



The Development of the KSU PDS Model: 25 Years in the Making

M. Gail Shroyer, Sally J. Yahnke, Teresa Miller, Cindi Dunn, and Nancy Y. Bridges

Dr. M. Gail Shroyer, a former public school educator, is Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at Kansas State University. Dr. Shroyer led the first Professional Development School planning teams in 1989 and served as the Director of the KSU PDS Partnership for 22 years.

Dr. Sally J. Yahnke, a former public school educator, is Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at Kansas State University. Dr. Yahnke has been involved with the KSU PDS for 20 years and currently serves as the Director of the KSU PDS Partnership.

Dr. Teresa Miller, Associate Professor Emerita in the College of Education at Kansas State University, was a former elementary and secondary public school teacher and principal. Dr. Miller was an active PDS participant since 1989, serving on multiple planning teams (primary and secondary) and participating first from the school district as one of the first PDS principals and then later as university faculty working with the university/school Leadership Cadre program.

Dr. Cindi Dunn is the Assistant Director for Project Management for the Office of Educational Innovation and Evaluation, a unit of the College of Education at Kansas State University. In 1995, Cindi became the first clinical instructor at the secondary level serving as a planning team member, supervisor, and instructor for eight years.

Ms. Nancy Y. Bridges, a recent retiree, continues to serve as university supervisor for student teachers for the College of Education at Kansas State University. Ms. Bridges has been an active Professional Development Schools participant since 1989, serving as an original planning team member, cooperating teacher, clinical instructor, and most recently as an instructor in the COE.

Introduction

Educational improvement demands continuous change, but change is not always productive. Reflecting on the past and vision setting for the future helps chart a course for a more productive change process. Historians urge learning from history to guide future actions. Future goals can be fruitfully shaped by understanding the history of an organization, as well as understanding all the components related to that history—the environment, the people, and the structures. The purpose of this article is to share the history of one Professional Development School (PDS) partnership in an effort to help others reflect, set visions, and move forward into a new educational future. The emergence, development, and continuation of this partnership was dependent upon finding ways to create a growth-oriented environment, nurturing all those within that environment, and then sustaining that culture as it continuously changed into something newer and even more exciting. The 25-year history of this unique collaborative effort will be shared through this perspective of organizational change.

The Context for Change (the 1980s)

While the Kansas State University PDS partnership formally began in 1989 with a district/university agreement, the conditions for this partnership were set earlier in the 1980s. These conditions contributed to the need for change and set the context for the creation of new relationships that resulted in large-scale change in the preparation of future as well as practicing educators within the schools and the university that made up the partnership. The NCATE Standards for Professional Development School Standards (2001) refer to such conditions as the “time before the beginning.” The conditions delineating the context for change are related below.

The 1980s have been called the Era of Reform. This reform movement was launched by reports such as *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). This initial report was followed by publications from numerous commissions, committees and foundations declaring the need for change

in K-12 education in the United States (Boyer, 1984; Goodlad, 1984; Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, 1983). The Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986) called the 1980s, a "Time of Ferment" and declared, "The nationwide effort to improve our schools and student achievement rivals those of any period in American history" (p. 11). In particular, there was growing alarm over the lack of scientific literacy among American youth needed to prepare them and the country for success in the 21st century (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989; McKinney, 1993; National Science Board, 1983).

The first wave of this reform focused on K-12 schools, while the second wave of reform, spilling over into the early 1990s, focused on teacher education and its strong link to K-12 schooling (AACTE, 1990; Goodlad, 1990; Holmes, 1986). The Holmes Group concluded, "Much is at stake, for 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 need for changes in K-12 schooling, combined with the need for changes in teacher preparation programs, set the stage for university-school partnerships. Although school-university partnerships were not a new idea (Dewey advocated the use of "practice schools" as part of teacher preparation in 1904), the conditions of the 1980/90s created new incentives for change. In 1986, John Goodlad and colleagues at the University of Washington established the National Network for Education Renewal (NNER), and The Holmes Group proposed the creation of Professional Development Schools (1990) to address improvements needed in K-12 schools and the preparation of the teachers who teach in these schools.

Many institutions initiated partnerships based on premises set forth by Goodlad (1994) and the Holmes Group (1990, 1995), and Kansas State University was no exception. Bailey (1988) proposed 6 additional forces at the local, state, and national levels impacting school-university partnerships: (a) access to information, (b) leadership, (c) research, (d) societal pressure, (e) fewer resources, and (f) administrator and teacher training (p. 22). These forces were part of the context for change in Kansas that created conditions for change at Kansas State University.

At a 1985 meeting between Kansas superintendents and the Dean of the College of Education at Kansas State University, the Council for Public School Improvement (CPSI) was envisioned to "coordinate, cooperate, and collaborate in achieving mutual goals" related to professional development efforts (Pankake, Bailey, & Rowe, 1988, p. 25). By 1988, university-school partnerships at Kansas State University were recognized in a special edition of *Educational Considerations* devoted to educational partnerships. In this publication, two university-district partnerships focused on preparing district leaders were described: the Topeka-KSU collaborative Leadership Academy (Thompson, 1988), and the Manhattan-Ogden-KSU Instructional Leadership Cadre Program (Bailey, 1988). A 1988 Partnership Seminar conducted at Kansas State University in collaboration with the Manhattan-Ogden

Public Schools resulted in six proposals for university-school collaborations:

- 1) the Manhattan Writing Project suggested the establishment of a literary community devoted to the study of communication based on the National Writing Project;
- 2) the Collaborative Partnership Plan focused on improving the teaching and learning of mathematics;
- 3) the Partnership Institute proposed a meeting place for partners to develop, document, and analyze new partnerships;
- 4) the Public School University Partnership Governance Structure provided a framework for institutional change through collaboration and partnership;
- 5) the Proposal for Improving Public School Climate through Collaborative Effort envisioned a collaborative center for educational equity and excellence; and
- 6) the Professional Efficacy Plan suggested a community-based apprenticeship model designed to develop professional efficacy in future educators at Kansas State University (Conkwright & DeNoon, 1988).

Although not all of these proposals were fully realized, all represented new relationships being formed and a synergistic and energized thinking occurred at that point in time to collaboratively "enrich and enhance learning" across educational institutions (Conkwright & DeNoon, 1988). It is important to acknowledge that the authors of these six proposals forged new friendships and alliances between university and school partners and became the early founders of the Professional Development School Partnership.

It could be said that the national call for reform in K-12 education and teacher education provided a strong incentive for change at Kansas State University, as well as within school districts and the faculty within both organizations. However, the conditions for change were established through friendships, alliances, and the synergistic power of university and school practitioners determined to merge the resources and strengths of each organization to tackle common problems and issues. These early partnerships created a sense of optimism and renewed energy that together they could achieve what they could never achieve alone. University and school partners acknowledged their "interdependence" and "shared responsibility" (Howey, 2006) for the simultaneous reform of K-16 teaching and learning. These early partners became the first "boundary spanners" blurring traditional lines of responsibility (Howey & Zimpher, 2006). The conditions for change were established and it was time for the PDS partnership to emerge.

The Emergence of the PDS Partnership (1990-1995)

Prompted by the reform literature and burgeoning partnerships, a group of science and mathematics educators, scientists, mathematicians, and elementary teachers and administrators began meeting in the fall of 1989 to discuss how to collaboratively enhance K-6 science and mathematics teaching in the Manhattan-Ogden School District while simultaneously enhancing the way elementary science and mathematics teachers were prepared at Kansas State

University. This group had a special interest in promoting science and mathematics for all children, particularly those historically underrepresented and underserved in these fields. The group's desire to simultaneously reform teaching in K-6 schools and teacher education along with their commitment to equitable teaching mirrored early recommendations regarding school-university partnerships and Professional Development Schools (Goodlad, 1994; Holmes, 1986) and led the group to propose the KSU/Manhattan-Ogden PDS Partnership. Three elementary schools in the district, Amanda Arnold, Lee, and Woodrow Wilson, were selected to represent Manhattan-Ogden USD 383 as the first Professional Development Schools. Twenty-five elementary teachers from these schools, along with six content faculty and six education faculty from Kansas State University, were identified to participate in the initial planning and implementation efforts.

Two grant projects and a unique partnership with the National Educational Association (NEA) provided critical support to this first PDS initiative. In the summer of 1990, with the support of the Educational Enhancement Grant and KSU's College of Education (COE), Manhattan-Ogden School District offered the first Math/Science/Technology (MST) Summer Magnet School for elementary children. A school district principal and university faculty member shared administrative responsibilities and provided professional development, guidance, and support for participating teachers. The MST Summer Magnet School served two purposes:

- to provide an innovative summer school experience for K-6 students to enable them to develop higher-level thinking and problem-solving skills in science, mathematics, and technology; and
- to create a Professional Development Center which would be conducted simultaneously with the magnet school, to provide exemplary training and field experiences for teachers to give them the opportunity to learn, practice, and experiment with the philosophy and strategies for hands-on, activity-based teaching in science, mathematics, and technology" (Shroyer, Ramey-Gassert, Hancock, Moore, & Walker, 1995, p. 115).

"I will be forever grateful for the relationships that I built and fostered through being a part of the change process with the PDS program. I learned how to have in-depth discussion about curriculum and research...working closely with college professors and classroom teachers to improve education was an amazing opportunity."

– Angie Messer

Assistant Principal, Manhattan High School,
Original Secondary PDS planning team member

The vision statement developed by participants focused on creating a community of learners who were involved in exploring, questioning, processing, experiencing, and thinking divergently about the world around them and their relationship and responsibility to that world. The MST Summer Magnet School was designed to integrate students into this vision and the Professional Development Center was designed to prepare teachers as peer coaches to model, evaluate, and improve teaching strategies being implemented in the MST Summer Magnet School to realize the vision. In addition, a special focus was placed on recruiting underrepresented students into the MST Summer Magnet School to emphasize that science and mathematics are for ALL children. Although the first magnet school served predominantly white males, the demographics had shifted by 1994 to include approximately 50% female and over 50% minority students (Shroyer et al., 1995).

In 1990, Amanda Arnold Elementary School, one of the first three PDS schools, was one of five national sites selected as a Mastery in Learning School by the NEA National Center for Innovation. This recognition included a five-year commitment to investigate the impact of site-based decision making. Through this partnership, teachers, administrators, and faculty associated with Amanda Arnold were connected to national researchers and a support system coordinated by the National Center for Innovation. Amanda Arnold's involvement in the Mastery in Learning project stimulated many "innovations in action" and teacher empowerment initiatives throughout the PDS Partnership that served to strengthen the partnership.

During this same five year period (1990-1995), the Kansas State University College of Education received funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF) to develop and implement an Innovative Model for the Science, Mathematics, and Technology Preparation of Elementary Teachers. Planning teams of scientists, mathematicians, science and mathematics educators, and elementary teachers met weekly to revise science and mathematics content courses required for elementary teachers and design new science and mathematics methods courses and field experiences to align with the revised content courses. Participating teachers attended content and methods courses and helped university faculty supervise new field experiences. University faculty visited the elementary PDS schools to enhance their understanding of and provide support for elementary level science and mathematics teaching and learning. University and school partners shared their common concerns and struggles and celebrated each others' successes. In addition, yearly summer institutes and monthly professional development days at the university provided ongoing professional development for the elementary teachers and university faculty involved in the partnership. These interactions fostered a sense of confidence in the idea of simultaneous reform.

The NSF project planning teams and professional development sessions focused on the theme: "What are the knowledge and skills needed for the next generation of elementary teachers to more effectively prepare elementary children to be scientifically and mathematically literate?"

Discussions were aided by the vast number of national standards, recommendations, and reform documents being released during this time period (AAAS, 1989; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; INTASC, 1995; Loucks-Horsley, et al, 1989; MAA, 1991; McKinney, 1993; NCISE, 1989; NCTAF, 1996; NCTM, 1989; NRC, 1988, 1996; NSTA, 1988). As participants read, reflected upon, and discussed the many recommendations being proposed, they realized the recommendations spoke to all of them at a personal classroom level as well as at department, college, school, district, and university levels.

The success of these early PDS partnership initiatives created a contagious enthusiasm within the university and elementary schools. The PDS partnership soon expanded to include all subject areas, additional schools, and new district partners. This success was highly dependent upon frequent communication, ongoing shared professional development, mutual respect and appreciation, and a shared vision of improvement. Weekly planning sessions, monthly professional development days, and annual summer institutes provided opportunities for ongoing two-way communication, as well as shared professional development. Teachers, administrators, and university faculty members did not learn in isolation; rather they learned with and from one another. Although discussions focused on future teachers, the implications for self-improvement were obvious, and participants soon adopted the philosophy of "learning and growing together as a community of learners" (Shroyer, Wright, & Ramey-Gassert, 1996). This philosophy led to mutual respect and appreciation among partners. Beliefs moved from an initial apprehension regarding each group attempting to "fix" the other group, to a shared belief that all participants were collaboratively creating a new system of education. This became the shared vision that held the partnership together. As time passed, it was clear that the growth and expansion of the PDS partnership would need nurturing.

Nurturing the Growth of the PDS Partnership (1995-2010)

By the end of the NSF funding in 1995, the PDS partnership had moved from a focus on science, mathematics, and technology to a focus on all subjects taught within elementary education as additional university faculty joined the partnership. Moreover, three additional Manhattan-Ogden elementary schools, Ogden, Northview, and Bergman, became PDS sites in an effort to involve all elementary teacher education candidates in PDS experiences. Many other changes were required after 1995 to nurture the growth and development of the PDS partnership. In particular, partners worked during these years on establishing financial support mechanisms, changing roles and responsibilities, and fostering initiatives to promote continued communication, collaboration, professional development, and improvement. The most critical change needed to support the continued growth of the partnership was to move funding from external grant sources to internal university and district resources. Although grant projects continued to be an ideal way to initiate and support collaboration, professional development, and improvement initiatives, PDS leaders realized that

the essential roles of key PDS participants, such as clinical instructors and PDS directors, needed institutionalized support for legitimacy and sustainability.

The PDS model was created using PDS-based teachers as clinical instructors to help plan, implement, and monitor all field experiences and professional development activities within each school. The first three clinical instructors worked full time on the grant and their full salaries were covered using NSF grant. As NSF funding came to a close, the university negotiated with the school district to pay half of the salaries for six clinical instructors to serve as half time clinical instructors within six PDS schools. Although the clinical instructors were almost always highly experienced teachers, the district charged the university the "replacement cost" of hiring a half time new teacher to cover half of the clinical instructors' classroom teaching responsibilities. Later, this agreement was changed to paying half of an average teacher salary for the half time clinical instructor positions. This financial agreement demonstrated a commitment to the partnership by both the university and the school district. The clinical instructors became true boundary spanners, spending half their time as teacher educators and half of their time as district and school leaders. As part of their district responsibilities, these individuals served as classroom teachers, specialists, or assistant principals. They were responsible for all teacher candidates placed in their buildings for four full semesters of field experiences. In addition, they coordinated professional development opportunities, mentored new teachers, and assisted with curriculum development, instructional improvement, and school improvement initiatives within their PDS. These roles made them indispensable to both organizations.

Clinical instructors met weekly after the partnership was initiated, and collaboratively engaged with PDS directors in program development and evaluation, as well as continuous professional development activities. Originally, the university faculty position of PDS Director was supported through NSF funds. At the conclusion of the NSF project, this funding was shifted to the College of Education (COE), and the director served as a COE elementary science educator and PDS Director. As the partnership expanded to secondary education, an additional director was supported part-time to coordinate the secondary PDS model. These two PDS directors were able to coordinate ongoing communication, collaboration, professional development, and K-16 improvement efforts along with providing traditional teacher education in their own content fields. Thus existing organizational funds were used to serve multiple purposes.

When the elementary PDS model was expanded to secondary education in 1995, Manhattan High School was included as a PDS site. The first secondary clinical instructor was hired by taking advantage of another window of opportunity. A secondary math educator in the COE and key PDS supporter took a two year sabbatical leave and encouraged the College of Education to hire a high school mathematics teacher as the mathematics educator and clinical instructor. This clinical instructor worked with the PDS directors to facilitate a full year of meetings between high

school teachers, high school and district administrators, and secondary faculty members to develop the specifics of the high school PDS model. Methods courses were revised and new field experiences were initiated through this planning process—demonstrating again the power of communication and shared collaborative projects. As the secondary PDS model grew and developed, the College of Education engaged in negotiations with the Manhattan-Ogden School District to jointly support clinical instructors (two middle and one high school) in the secondary schools.

Although internal financial support for key players was critical for nurturing and sustaining growth in the partnership, external influences continued to play an essential role. The importance of outside sources of support and influence was demonstrated when Manhattan-Ogden School District and the KSU College of Education became the first district-college partnership in the nation to be recognized as an NEA Learning Lab in 1992. This was a five-year recognition that provided NEA support through the National Center for Innovation for district and college partners to study and improve K-12 education while simultaneously improving teacher education. As members of the NEA Learning Lab, district teachers and administrators attended the annual NEA National Symposium with administrators and faculty members from the college. These symposia provided school and university partners with additional opportunities to communicate, plan, reflect, and engage in shared professional development. The first formal PDS Partnership agreement between Manhattan-Ogden School District, the College of Education, and the local NEA was written at an NEA Learning Lab Symposium.

In 1997, as a result of the formal NEA Learning Lab/PDS partnership agreement, all Manhattan-Ogden schools were identified as PDS sites. This included four additional elementary schools (Bluemont, Eugene Field, Marlatt, and Theodore Roosevelt) and the two middle schools (Anthony and Eisenhower), thereby bringing the total to 10 elementary, two middle, and one high school PDS. Additional forms of external support were needed to nurture this growth.

A major part of the PDS directors' responsibilities became securing external support for initiatives that could not be implemented through college and district funding alone. One state grant, two national grants, and two national projects, offered through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the National Educational Association (NEA), were leveraged between 1996 and 2010 to provide additional resources for collaboration time, research support, and ongoing professional development for all PDS participants.

From 1996-1997, a state Eisenhower grant provided much needed assistance to encourage teachers to enhance K-12 teaching across the district. The Project to Promote Reform through Innovation, Development, and Evaluation (Project PRIDE) provided teachers with professional development through two month-long summer institutes, six monthly professional development days each year, and additional release time as needed to conduct team action research projects. Thirty participating teachers collaboratively studied school and district data to identify curricular and instructional

“ ***Being part of a community of learners was stimulating, raised my standards, increased my intellectual level, and provided satisfaction. I felt that I was part of the process of improving teacher education for all involved parties and cohorts. All my experiences were meaningful and formative for me and they continued to be so throughout my participation. While I miss the K-State community of learners, the PDS experience reinforced my commitment to continued professional development and lifelong learning.*** ”

– Dr. John Dalida

Professor Emeritus, College of Education,
Kansas State University

opportunities for improvement with two science educators, a scientist, and two mathematicians. These studies led to team improvement projects that were evaluated and sustained using action research. One of these team action research projects, conducted at Woodrow Wilson Elementary School, won national recognition through the U.S. Department of Education's National Awards Program for Model Professional Development and by being highlighted as a Successful Program in *Ideas that Work: Mathematics, Professional Development* (ENC, n.d.). Project PRIDE also resulted in the first expansion of the PDS model into a new district. A team of teachers from Morris Hill Elementary School on the Ft. Riley military base participated in Project PRIDE and then encouraged the district, Geary County USD 475, and the College of Education to include Morris Hill as the 11th elementary PDS site in 1997. Morris Hill also expanded the focus of the PDS partnership to include issues related to military-connected children and their families. This military connection was a powerful addition to the existing teacher preparation program.

Between 1998 and 2000, additional external support was provided, as the KSU PDS partnership was selected as one of 20 institutions to participate in the NCATE PDS Standards Project (NCATE, 2001). The newly established Manhattan High School PDS site was selected as the primary site to study the appropriateness, usefulness, and manageability of the NCATE PDS standards. This high school's involvement in this project created new opportunities for communication and collaboration between partners that helped the newly established PDS grow and develop.

Perhaps the largest source of support for nurturing the growth and development of the PDS partnership came via another externally funded project, Enhancing Teacher Quality Through PDS Partnerships. This project was funded under a Teacher Quality Enhancement grant from the U.S. Department of Education from 1999-2004. These external funds were

used to involve additional teachers and administrators, content faculty, and education faculty to expand and further study and develop the PDS partnership. Summer institutes were again conducted each year to provide ongoing professional development and opportunities for partners to communicate across traditionally separated roles to jointly plan K-16 improvement strategies. Participants were placed in planning teams to study national reform documents and newly released standards in all content areas. Self-assessments were conducted and self-improvement plans were identified at all levels K-16. A highlight for participants was their participation in Peer Consultation teams involving K-12 teachers, content faculty members and education faculty members. These teams reviewed one another's curricula, instructional practices, and assessment strategies. In addition, the teams observed in one another's classrooms. Participants acknowledged the power of these collaborative improvement efforts on their beliefs and practices related to teaching and learning.

This grant project also resulted in the expansion of the PDS partnership within the Geary County School District: Junction City High School, Ft. Riley Middle School, and Junction City Middle School became PDS sites in 2000; and Lincoln, Sheridan, and Ware elementary schools became PDS sites in 2002. These schools increased the important element of diversity in the PDS partnership, as Geary County was among the most ethnically diverse districts in the state and served the military families of Ft. Riley.

Another opportunity to partner with the NEA occurred from 2001-2003 through the NEA PDS Research Project (NEA, 2001). This project helped nurture growth and development of the PDS partnership by encouraging college and district partners to examine the effectiveness of the PDS partnership. In particular, the project within the KSU PDS partnership examined the impact of the partnership on new teachers and student achievement within the PDS. University-district partners offered mentoring for new teachers and tracked achievement gains and decreases in achievement gaps based on race, gender, and socio-economic indicators. The success of K-12 students and teacher education candidates was viewed as the joint responsibility of university faculty and their K-12 partners.

From 2004-2010 a second Teacher Quality Enhancement Project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, and the Equity and Access Project was launched. This project again used summer institutes and cross-organizational planning teams to provide professional development and ongoing opportunities for communication, self-reflection, and collaborative improvement. In addition, the Equity and Access Project involved three community colleges and three highly diverse districts in southwest Kansas to implement a distance-based teacher education program for place-bound, non-traditional, Hispanic, and English Language Learners working as paraprofessionals. During the six years of the project, partners were collaboratively able to graduate 30 culturally and linguistically diverse teachers prepared to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners in this underserved region of the state. In addition,

over 100 teachers, 60 faculty from the College of Education, 30 faculty from content fields in the College of Arts and Sciences, and 30 community college faculty worked together on K-16 improvement efforts specifically aimed at meeting the needs of culturally, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse students at all levels of schooling. This addition was a tremendous source of pride across the partnership.

It is evident to PDS partners that internal as well as external sources of funding and support were essential to supporting the growth and development of PDS partnerships. These experiences demonstrated that internal sources of support for key roles and jointly established responsibilities were needed for legitimacy and sustainability. However, the power of external sources of influence and support cannot be overlooked. A hallmark of the partnership was the creation of a culture of grant writing that still exists in the College of Education. Neither districts nor universities have the resources to provide enough time and opportunities to sustain continuous professional development, communication, and collaborative improvement—particularly in fiscally tight eras. Yet continuous professional development, communication, and collaborative improvement projects help nurture growth and development. It appears that educators interested in nurturing large-scale change must think and plan carefully to secure internal support and find ways to leverage external support as well. Windows of opportunity should be sought and taken advantage of whenever possible.

Sustaining the PDS Partnership (2010 and beyond)

As the 25th anniversary of this unique collaborative PDS partnership approaches, the question becomes, "How do we sustain large scale change efforts like a PDS Partnership?" The last large Teacher Quality Enhancement project ended in 2010. Since then, the focus has shifted from expanding the partnership to sustaining it at current levels. Numerous smaller grants have sustained PDS participants' interest, enthusiasm, and growth in selected content areas. State partnership grants and even university small research grants have been used to sustain growth and development of PDS partners, particularly in mathematics where funds have been received annually for more than 15 years. The Manhattan-Ogden district received federal funding to offer a Science, Technology, Engineering, & Math (STEM) academy each summer from 2011 to 2014 in order to team PDS teachers and administrators with Kansas State University faculty and teacher candidates to offer enriched STEM summer opportunities for middle school students. These smaller projects have continued to provide ongoing professional development and opportunities to communicate and collaborate across institutions and jointly enact improvement efforts. Perhaps external support and funding is as important for sustaining partnerships as it is for developing them.

In addition, internal influences continue to need attention if PDS partnerships are to be sustained. The 25 years of the PDS partnership have seen changes in leadership and participants in every school and district in the partnership. In addition, the College of Education has seen recent turnover of faculty and leadership at the department as well as the college level.

Many, if not most, of the original PDS partners have retired or will do so within the next few years. Times have changed, and it cannot be assumed that new teachers, administrators, and faculty members will understand or appreciate the importance of PDS partnerships without on-going communication. They did not experience the limitations and disillusionments of teacher education of the past. They did not live through times when teachers and faculty members barely spoke and neither trusted the other. Current financial climates are especially difficult for districts and universities. Accountability measures and a focus on standardization have impacted educators' focus. PDS partnerships demand resources that are hard to understand or defend when other educational needs are going unmet. Earlier generations of educators must embrace the responsibility to help the newer generation appreciate the past and understand how it led to the present. Communication continues to be as important to sustaining partnerships as it was to developing them as new partners enter the picture.

The first generation of PDS partners also needs to understand the importance of personal relevance and ownership for second-generation PDS partners. Institutionalized practices do not need to live on forever. First generation PDS partners need to be open to change as second generation partners assume their roles. New ideas and strategies can be just as beneficial as existing practices have been, as long as they are designed to address the same perennial issues educators continue to face.

Perhaps the key to sustaining any change effort is to understand the process of change itself. The KSU PDS partners studied the change process as the partnership was being developed (Fullan, 1991). However, institutionalization of practices can make educators take those practices for granted. The lessons learned regarding educational change involving the development of the KSU PDS partnership include the importance of frequent communication, on-going professional development for all members of the partnership, mutual respect and appreciation, and a shared vision of improvement. Growing and developing these partnerships was dependent upon internal support and mutually determined roles and responsibilities along with external influences and support. However, this PDS partnership also was nurtured through continuing professional development, communication, and simultaneous improvement initiatives.

Perhaps first- and second-generation PDS partners would benefit from studying educational change together and collaborating on a vision for PDS partnerships of the future. Identifying new possibilities for simultaneous improvement related to changing national standards and assessment practices; providing new equitable opportunities for all students; expanding and diversifying the teaching force; and responding to the changing needs of future students could galvanize the passion and energy of PDS partners as they jointly create a path toward a better tomorrow. Finding new opportunities for communication and collaboration, while helping all those involved develop a personal sense of meaning and ownership, should enhance future PDS partnership initiatives while also tending to

critical components of the change process. Sustaining the partnership will now be dependent upon coming full circle and initiating new rounds of communication focused on a mutually agreed upon vision of the partnership and new opportunities to collaborate on the continuous improvement of the model and enhancement of the educational system.



References

- American Association for the Advancement of Science. (1989). *Science for all Americans project 2061: Report on literacy goals in science, mathematics, and technology*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of Colleges for Teachers Education. (1990). *The AACTE/Ford Foundation clinical schools project*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Bailey, G. D. (1988). Public school-university partnership: Existing ground, common ground, or new ground? *Educational Considerations*, 25(3), 21-24.
- Boyer, E. L. (1984). *High school: Report on secondary education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York, NY: Author.
- Conkwright, P., & DeNoon, D. (1988). Partnership perspectives: Empowering stakeholders. *Educational Considerations*, 25(3), 30-31.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- The Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the sign of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- The Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Howey, K. R. (2006). Why boundary spanning? In K. R. Howey & N. L. Zimpher (Eds.), *Boundary spanners: A key to success in urban P-16 university-school partnerships* (pp. 5-26). Washington DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Howey, K. R., & Zimpher, N. L. (2006). *Boundary spanners: A key to success in urban P-16 university-school partnerships*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1995). *INTASC core standards*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, S. E., Love, N. B., & Hewson, P. W. (1989). *Developing and supporting teachers for elementary school science education*. Washington, DC: National Center for Improving Science Education.
- The Mathematical Association of America (MAA). (1991). *A call for change: Recommendations for the mathematical preparation of teachers of mathematics*. Washington, DC: Author.
- McKinney, K. (1993). *Improving math and science teaching: A report on the secretary's second conference on mathematics and science*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- National Center for Improving Science Education. (1989). *Science and technology education for the elementary years: Frameworks for curriculum and instruction*. Andover, WA: The Network.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York, NY: Author.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001). *Standards for professional Development Schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Council for Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Professional standards for teaching mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Council for Teachers of Mathematics. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Research Council. (1988). *Everybody counts: A report to the nation on the future of mathematics education*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Research Council. (1996). *National science standards*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Science Board (1983). *Educating Americans for the 21st century: A report to the American people and the National Science Board*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Science Teachers' Association. (1988). *Science education initiatives for the 1990s*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Pankake, A. M., Bailey, G. D., & Rowe, H. (1988). The Council for Public School Improvement: From coexistence to collaboration in professional development efforts. *Educational Considerations*, 25(3), 25-26.
- Shroyer, M. G., Ramey-Gassert, L., Hancock, M., Moore, P., & Walker, M. (1995). Math, science, technology after-school clubs and summer magnet school: Collaborative professional development opportunities for science educators. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 6(2), 112-119.
- Shroyer, M. G., Wright, E. L., & Ramey-Gassert, L. (1996). An innovative model for collaborative reform in elementary school science teaching. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 7(3), 151-168.
- Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). *Action for excellence*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Thompson, D. (1988). A working partnership: Training administrators in a cooperative field-based model. *Educational Considerations*, 25(3), 17-20.