [the assistant superintendent]. I haven’t seen any additional staff. Now they bring in people who teach us the technology...." Stewart confirmed that there was no
additional staff added by the district, and that only mentors received technology training.

Flowers responded to a question about additional staff, training, and resources to become a successful principal. He reported he made site visits while designing the program and had a full time site professor on campus who helped. Tiffin confirmed the visits while Stewart confirmed the teachers receiving computer technology and training.

**Alpha CPDT**

**Mason PDS.** Three participants responded to a question concerning supports provided for PDS principals. Adair, Mason principal, commented that she does receive an additional teacher to provide training to teachers, but no other training or staff development. Adair commented that the additional person is a "teacher trainer..."

Adair stated that one of the "requirements of [the trainer’s] job is that she is a certified trainer in one or two areas." Adair commented that the teacher is a New Jersey Writing Project and Workshop Way trainer who does "modeling, lots of training in the individual classrooms.... problem-solving as part of the activity period....and is a resource person for all these interns" and teachers also.

The teacher trainer also helped interns who were having difficulties. Adair reported, "We had a couple [of interns] who really had some problems relating to the students, and
she worked real closely with them on that....and that really, really helped."

Adair reported that she did not receive any special training or staff development opportunities especially designed for the PDS principal. When asked to describe other resources, Adair commented that she received "Every available support as far as no money, no extra time, but 'Oh, you’re doing a good job.’" She commented that technology and training was designed by the university for mentor teachers, not specifically for principals.

Brown, site coordinator, was asked if the principal received any additional supports to aid her as principal. Brown commented, "Not that I’m aware of. The staff development opportunities that are available...is open to principals. We have had many administrators participate in that, but specific to them—I am not aware of any." Brown did not mention any supports specifically for principals.

Grimms, Mason mentor teacher, commented on supports for the principal. She reported, "I don’t know if it was specifically for the principal, but I know she’s attended some of the staff development that we have attended, some of the mentor meetings and training." Grimms indicated that Adair went to the training for mentors, but was not aware if there was training specifically for the principal.

Three interviewees responded to a question concerning additional supports for the PDS principal. The principal
indicated that the only support she had received was the teacher trainer. Neither the site coordinator nor mentor teacher knew of any resources available specifically for the PDS principal.

**Beta CPDT**

**Crawford PDS.** Four Crawford participants discussed additional supports available for PDS principals. Starnes, Crawford principal, commented on the supports he had received. Starnes reported, "I guess the biggest thing I can say is the connection with the university. It allows me lots of access to expertise that other people don't have, other principals might not have." Starnes added, "I've been able to go to some conferences, participate in some conferences, present at some conferences, based on my involvement with the collaborative."

Starnes reported another resource available to him is the site coordinator, who is a district employee. Starnes commented, "The district has basically paid [Johnson's] salary as site coordinator, and the university paid the teachers's salary" to replace Johnson. He pointed out "I can't tell you how valuable it is to have somebody like [Johnson] available to me to help me do some of the things I need to do."

Hansen, University facilitator, commented on additional supports available for the PDS principals. She reported, "I do not know of specific things that happen just for
principals." Hansen added, "They are welcome to come to any of the development stuff that we have" for mentors.

Johnson responded to the question concerning additional supports available for the PDS principal. Johnson reported that "the site coordinator is probably the biggest support staff in that it takes the biggest load off of the principal." Although principals can go to the other training, Johnson added, "Naturally the mentorship training and the staff development are just for the teachers. But as far as training just for the principals as being a principal in a PDS, no." Johnson indicated that the site coordinator is the only support specifically for the principal.

Raines, Crawford mentor teacher, commented on additional supports for the PDS principal. Raines stated, "Lots from the university. Resources, computers, technology, personnel, just a huge amount. Anything we need that is on the market that is available personnel wise, people wise, technology wise." None of the things that Raines listed are specifically for the PDS principal; rather, they are things for the PDS program in general.

Four interviewees discussed additional supports that are available specifically for the PDS principal. The principal reported that he received development opportunities from the university and a site coordinator. The site coordinator confirmed his comments about her
position. Neither the university facilitator nor the mentor identified specific supports for the PDS principal.

**Beta CPDT**

**Bryson PDS.** Four Bryson interviewees discussed additional supports for the PDS principal. Dreskin, Bryson principal, commented that his "site coordinator was a teacher and we freed her up half time starting in January for the second semester." He added, "We contracted with another person to come in and be a long term substitute in there....We contribute then 25% of the site coordinator’s salary...." Dreskin stated that the site coordinator is additional staff to help with the PDS.

Dreskin elaborated that the site coordinator’s salary during the first year was fully paid for by the TEA grant. Dreskin stated that "[n]ext year they want the district to pick up that whole thing or half of it at least." What portion the district will end up paying will be subject to negotiations based on TEA grant funding for that year.

Dreskin reported that he went to mentoring training with his staff one time. "The site coordinators and the university staff provided mentoring training and they developed this as part of their PDS program. I went to that along with my staff. Dreskin indicated he went to training designed for the mentors, but not for him as principal.

Dreskin indicated that the CPDT provided development opportunities which included Dupont training. He stated,
"The Dupont training is almost a personal thing because it gives you a lot of personal strengths and skills and it’s not necessarily totally related to classroom teaching. I think that it is good training for people in leadership roles." Dreskin indicated that this training was also meant for the mentors, but he found it useful in his position.

Drew, site coordinator, discussed the additional supports available for the PDS principal. Drew commented, "Yes, I think I am a support to him. He is not doing this CPDT thing, that is my job." Drew indicated that she as site coordinator was the only additional staff he got.

As far as other training and development opportunities, Drew reported, "The same opportunities that are open for me are open for him, the study groups, training, leadership training....He has the opportunity as much as I do or any other teacher on our campus." All available development and training opportunities are open to principals, but not specifically for them.

Two other participants commented on additional supports for the principal. Binning, mentor teacher, confirmed, "We have [Drew]...who is our site coordinator." Neither Drew nor Banks, University facilitator, indicated that the principal received additional staff development or training opportunities specifically for principals.

Dreskin reported that he received one additional staff person, but no training or development opportunities
designed specifically for principals. All 3 other participants confirmed his remarks.

**Gamma CPDT**

**Barnett PDS.** Three participants discussed additional supports for the PDS principal. Dutch, Barnett principal, commented on the supports he received. At the time of the interview, Dutch stated that he had not received additional staff to aid him in his role as PDS principal.

Dutch commented that he would like additional staff to help. He stated, "I would love to have someone else to help ....What would be ideal is to have a constant presence on the campus who would be dedicated just to the center to help. My best guess would be a full time professor...."

Dutch commented on additional training and development supports. He stated, "We were offered the same staff development opportunities as the staff, Dupont training, some of those things developed for everyone that help, but not specifically singling out principals." Dutch indicated that he did not receive additional training just for PDS principals.

Another participant, Jeffers, University professor, discussed additional supports available for the PDS principal. Jeffers commented, "I don't know. We give training, we give workshops....[for] anyone in [the district] but first of all to mentors." Jeffers indicated
that the principal does not receive additional supports specifically for himself.

Kelly, mentor teacher, mentioned people that work with the PDS such as "the project professor, Dr. [Jeffers]" and "[Mrs. Jeffers], who is our resource person." Kelly indicated that there was no additional support specifically for the principal.

Three interviewees discussed additional supports provided for the PDS principal. The principal commented that he did not receive any additional supports specifically for him as principal. The other two participants confirmed his remarks.

Delta CPDT

Caldwell PDS. Three Caldwell participants responded to a question concerning additional supports for the PDS principals. Martinez, Caldwell principal, discussed supports that she had received. She commented, "Additional staff as in teachers....No, we don't." Martinez indicated that no additional staff was added to help the principal.

Martinez commented on additional training and development opportunities for the principals. She reported, "I guess all of the staff development that has been offered has been principals can go to it....but as far as this staff development is for principals, there has not been any." Martinez commented that "the thrust has been for teachers,
but we have been involved in a lot of the planning; they have not left us out."

Although Martinez stated that there had not been specific training or staff development just for principals, she reported that she attended the Association of Teacher Educators national conference when the CPDT "was selected as a finalist in competition with CPDTs across the nation." This was the only professional growth activity she mentioned that occurred in her 4 years as a PDS principal.

Shaffer, University site coordinator, discussed available supports for the PDS principal. Shaffer stated that any of the "staff development sessions that they have had has been opened to mentors, principals, or liaisons." She added, "We put all of it together because we talked about things like conflict resolution or working with the adult learner, presentation skills, higher order thinking ....it is that concept of level ground." Although Shaffer indicated no additional staff or development opportunities specifically for the principal, it was clear that including the principals was by design, not afterthought.

Williams commented on additional supports for the PDS principal. Williams reported, "You do get training opportunities made available to our principal. Support personnel would be the liaison person from the university." Williams indicated that there was no additional support staff or training specifically for the principal.
Three Caldwell interviewees discussed additional supports available to the PDS principal. The principal reported that she did not receive any staff or training specifically for the principal. The other 2 interviewees confirmed the principal’s comments.

Gibson PDS. Three Gibson participants discussed additional supports for the PDS principal. Summers, Gibson principal, commented on additional supports that he received. Concerning additional staff, Summers reported, "No, whatever bodies I had, I had." Summers stated that he did not receive additional staff or training designed specifically for principals. However, he reported, "We [he and Shaffer] did a workshop in New Orleans" which he considered a great professional development opportunity. Summers reported that he had not received supports specifically designed for PDS principals.

Evans, University liaison, discussed additional supports provided for PDS principals. Evans only commented on staff development. Evans reported that she did not "recall one of my principals being at the staff development meetings, but it could be that they attended some that I did not attend. I am sure they are open...and the principals are encouraged to attend."

Slavin, Gibson mentor teacher, discussed additional supports provided for the principal. She reported that she
had "not seen any additional staff." Slavin indicated that there were not additional supports that she knew of.

Three Gibson participants commented on additional supports provided for the PDS principal. The principal indicated that he had not received and additional staff training or opportunities specifically for principals. The other two participants confirmed his remarks.

Summary

Participants were asked if principals were given any support staff, training, or developmental opportunities specifically to help them in their role as PDS principals. Interviewees’ responses indicated that very little in the way of support was given to any of them. See Table 7.

Four principals responded that they did not receive additional support staff to aid them as PDS principals. Three principals reported that they did receive an additional staff member.

One unique support was the teacher trainer position added to Adair’s PDS. Since Adair did not have an assistant principal or a full-time site coordinator, the additional support person was helpful in carrying out her PDS duties.

Two principals received a replacement teacher for a newly promoted site coordinator, who was freed to take on PDS duties and responsibilities which in effect helped the principal. Dreskin reported that his district hired a part-time substitute to fill in for his site coordinator, a
kindergarten teacher who works part-time at that position and part-time at the PDS position. Starnes reported that he was given a full-time site coordinator whose salary was paid by the district and a teacher replacement whose salary was paid by the university.

It was interesting to note that although Starnes and Dreskin listed their site coordinators as a support for themselves as principals, the other 4 principals did not. Further analysis of CPDT documentation concerning the duties of the site coordinator indicates that the bulk of duties listed focused on helping the interns, residents, and mentor teachers, not the principals. It was clear that the universities did not intend for the site coordinators to be a support for the principal; indeed, little thought seemed to be given to the principal at all!

Although all 7 principals reported that they received no special training to become PDS principals, 4 principals indicated that they could participate in mentor teacher training on topics such as mentoring and technology. University training has been geared to teaching mentors mentoring, technology, and leadership skills, while basically ignoring any specific training for principals. Only 1 principal reported actually attending mentoring staff development sessions.

Six principals reported that they did not receive any specific development opportunities designed for principals.
Table 7

Principals’ Responses to Supports Provided for Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Adair</th>
<th>Starnes</th>
<th>Dreskin</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Martinez</th>
<th>Sunners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Support Staff</td>
<td>No additional support staff</td>
<td>Promoted teacher as trainer who serves as teacher resource</td>
<td>Promoted teacher to full-time site coordinator</td>
<td>Utilize teacher as part-time site coordinator</td>
<td>No additional support staff</td>
<td>No additional support staff</td>
<td>No additional support staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Principal Training</td>
<td>No specific principal training received</td>
<td>No specific principal training received</td>
<td>No specific principal training received</td>
<td>No specific principal training received</td>
<td>No specific principal training received</td>
<td>No specific principal training received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Principal Development Opportunity</td>
<td>No specific development opportunity</td>
<td>No specific development opportunity</td>
<td>Access to university allows development</td>
<td>No specific development opportunity</td>
<td>No specific development opportunity</td>
<td>No specific development opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental Development Opportunity</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Dupont</td>
<td>Dupont</td>
<td>One conference</td>
<td>One workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 1 reported that access to the university personnel afforded developmental opportunities. However, 4 principals indicated that they had received some incidental developmental opportunities from being associated with their CPDT: 2 conferences, 1 workshop, and 1 Dupont session.

When asked if the supports provided for the principals were adequate, 5 principals responded that they were not. Two principals indicated that they were satisfied with the resources provided so far, but had concerns about continued funding to provide personnel, training, staff development, and other supports for the PDS program.
All principals and other participants made interesting and relevant comments concerning the formal governance and authority relationships of the CPDT partners; school and university interactions; the principal's job description and selection process. In addition, the principal's role in implementing change, and additional management concerns such as the university student presence, teacher empowerment, and supports for the principal were discussed.

Summary of Findings

Six research questions guided the research. The major findings for each of these questions are summarized below:

Research Question 1:

The first research question involved identifying the formal job descriptions or expectations of the PDS principals. All principals reported that they were expected to be the liaison between the university, school, and the district, as well as the instructional leader in the school. Principals who had a site coordinator tended to be less focused on the routine coordination and management aspects of their jobs and were freer to pursue other aspects.

CPDT planners appeared to have given little thought to the job description or expectations of the PDS principals. None of the schools changed the job descriptions of the PDS principals which suggests that the program was considered an added on responsibility. The lack of a formal set of expectations was not particularly troublesome for the
principals, but they were forced to conceptualize their job as PDS principals in their own way.

**Research Question 2:**

The second research question dealt with how principals were selected to be PDS principals or how their schools were selected to become a PDS. It was found that all 7 of the principals were principals at their schools when they became PDS sites.

To give their own students the best possible experiences in public schools and the best training as future teachers, university planners used several criteria to select the PDS sites. The principal's and faculty's willingness to participate and a diverse student population were 2 important factors. Others factors included the availability of classrooms for on-site university classes, innovative and professional staff who could model effective teaching practices, and location near the university.

**Research Question 3:**

The third research question involved the role of the principal in implementing change in the professional development schools. Analysis of their reflections on their PDS role showed that all principals linked the PDS to the pre-existing expectations for the principalship. In some cases the PDS tasks were defined as additives to the job. At a minimal level, all principals identified liaison responsibilities, seeing themselves as a link between the
university and their teachers. Other principals saw the PDS as a resource to help them achieve their goals of improving student achievement and staff development. While some remained focused on their building-level responsibilities, 2 principals had begun to see their role as having an impact on the teaching profession itself.

Districts typically expected principals to be responsible for improving student learning and achievement. Some principals linked the PDS resources to accomplishing these goals. However, while the PDS brought resources to the school, it had the potential to work against goals for students. Principals found that they had to balance the expectation that the PDS provide opportunities for university students to work with school children with their concern for maintaining a stable setting for those children who came from unstable home and community settings.

In addition to working with student teachers as another staff member, some principals saw their role as improving the teachers of the future. They made an active effort to imbue student teachers with their own professional standards. They also served as gatekeepers to counsel student teachers out of the profession.

Research Question 4:

The fourth research question was concerned with the additional management concerns of the PDS principal. Three major concerns were identified and dealt with separately.
They involved the impact of large numbers of pre-service teachers had on the school, the effects of teacher empowerment on the principal’s role, and the interactions between university staff and the school’s staff.

The principals identified additional management concerns and problems unique to the PDS. Principals reported that they and the teachers experienced an increased work load as PDS participants. They wanted to make sure that they selected the best interns to work with their school children and to screen out those they considered undesirable. Principals reported conflicts with university faculty and university procedures. In addition, the PDSs created human relations problems, openness to scrutiny and unpleasant reports, and budget concerns.

Effects of pre-service teachers. Principals reported that the pre-service teachers had a positive impact on their schools. They reported that the interns helped teachers by prompting teachers to reflect on their own job performance, and creating flexibly in their scheduling. Pre-service teachers helped school children by serving as role models and providing individualized instruction.

It was found in one school that frequent intern rotations had a disruptive effect on the children. Students would grow accustomed to having one intern around. When the intern rotated out student discipline problems increased.
Teachers' role in decision making. Teacher empowerment and shared decision making have been identified as strategies for school improvement. Though all of the principals reported that they had site based decision making teams as required by state regulations, it was evident that some CPDTs and PDSs included teachers in the decision making process more than others. In one case the teachers were involved in more decision making than they cared for. In some cases the decision to become a PDS was influenced heavily by teacher input and support.

In most PDSs, teachers were empowered to make decisions about staff development, curriculum, budget, and PDS matters. Some schools had special committees that dealt with specific PDS program issues such as selection, placement, and evaluation of interns, while others incorporated PDS concerns into their site based committee agendas.

University and school personnel interaction. The PDS interviewees discussed how university and school personnel communicate, interact, and work through disagreements. All participants reported good communication and cooperation between school and university staff with the exception of 1 principal who had a problem with a site coordinator.

When participants were asked how they resolved disagreements between university and school personnel, all of the participants described an informal process of talking
it out. Most reported that the disagreeing parties were encouraged to come to an agreement.

However, if problems could not be resolved participants reported that there was a process to follow which involved interns going to the site coordinator or CPDT director, or teachers going to the principal or central office staff. However, serious conflict requiring outside intervention rarely. Participants tended to report problems that directly related to their own jobs.

Research Question 5:

The fifth research question concerned the formal governance and authority relationships between partners in CPDTs. The governance structures required by the CPDT regulations were implemented without exception. Universities fulfilled their responsibilities in setting up CPDTs and empowering them to carry out their mission of implementing teacher education programs on PDS campuses. Most participants were knowledgeable about the structures and worked within guidelines to carry out their mission. Not surprisingly a few mentor teachers could not describe governance structures beyond their schools and their own involvement.

Research Question 6:

The sixth question concerned supports provided for PDS principals. Participants commented on the types of supports such as support staff, training, or developmental
opportunities that they had received. The CPDTs provided minimal support to principals. Additional staff was provided in some schools to coordinate the program, but not as a specific support for the principal. Training and staff development were provided generally for mentor teachers, but not specifically for principals.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 4 presents the results of the research and provides a summary of the findings for the research questions. When reflecting upon the findings and possible conclusions of the data of this study, the "why" of the study came to the forefront. In that, the author found something in common with Dr. Harry Wolcott: interest in the actual behavior of school administrators. Wolcott (1994) stated that the impetus for beginning his ethnographic study of 1 principal was: "The apparent neglect of attention to the actual behavior of school administrators in the literature of educational administration" (p. 116).

Wolcott (1994) commented that his expectation that the literature would provide information about administrative behavior was left unmet. He stated that the literature on the principalship was "prescriptive rather than descriptive" in that it told principals "how they ought to act," but failed to "provide an account of what actually goes on or how the ideals are translated into real behavior" (p. 117). It is precisely for this reason that the author chose to investigate the actual behavior or role of the principal in implementing change in the professional development school.
This concluding chapter includes a discussion of the findings and interpretations, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future studies. However, a brief summary of the educational administration knowledge base is in order to provide a link between what is currently known and what is presented in this study.

Educational Administration Knowledge Base

Scholarship would be inadequate without being grounded in the firm foundation of the educational administration knowledge base. McCleary (1992) argues that educational administration has at least four sources of knowledge: what everyone knows, what practice demonstrates, what authorities say, and what research confirms. These sources of knowledge provided the infrastructure for this study.

What Everyone Knows

McCleary (1992) pointed out that there are generally accepted tenets and ideals of the profession that are derived from the experience of practitioners and observers of education and administrative practice. The literature cited in Chapter 2 identifies two ideas that have become widely accepted among educators and policy makers. The first is the belief that there is a need to reinvent or restructure public school education for a myriad of reasons (A Nation at Risk, 1983; SCANS, 1992). Second is the belief that pre-service education of teachers is a necessary
intervention strategy (SCANS, 1992; U. S. Department of

What Practice Demonstrates

McCleary (1992) explained that, when efforts have been
made to solve an important problem, there are accounts of
practices that have been shown to produce certain effects.
At least two accounts of practices have been documented that
are of importance to this study. First, Clark (1988)
reported that school-university collaboration was advocated
as a strategy for school improvement as early as the late
nineteenth century. The collaboration led to the sharing of
information concerning the best instructional and testing
methods; articulation of college entrance requirements,
specified courses, and entrance examinations; and
introduction of scientific approaches to school management.

Lange (1993) explained that another collaborative
effort between schools, universities, and other partners
involved establishing portal schools. The purpose of portal
schools was to provide teacher renewal, interface with
university teacher programs, and implement curricular
innovations. Portal schools disappeared due to a lack of a
research plan and systematic assessment of programs.

What Authorities Say

McCleary (1992) stated that there are generalizations
made by persons who are known for their scholarly study and
given special credence. "What everyone knows" about the
need to change teacher pre-service training is supported by leading scholars. The professional development school has been promoted as the most promising strategy for school reform (Holmes Group, 1990; Goodlad, 1990).

Researchers on the process of change or implementation of innovation in schools provide another generalization of importance to understanding how to implement PDSs successfully. Authorities (e.g. Duttweiler & Hord, 1987; Hall & Hord, 1987) agreed that the principal is the key to the successful implementation of change within the school.

**What Research Confirms**

Legitimate research findings are confirmed by evidence, arrived at through known procedures, and subjected to critical review and testing (McCleary, 1992). Three such findings are especially relevant to this study. First, Hall and Hord (1987) conceptualized the Concerns Based Model which will be discussed in connection with PDS principals. Second, the Holmes Group (1990) found that no single leadership model has emerged in PDSs. The Holmes group identified 2 alternate notions of the principal: the enabler and the strong leader. Third, Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) found that successful change efforts move through a series of 3 phases which incorporate 6 themes for change.
Stages of Concerns

Stage theories of adult development and professional development posit that, in the process of personal or professional growth, people move through a sequence of stages. Each stage is a structured whole, representing an underlying organization of thought or understanding (Levine, 1989). Most educators are familiar with stages of cognitive and moral development through the writings of Piaget and Kohlberg. Students of educational change are familiar with the stages of concern in the Concerns Based Model of implementation (Hall & Hord, 1987). Teacher educators and staff developers have identified stages of concerns of teachers as they grow in their profession.

Prior to entering the profession, pre-service teachers are at levels where their concerns are first unrelated to the profession, then move to self concerns about their ability to function as student teachers. Glickman (1995) described a sequence of 3 stages of professional teacher concerns: the self-adequacy stage, where their primary concern is survival and making it through the day; the teacher tasks stage, where teachers are concerned with teaching tasks, discipline, developing routines, and improving their teaching materials and methods; and, the teaching impact stage, where concerns emphasize teachers' impact on students and student achievement. Similarly, as teachers confront innovations, they move through a sequence
of 7 stages of concern, following the same model of concerns about self, task, and impact (Hall & Hord, 1987).

The concerns of the 7 principals in this study as they describe their roles, suggest that the principal’s concerns about a new role also may be described in terms of stages. These stages appear to affect how they view the impact of participating in the Professional Development School on their own organization. While all principals saw many task-related concerns with their liaison and management responsibilities, the bulk of one principal’s concerns fell into this area.

One principal identified the major difference between her school and a non-PDS in terms of the large number of university students on campus and the computers purchased for her school through the grant. Her major concerns were time management, meshing university and school district schedules, revolving door professors, and lack of flexibility of some of the professors. Other principals’ concerns moved toward their impact on their own students, the university students in their building, and the profession of education.

The differences in the stages of principal concerns about their PDS role can be explained by many conditions. Years of experience as a principal and experience in a professional development school do not seem to affect the concerns about the PDS role. One contributing factor to
explaining why some PDS principals focus on coordination and management in the school while others added concerns of teacher growth and professional impact is the PDS organizational structure.

For example, the principal whose role definition was most focused on coordination and management had a complex PDS and minimal assistance. With no assistant principal, a site coordinator shared with another site, turnover among university personnel in her school, and over 50 university students a semester on her campus, she had many management responsibilities. In addition to feeling alone, she felt responsible for making the PDS work. While positive about the impact on her school, she may not have had the time to expand her perspective to the university and the profession.

In contrast, another principal had almost twice as many university students, but he had an assistant principal, a full-time site coordinator, and a consistent site professor to work with him. Although he had more university students, he had more help with his load and was able to move beyond those immediate tasks to those that included an impact on the university students and the profession.

Still another principal's campus had only 5 university students who began the fall as observers and remained to student teach in the spring. Although this principal expressed concerns about coordination and management, she
expanded her perspective to include the university and the profession.

Other personal and professional factors not identified in the study also may affect the way principals define their roles. However, this data does not address these variables.

Alternate Notions of Leadership

The Holmes Group (1990) applied 2 notions of leadership to principals: the enabler and the strong leader. The enabler’s goal is to encourage the emergence of leadership from participants. On the other hand the strong leader is vested with authority to secure and mobilize resources, run interference politically, coordinate activities, and manage the change process. These categories did not differentiate principals in this study.

When the leadership style of the 7 principals was considered, every principal met the criteria for the strong leader. Principals described the resources brought by their school’s involvement in the CPDT program, and how they mobilized resources for the benefit of their teachers and students as well as the university students. They reported the necessity of dealing with the political concerns of the school, district, university, and community members as they implemented the program. The principals were involved actively in the coordination of program activities as well as in the management of the whole process of change.
However, it was evident that because of the state site based decision making mandate and the nature of the CPDT program, the principals also fit the description of the enabler as they encouraged leadership among participants. By providing release time and substitutes, principals encouraged teachers to take an active leadership role. Teachers served on decision making committees and special PDS committees on their campuses. Instructional leadership teams were composed of teachers. Teachers were included in the CPDT governance structures and were involved in committees at various levels.

The principals were both strong leaders and enablers. They possessed the attributes of each and were able to mobilize both leadership styles when needed. In essence, the principals had the ability and discernment to provide what was needed within their educational context. Effective leadership in the PDS involves both leadership styles.

**Themes for Change**

Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) posit that an innovation moves through 3 phases in the change process: initiation, the decision making process to adopt or proceed with a change; implementation, the attempt over a period of several years to put the innovation into practice; and institutionalization, the point when the innovation becomes an ongoing part of the system. The implementation phase includes 6 themes, or ideas that must be present for change
to occur. The themes are leadership and vision, evolutionary planning, initiative-taking and empowerment, staff development and assistance, monitoring/problem-coping, and restructuring.

Leadership and vision address the ability to articulate a sharable vision of the future that is both easily understood and clearly desirable. Evolutionary planning involves adapting plans to improve the fit between the innovation and the school. Initiative-taking and empowerment concern taking action and supporting people moving in purposeful directions. Staff development and assistance include specific teacher training and continuous support. Monitoring/problem-coping is gathering information and acting on the results to improve and deal with problems. Restructuring creates new organizational arrangements that support and press for improvement.

It is clear that all the professional development schools in this study have moved through the first stage of initiation and into the second stage of implementation. The vision has been articulated and plans have been adapted to improve the fit between the innovation and the schools. The teachers have received training to take on the role of mentor and leader and actively use the computer technology that is an integral part of the PDS concept. Monitoring the PDS and coping with daily problems and concerns encountered with the program has become routine.
All sites are in the active process of restructuring the traditional program into the PDS program. Some are close to becoming restructured schools, whereas others have a longer way to go towards that goal. Future funding and resources as well as resolving problems and concerns will impact the implementation process at these and future sites.

Institutionalization of the PDS Model

Miles' (1983) model may be used to predict which PDSs will be institutionalized. The model posits that the local administrator is crucial to the successful implementation and institutionalization of an innovation. That administrator maintains pressure on teachers to use the innovation, provides supports to help them use it successfully, and makes changes in the organizational structure to accommodate the innovation. These supports are especially necessary as threats such as environmental turbulence and staff turnover exist.

Thus, a PDS site receives a high level of support and steps are taken to ward off threats to the program, the chances of the program becoming institutionalized are good. High levels of administrative support, user effort, assistance, and organizational change are indicators of support (Miles, 1983), whereas environmental turbulence and career advancement motivation are threats.

Miles' model suggest that Barnett PDS has a low probability of institutionalization. This 612 student K-12
school had an assistant principal. The PDS program of 6 interns and 8 residents was facilitated by 2 university faculty and a university employee. Administrative commitment by Principal Dutch led to both administrative pressure on the users to implement the PDS, along with administrative support in the form of assistance to users.

However, the planned assistance from the university professor site coordinator dwindled when the professor experienced a teaching overload and declined to be the site coordinator. The site functioned for a period of time without a coordinator, thus putting more pressure on the principal and teachers to coordinate the program. In this case, the participants worked harder, but, although they were committed to the program, they experienced burnout from having an intern and resident per mentor every semester. At times the mentors did not want to take on this additional responsibility and requested time off from participation in the program. As a result, the school as a whole decided to reduce the number of interns assigned to their school instead of increasing the amount of university students to full capacity.

The principal did not mandate the PDS program. It was considered an add on program. Not all eligible teachers became mentors, so the percentage of users did not increase to 100 percent which discouraged institutionalization.
Although administrators were committed to the program, they did not take direct action to bring about all the necessary organizational changes to insure successful implementation. They did alter the structure and approach of inservice training and appoint a teacher as site coordinator. However, at the time of this study, they had not written innovation's requirements into job descriptions, made new budget lines, or made sure that needed materials and equipment would continue to be available in future.

Barriers to institutionalization included threats to the innovation in the form of environmental turbulence and career advancement motivation. Environmental turbulence in the form of state funding cuts posed a decided threat to PDS program institutionalization.

As explained above, the career demands for university personnel added to turbulence for the program. A site professor experienced a teaching overload and declined to be site coordinator as planned. The professor explained that the administration at his university expected him to meet the requirements of a tenure track professor as well as teach in the field based PDS program. He commented that his other university responsibilities which included publishing and committee membership which could lead to his promotion took precedence over his site coordinator duties and precluded involvement other than teaching at the PDS site. Without a change in university expectations, the site is
likely to experience continued turbulence as faculty rotate through the school.

For the PDS to become institutionalized at Barnett Elementary, several factors must be addressed. First, assistance must be given to the program participants to help resolve internal problems and teacher burnout. Second, efforts must be made to engage other eligible teachers to participate to increase the number of mentors and foster commitment to the program. Supports, training, and resources must be provided to new mentors. Third, administrators must mandate the program and make the needed organizational changes such as including innovation requirements into job descriptions; adding new budget lines; and insuring that continuous training, resources, and equipment are available in the future. Finally, threats such as career advancement motivation and environmental turbulence must be dealt with to eliminate these barriers to institutionalization.

Miles' model would predict that the PDS at Caldwell has high probability of institutionalization. This K-4 school was the second smallest in the study. The principal was assisted by a site coordinator and a university professor. Only 5 university students served as residents at the school. Martinez, Caldwell principal, was 1 of the 2 principals with the most fully developed view of her role as a PDS principal and the most concern with impact on the
profession. The PDS had been implemented and the principal and teachers had begun to modify it. For example, she and her staff had revised the governance structure to give the ILT the major decision making power.

Similarly, Miles model can be used to predict the probability of institutionalization at the 7 PDS sites. Table 8 compares the level of support with the level of threat at the different schools.

Table 8

PDS Level of Support vs. Threat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Threat</th>
<th>Moderate Threat</th>
<th>High Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Support</td>
<td>* Caldwell</td>
<td>* Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Support</td>
<td>* Crawford</td>
<td>* Bryson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Support</td>
<td>* Gibson</td>
<td>* Barnett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations and Policy Implications

Where state and teacher certification policies that require pre-service teachers to participate in PDSs are developed, and local public school policies and procedures are developed to implement PDSs, planners should assure that
the number of university students do not overwhelm the school, that personnel resources are provided to support the principals, and that principals receive training specific to PDSs.

Specific recommendations can be made from this study and applied to future efforts by schools and universities collaboratives implementing new programs to transform schools for the future. Developers of PDSs do not always consider the role of the principal, yet research shows that principals are crucial to successful change. This study suggests that supports for principals could increase the likelihood that the PDS will be institutionalized in their schools. PDS developers can support principals by:

1. Providing written job descriptions and expectations for principals to guide their involvement in the PDS;

2. Preparing principals through orientation training prior to becoming a PDS principal to help them understand or conceptualize their role;

3. Affording other training specifically for principals such as conflict resolution or mediation skills, effective liaison skills, and communication skills to share the vision to promote teacher buy-in;

4. Recognizing that principals move through stages of concern, and help them go beyond management of the site to impacting a profession;
5. Providing development opportunities for growth for principals such as visiting other successful sites, attending principal conferences and workshops, and networking with other PDS participants;

6. Supplying additional supports for the principals where there are large numbers of interns and other students to move beyond the management concerns to being an effective PDS leadership and having an impact on shaping future teachers and the profession. An additional staff person with specialized administrative or supervision training such as an assistant principal or a site coordinator, and a consistent university faculty would be beneficial.

7. Providing other resources such as additional funds for computer software, hardware, and technology training for every principal to aid them in their job, E-mail linkages between the site and universities and to Internet would vastly improve communication and availability of information.

This study shows that schools and universities can work together toward common goals. Collaboration and institutionalization of the PDS in a school can be improved by selecting qualified students to participate as interns and by vision and consensus building among school, university, and other CPDT partners.

Selection of the most qualified university students is critical. Students must be able to mesh with the school
environment in the best interests of the children. Since university students are considered as faculty and are so involved with the children, interns should go through the same screening as regular faculty. District and CPDT policy must reflect that requirement.

Vision and consensus building among teachers and other participants, and decision making authority of teachers must be encouraged and developed by principals. PDS participants should be empowered to decide how the program should be adapted to fit on their campus in the best interest of the school children, university students, and participants. The size of the program or the number of university students at the PDS should be based upon the availability of mentors and resources such as space and computers needed to accommodate the students. Each PDS should have the freedom to make those determinations and changes as circumstances dictate.

Involving, empowering, and supporting teachers helps to bring about desired change and the institutionalization of innovations.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Findings of this study point to areas in which research is needed, whether it is quantitative or qualitative or both. The role of the principal in implementing change in professional development schools in Texas Centers for Professional Development and Technology was the focus of this study. The dynamics of implementing organizational
change vary from district to district, and even from site to site. A broader research base is needed on which to build future information about the principal's involvement in training future teachers in professional development schools and improving the profession. The following recommendations should be considered by researchers for further study:

1. Research should be designed to determine if orientation training and ongoing staff development would be useful to future PDS principals in conceptualizing their role expectations, implementing and sustaining change, and successfully interacting with participants.

2. Further research is needed to investigate the movement of principals through stages of concerns similar to teachers stages of concerns.

3. Further study of the principals' role in implementing change in the professional development schools is warranted to determine if the findings are true for other PDS principals.

4. School-university collaboration with in the CPDTs should be investigated further to determine the level of involvement, resources, and other factors necessary to sustain PDS programs within the schools.

5. PDS programs should be studied to determine program configurations or plans that most successfully balance the needs of the public school children and the needs of university students.
Table A-1

School Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPOT</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Bryson</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>PK-5</td>
<td>PK-1</td>
<td>PK-6</td>
<td>8-4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Socio-Economics</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAAS 1994-</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores-All</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Information was obtained from the Texas Academic Excellence Indicator System report for the 1993-94 school year.

2 Both Caldwell and Gibson only accept university students during the fall semester. The interns became residents during the second semester. Therefore, the students are only reported once, as residents.

3 Crawford has a full year internship only. Residents who are completing their student teaching assignment go to another campus. Therefore, no residents are reported for this site.

4 Since Bryson is a PK-1 campus, its feeder school 3rd grade TAAS scores are reported for comparison purposes.
Table A-2

Principal Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Flowers</th>
<th>Adair</th>
<th>Starnes</th>
<th>Dreskin</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Martinet</th>
<th>Summers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Bryson</td>
<td>Barnett</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>35-45</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex P*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex S**</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ex P indicates years experience as a principal.

** Ex S indicates years experience in the school.
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